

# MUSEOLOGICA BRUNENSIA

MB

2016 / ROČNÍK/VOLUME 05  
ČÍSLO/NUMBER 02



MB

MASARYKOVA UNIVERZITA  
FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA

MASARYKOVA UNIVERZITA, FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA,  
ÚSTAV ARCHEOLOGIE A MUZEOLOGIE

BRNO 2016

ISSN 1805-4722 (print)  
ISSN 2464-5362 (online)

## OBSAH ČÍSLA/CONTENTS

ÚVODNÍ SLOVO/EDITORIAL	strana 4
<b>STUDIE/ARTICLES</b>	
<b>BRUNO BRULON SOARES*</b> Provoking museology: the geminal thinking of Zbyněk Z. Stránský	strana 5
<b>PETER VAN MENSCH*</b> Metamuseological challenges in the work of Zbyněk Stránský	strana 18
<b>FRANÇOIS MAIRESSE*</b> What is Zbyněk Z. Stránský's "influence" on museology?	strana 27
<b>FRANCISCA HERNÁNDEZ – J. PEDRO LORENTE*</b> Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský and Spanish Museology	strana 37
<b>MARKUS WALZ*</b> Too early, too late: the relevance of Zbyněk Z. Stránský for German museology	strana 44
<b>BERNADETTE BIEDERMANN*</b> The theory of museology. Museology as it is – defined by two pioneers: Zbyněk Z. Stránský and Friedrich Waidacher	strana 51
<b>LENKA MRÁZOVÁ*</b> Remarks on the role of Z. Z. Stránský in conceptual development of the curriculum of Brno museology	strana 65
<b>METODICKÉ A INFORMAČNÍ TEXTY/ METHODICAL AND INFORMATIVE TEXTS</b>	
<b>EIN UNERSETZBARER. ZUM ABLEBEN VON ZBYNĚK Z. STRÁNSKÝ/ THE IRREPLACEABLE ONE. ON THE DEMISE OF ZBYNĚK Z. STRÁNSKÝ</b> Friedrich Waidacher	strana 74
<b>ZBYNĚK ZBYSLAV STRÁNSKÝ, ICOFOM AND THE MUSEOLOGY</b> Hildegard K. Vieregg	strana 76
<b>THE INFLUENCE OF Z. Z. STRÁNSKÝ'S IDEAS ON THE FORMATION OF THE SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MUSEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF SAINT PETERSBURG STATE INSTITUTE OF CULTURE</b> Maria J. Gubarenko	strana 82
<b>MOJE VZPOMÍNKY NA DOCENTA PHDR. ZBYŇKA Z. STRÁNSKÉHO (26. 10. 1926–21. 1. 2016)/ MY MEMORIES OF DOCENT PHDR. ZBYNĚK Z. STRÁNSKÝ (26. 10. 1926–21. 1. 2016)</b> Vladimír Podborský	strana 85
<b>FENOMÉN „STRÁNSKÝ“ V MÚZEJNÍCTVE NA SLOVENSKU/ THE „STRÁNSKÝ“ PHENOMENON AND SLOVAK MUSEUMS</b> Marcel Lalkovič †	strana 90
<b>ZBYNĚK ZBYSLAV STRÁNSKÝ: ŽIVOT A DÍLO/ ZBYNĚK ZBYSLAV STRÁNSKÝ: LIFE AND WORK</b> Pavel Holman	strana 99

\*recenzované studie/peer-reviewed articles

## ÚVODNÍ SLOVO

Vážení čtenáři,

na začátku roku zastihla muzeologickou obec smutná zpráva o smrti českého muzeologa světového významu Zbyňka Zbyslava Stránského. Jeho jméno je jak v domácím, tak i v mezinárodním kontextu spojeno s rozsáhlou publikační činností, v níž odborné veřejnosti představil své specifické a originální pojetí muzeologie jako autonomní vědy, s organizováním univerzitního muzeologického vzdělávání (Brno, Banská Štiavnica; International Summer School of Museology ISSOM Brno), s profesním sdružováním a s ním spojenou mezinárodní spoluprací (např. ICOFOM) i redakční prací (Muzeologické sešity). Svou stopu zanechal také v odborném oborovém periodiku *Museologica Brunensia*, na němž participoval jako autor a člen redakční rady.

Redakční rada časopisu se památce této stěžejní osobnosti brněnské muzeologie rozhodla věnovat monotematické číslo, do nějž přispěla řada současných významných představitelů oboru. Obsah předloženého čísla mohl být i díky tomu rozdělen do dvou částí. Odborné studie především analyzují muzeologické myšlení Zbyňka Zbyslava Stránského a zkoumají jeho dopady na rozvoj muzeologie v minulosti a současnosti. Sekce informativních a metodických statí pak dává prostor vzpomínkovým textům někdejších soupeřníků, spolupracovníků a kolegů. Velké díky patří všem autorům, kteří s pochopením a ochotou přijali nabízenou výzvu, a umožnili tak tomuto tematicky ucelenému číslu vzniknout.

Podzimním číslem se *Museologica Brunensia* loučí také s dalšími osobnostmi, které nás v tomto roce opustily, a to se členem redakční rady časopisu a dlouholetým vedoucím Ústavu archeologie a muzeologie na Masarykově univerzitě v Brně, Zdeňkem Měřínským, a slovenským muzeologem Marcelem Lalkovičem, který je autorem jednoho z textů v tomto čísle. Současně s obnovou složení redakční rady proběhly také některé další změny, z nichž za zmínku stojí zařazení periodika do vědecké databáze European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH Plus).

Otakar Kirsch a Lucie Jagošová

## EDITORIAL

Dear readers,

early this year, our museological community was caught out by the bad news that the world-recognised Czech museologist Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský has passed away. His name, in both Czech and international context, is connected with extensive publication activity, by which he presented to the professional community his specific and original concept of museology as an autonomous discipline, and communicated his experience with organising the museology education in universities (Brno, Banská Štiavnica; International Summer School of Museology ISSOM Brno), with professional associations and the related international cooperation (e. g. ICOFOM), and his editorial work (*Muzeologické sešity*). He also left a trace in the professional periodical *Museologica Brunensia*, in which he participated as author and member of Editorial Board.

The Editorial Board decided to dedicate a monothematic issue of the journal to the memory of this key personality of Brno museology school. Many significant representatives of present-day museology submitted their papers to this special issue. The content of this issue is therefore divided into two parts. Professional papers mainly analyse the museological thinking of Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský and pay attention to its impact on the past and present development of museology. The section of informative and methodical texts comprises commemorative essays by Stránský's contemporaries, co-workers and colleagues. Big gratitude goes to all authors who with understanding and good grace took up the challenge and helped to give rise to this thematically unified issue.

With its autumnal issue, *Museologica Brunensia* also bids farewell to another personalities who passed away this year, namely to Zdeňk Měřínský – member of Editorial Board of the journal and long-time head of the Department of Archaeology and Museology at the Masaryk University in Brno, and the Slovak museologist Marcel Lalkovič, who wrote one of the articles in this issue.

Along with reconstitution of the Editorial Board also some other changes came into being, for example the inclusion of the periodical in the scientific database European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH Plus).

Otakar Kirsch and Lucie Jagošová

## STUDIE/ARTICLES

# PROVOKING MUSEOLOGY: THE GEMINAL THINKING OF ZBYNĚK Z. STRÁNSKÝ<sup>1</sup>

DOI: 10.5817/MuB2016-2-1

BRUNO BRULON SOARES

**ABSTRACT/ABSTRAKT:**

The paper intends to make a conceptual revision of the work produced by the Czech museologist Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský (1926–2016), referring to the period between 1965 to 1995, when he was responsible for the attempt to conceive a theory for museology. With his metatheory, this thinker aimed to defend and sustain this discipline's scientific status. In his works, by refuting the museum as the study subject for this supposed "science", Stránský would discuss which should be its fundamental subjects of interest in its place, creating specific concepts for museology. With the terms *musealia*, *museality* and *musealization* he shifts the discipline's focus from the museum, as an instrument for a certain end, to the processes of attributing value to things. His theory generates, thus, the necessary foundation for the museological field, integrating theory and practice, and initiating a social and scientific reflection for museology. Therefore, the paper historicizes the process of configuration of disciplinary museology in Eastern Europe in order to understand what was in the base of the geminal thinking structuring this branch of knowledge and, at the same time, appointing new pathways for its future.

**Formování muzeologie jako vědy a myšlenkový odkaz Zbyňka Z. Stránského**

Cílem tohoto příspěvku je konceptuální přehled aktivit českého muzeologa Zbyňka Zbyslava Stránského (1926–2016), které se vztahují k období mezi lety 1965 až 1995, kdy se pokoušel vytvořit teorii muzeologie. Prostřednictvím této metateorie se Z. Z. Stránský snažil obhájit a posílit pozici muzeologie jako vědního oboru. Ve svých pracích Stránský vysvětloval, že předmětem studia této formující se vědy není muzeum samotné, ale že jsou jím jiné základní oblasti zájmu, čímž vytvářel specifické koncepty muzeologie. Prostřednictvím pojmů *muzeálie*, *muzealita* a *muzealizace* přesouvá ohnisko vědeckého zájmu muzeologie z muzea jako nástroje pro určitý účel k procesům přisuzování hodnoty předmětům. Jeho teorie tak vytváří potřebný základ pro obor muzeologie, který v sobě spojuje teoretické i praktické aspekty a vyvolává společenskou i vědeckou reflexi. Příspěvek proto pojednává o historii procesu etablování muzeologie jako vědy ve východní Evropě, který umožňuje lépe pochopit dvě základní roviny myšlení, jež pomáhaly formovat tento obor, a zároveň vytyčuje i nové cíle do budoucna.

**KEYWORDS/KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA:**

*museology – Stránský – Brno school – musealization*  
*muzeologie – Stránský – brněnská muzeologická škola – muzealizace*

*“If thirty or even twenty years ago anyone had talked or written about museology as a science, many people would have reacted with a compassionate or a contemptuous smile. Today this is, of course, different.”*

*(J. G. Graesse, Zeitschrift für Museologie und Antiquitätenkunde, 1883)*

*“It is my opinion that knowledge of one's own history is a very important argument for every branch of science, when defending its existence.”*

*(Zbyněk Z. Stránský, Museological News, 1985, no. 8)*

At first, there were material objects. Then, there were museums occupying the center of the branch that gathered specific knowledge and practices, which has been called "museology". Among a few other pioneer thinkers, and maybe the most prominent of them all, Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský (1926–2016) was responsible for the first contemporary attempt to give some conceptual structure to this new born discipline in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In the present paper we intend to revise some of his geminal ideas that are, still today, in the bases of museological thinking and that evolved in his works notably from 1965 to 1995.

In chemistry, the term *geminal* refers to a relationship that is established between two atoms or functional groups that are attached

<sup>1</sup> *In memoriam Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský.*

to the same common atom. The concept is important because functional groups attached to the same atom tend to behave differently from when they are separated. This movement of conversion, that is often observed in atoms, can be here taken as a metaphor for the geminal ideas disseminated by Stránský's museological thinking. Very early, in the mid-1960s, he conceived the foundations of a discipline that connects the museum work to theory through what he understood as *museology*.

His metatheory specifically designed for museology was the linking element that was missing for the transformation of museum practice, with the goal to attend to social needs that were in the base of the development of the museum institution. Saying that Stránský has founded the discipline as we know it in the 21<sup>st</sup> century might not be an exaggeration if we consider what was the main motivation for his ideas: to create a corpus of specific knowledge that could be systematically taught for training museum professionals. His project, first initiated in Brno, would gain followers in virtually every part of the world, first with the International Committee for Museology – ICOFOM, created in 1977, and with his International Summer School of Museology – ISSOM (1986–1999).

Born in Kutná Hora, the old Czechoslovakia, in 26<sup>th</sup> October, 1926, Zbyněk Z. Stránský – as he used to sign his papers – studied history and philosophy at Charles University, in Prague, from 1946 to 1950. During the 1950s, he worked in several Czech museums and in 1962 he was appointed the head of the innovative Department of Museology of the Moravian Museum and the J. E. Purkyně University, in Brno. There, he has established, under the influence of Jan Jelínek (1926–2004), the museum director, the first teaching school of museo-

logy devoted to museological theory in the world. Already in the 1960s and 1970s, Stránský was considered the leading person of the Central-European museological school, and, according to some voices, “Copernicus of museology”.<sup>2</sup>

First, there were museums. Then, museology. In the middle, there was, and somehow there still is, Stranskian geminal thinking as the missing element for our disciplinary structure. Beyond defending museology as a science, Stránský's ideas dislocated the focus of museum studies from the collections and the very museums, to the processes that constitute them: *musealia*, *museality* and *musealization* would be his key concepts to understand the full process of attributing value to things. This *chemist* has created a new branch of studies, inaugurating a *museological* school and provoking the awakening of a theoretical consciousness for museology that is indispensable for any study in this area today.

### The museum field and museology: the origins of the Brno School

The history of museology as an academic discipline begins in a museum. It was the year of 1962, when some professionals of the Moravian Museum, in Brno, Czechoslovakia, have presented to the Philosophical Faculty of the J. E. Purkyně University the proposal of creating a Department of Museology, institutionally connected both to the museum and the university. The idea was seen by many “*as an attempt to enforce a measure which had no prospect of success and which sooner*

*or later would prove to be a failure.*”<sup>3</sup> However, the proposal was approved for the initiation of an experimental project. The main goal, shared by both institutions, was the establishment of a specialized training program for the museum staff in “museology”.

In this first stage of specialized training for museum professionals, it was clear that the J. E. Purkyně University would not have the financial means or even the personnel to properly ensure its continuous operation. For this reason, the teaching of museology in the new Department was dependent on professionals from the museum staff and some collaborators from other Czech museums.<sup>4</sup> The challenge taken on by these museum workers, who had no legitimate place at a university, was to create and defend a theoretical conception of museology, as well as a structured system of thought that could justify the existence of this discipline in the framework of university education. Furthermore, at the same time that museology should prove to be theoretically based, its training should present practical results for museum work. Hence, according to the Faculty dean, in 1974, the graduated professionals in this branch of studies:

are equipped – as has been shown mainly by their diploma theses – not only theoretically, but also for the efforts to work out a new and truly progressive form of museum work, fully conscious of the importance and specific role of the museum in society and able, therefore, to perform really fundamental, pioneer work in the urgent qualitative

2 DOLÁK, Jan. Museologist Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský – Basic Concepts. In BRULON SOARES, Bruno, Anaildo Bernardo BARAÇAL and Luciana Menezes DE CARVALHO. *Stránský: a bridge Brno-Brazil/ Stránský: uma ponte Brno-Brasil*. Papers from the III Debates Cycle in Museology, Rio de Janeiro, Universidade Federal do Estado do Rio de Janeiro – UNIRIO, International Committee for Museology – ICOFOM, unprinted.

3 See the statement of Milan Kopecký, dean of the J. E. Purkyně University in 1974, in STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Brno: Education in Museology. *Museological Papers V, Supplementum 2*, 1974.

4 Kopecký, Milan, in STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Brno: Education in Museology. *Museological Papers V, Supplementum 2*, 1974, p. 8.

transformation of the running of museums.<sup>5</sup>

The craved transformation was in the very museum as a space of work for these professionals, but further – and indistinctly, according to the ICOM president and director of the Moravian Museum, Jan Jelínek – of “*making a real profession of museum work.*”<sup>6</sup> For Jelínek, the profession is not a question of whether a person is or is not employed in a museum, but primarily whether this person has acquired the specific knowledge. In this sense, in the beginning of the 1960s, the question frequently posed by museum workers was: “*from where should an employee or specially the beginner acquire such a specialized knowledge?*”

In fact, in the context in which several of the so-called contemporary sciences were being configured, a museum professional wouldn't know the difference exactly between the work he or she is carrying out as a specialist in the environment of a museum – for example, in biology, zoology, anthropology or archeology – and the work of his/her colleagues employed as teachers at a university or research institute.<sup>7</sup> Their practice, in general, was determined by other specialties whose focus was in the museum collections as products of different sciences and the specific knowledge produced from them. Meanwhile, there was not a branch of studies dedicated to the museum processes, its function and organization.

Was the work of museum professionals being limited by the very collections they helped to preserve? Was the museum devoid of a special knowledge produced from

<sup>5</sup> Idem, p. 8.

<sup>6</sup> Jelínek, Jan, in STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Brno: Education in Museology. *Museological Papers V, Supplementum 2*, 1974, p. 10.

<sup>7</sup> Idem, p. 10.

its practice? In reality, research developed on the very museum collections was held by university scholars. What was left, then, for museum professionals as knowledge producers?

A drastic transformation in the profile of these professionals would take place in the Moravian Museum in the 1960s. Stránský, as head of the recently created Department of Museology, would master a way through which his theory, taught as “*museology*” in this very museum, would revolutionize practice and assure a place for *museologists* as thinkers and researchers, instead of mere museum technicians.

The years of 1964 and 1965 were marked by public museological seminars organized by the department of the faculty and the Moravian Museum together. They had the double aim of, from one side, testing the solution for some museological problems and, from the other, advertising museology. Between 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> March, 1965, the first museological symposium counted with the wide participation of scholars beyond the general public, when the question on the scientific character of museology was put.<sup>8</sup> According to Stránský, through these seminars, several participants were motivated to study museology. In the middle of 1965, the Ministry of Culture approved the proposal to create a post-graduate program in museology in Brno, allowing the system of education in the country to train professionals in different levels.<sup>9</sup>

The Brno School was recognized by the strong theoretical scope of

<sup>8</sup> For Stránský, with the goal to discuss museology as a science and its teaching, this symposium witnessed the growing interest of a wide group of scientists – and not only museum professionals – for museology. STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Brno: Education in Museology. *Museological Papers V, Supplementum 2*, 1974, p. 18.

<sup>9</sup> The post-graduate course in museology began its activities in the semester between 1965 and 1966. Idem, p. 19.

museological education and for the dissemination of pioneer ideas on museology. With its innovative organization aligning the practice in the Moravian Museum with the theoretical reflection under the auspices of the Philosophical Faculty of a university, the school marked momentarily the conception of museology as a scientific discipline, justified in its theory and methods, primarily, only in the provocative ideas proposed by Stránský. These ideas, that came from a museum professional, would gain a certain centrality in the academic production in Eastern and Central Europe when several new museology schools were created in the region under the influence of the Czech education project in the following decades.

In 20<sup>th</sup> June, 1968, the students of the first class of museology received their university diplomas in Brno.<sup>10</sup> As reported by Stránský, most of them were museum directors or professionals who already had a degree in another disciplinary field. The museology course had the duration of two years, with four sessions composed of one hundred lessons each, including theoretical courses and practical lessons. The themes of the classes were divided between general museology and special museology. In the end of the course, students had to defend a theoretical thesis in museology. With the graduation of the first class, Stránský would comment on the accomplishment:

On this occasion it is necessary to mention that it was for the first time that the expert study of museology was realized within the scope of university studies and where the graduates were awarded the extension of their expert qualification by the field of museology.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. The first museology graduates in Brno. *ICOM News/Nouvelles de l'ICOM*, 1969, June, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 61–62.

<sup>11</sup> Idem, p. 62.

According to the course structure determined by Stránský, “general museology” consisted in “problems relating to the conception of museology” considered as a “scientific branch”, and mainly composed of theoretical contents involving documentation, selection and communication; “special museology” followed the structure of “general museology”, but referred to concrete problems resulting from the correlation between museology and related branches. The concluding part of the course was concentrated in questions selected from the field of museography, whose emphasis was in the factors resulting from the “institutional character of the museum and techno-organizational factors that condition its functioning.”<sup>12</sup>

In effect, what has marked the Brno School, in comparison to other schools of museology in the world, was Stránský’s claim for the statute of *science* for museology. The term, that is more widely spread after the 1950s presenting the derivatives *museological* and *museologist*, applied, in general, to all that refers to the museum and the exercise of the museum practice.<sup>13</sup> In France, for instance, this wide notion of museology would compete with the term *museal*; the same would happen in North American countries where the notion would be close to *museum business*;<sup>14</sup> such an imprecision is analogous in the context of Latin-American countries as well.

Museology, a term that acquired different connotations throughout

<sup>12</sup> Idem.

<sup>13</sup> DESVALLÉES, André. Cent quarante termes muséologiques ou petit glossaire de l’exposition. In DE BARY, Marie-Odile and Jean-Michel TOBELEM (eds.). *Manuel de muséographie. Petit guide à l’usage des responsables des musées*. Biarritz: Séguier, 1998, pp. 205–251.

<sup>14</sup> Idem.

the 20<sup>th</sup> century and even before,<sup>15</sup> thanks to the attempt to obtain academic legitimacy by some Czech museum professionals, it would gain a new dimension, from the 1960s, providing the necessary bases for museum work. In this perspective, museology would be configured as a *discipline of the interstices*, existing between two professional spheres: the practice, that is not necessarily limited by the empirical universe of the museum; and reflexive theory, that would make museum professionals (or museologists) become, rather than mere technicians, real *thinkers*.

#### ICOFOM and the international role of Stranskian theory

It is true that, in its initial stages, Stranskian theory has generated a confusion in the interpretation of commonly used categories and expressed chaos exposing museology’s anti-structure. Thanks to the uses of terms unknown by the majority of thinkers of other regions, the terminology employed in the first papers and in classes was much criticized.<sup>16</sup> According to Suely Cerávol, the use of what the author calls a “lexicon of Brno”<sup>17</sup> didn’t facilitate the full comprehension of the museological themes for the ones who weren’t familiar with it. Terms such as “musealia”, “museality”, “museistic”, among others, were not seen in the West, and did not present an equivalent

<sup>15</sup> On the history of the term until the 20<sup>th</sup> century, see AQUILINA, Janick Daniel. The Babelian Tale of Museology and Museography: a history in words. *Museology: International Scientific Electronic Journal*, 2011, no. 6, pp. 1–20; and DESVALLÉES, André and François MAIRESSE. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Colin, 2011.

<sup>16</sup> Burcaw (1981), in CERÁVOLO, Suely Moraes. *Da palavra ao termo – um caminho para compreender a museologia*. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo, Escola de Comunicação e Artes, 2004. PhD Thesis.

<sup>17</sup> CERÁVOLO, Suely Moraes. *Da palavra ao termo – um caminho para compreender a museologia*. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo, Escola de Comunicação e Artes, 2004. PhD Thesis.

in the English language.<sup>18</sup> Accused of fabricating a philosophical theory of the Museum, only taught at the J. E. Purkyně University, in Brno, in fact Stránský and his colleagues were talking about changes in the conception of the museum that were being noticed around the world. They established a grand part of what would become, in the following decades, the museological theory mostly disseminated within ICOFOM.

The idea of a theoretical base for museology, was motivated by Jelínek’s strong belief in the fact that museum work needed theoretical studies – a motivation that was later shared by Stránský. In fact, university disciplines in Czechoslovakia required a theoretical base to be a science, defining science more broadly than the Anglo-Saxon definition of only the physical world with tangible studies of cause and effect.<sup>19</sup> It was only in the mid-1980s, with the worldly recognized ISSOM, organized by the Moravian Museum and with support from UNESCO, that the theory developed strictly in the Brno context would become known internationally and respected by peers of scholars and museum workers.

Since the beginning of the decade, a part of this theory would start to circulate in the world thanks to the efforts of the Czechs Jan Jelínek and Vnoš Sofka (1929–2016), with the realization of the first ICOFOM publications dealing with subjects that were central for the configuration of scientific museology, along with the organization of the committee’s first international symposiums. In 1980, one of the first sessions held in Mexico, dur-

<sup>18</sup> Idem, p. 125.

<sup>19</sup> Of course, Jelínek was an anthropologist by training and this also brought him to look for understanding of the need for mankind to collect and display. NASH, Suzanne. *Interview for the special Project The History of Museology, International Committee for Museology – ICOFOM*, 2 December, 2015.



ing the ICOM General Conference, have been devoted to the theme of “*the systematics and the theory of systems in museology*.”<sup>20</sup> The first issue of a bilingual international journal was published in the same year, in which authors from different origins discussed the notion of a scientific museology.<sup>21</sup> The wide dissemination of the first issue, in both sides of a politically divided Europe, resulted in the organization of a second issue in 1981.<sup>22</sup> Stránský, along with Anna Gregorová and other Eastern European authors published in both issues and became known in different parts of the world.

The committee for museology had embraced the theoretical notions disseminated, at first, from Czechoslovakia, allowing these ideas to influence different museologists and schools of museology around the globe. Until the beginning of the 1990s, ICOFOM had expressed its mission to “*establish museology as a scientific discipline*.”<sup>23</sup> Stránský has continually influenced this committee and participated in several of its meetings, becoming an elected member of its Executive Board in 1986.

Since its initial years, ICOFOM has shared some of ICOM’s concerns with a terminology for the museum field. In one of the initiatives,

20 JELÍNEK, Jan. Letter from the Chairman. *Museological News, Semi-Annual Bulletin of the International Committee of ICOM for Museology*, 1981, may, no. 1.

21 See SOFKA, Vinoš (ed.). *MUWOP: Museological Working Papers/DOTRAM: Documents de Travail en Muséologie. Museology – Science or just practical museum work?*, 1980, vol. 1.

22 The Editorial Board have received twenty new articles for the second issue of the *Museological Working Papers*. A third issue was being planned, and it intended to discuss the theme of “the object/subject of museology”. However, for the lack of financial resources it could not be organized. SOFKA, Vinoš. A message from Dr. Sofka. *Museological News, Semi-Annual Bulletin of the International Committee of ICOM for Museology*, 1981, may, no. 1.

23 ICOFOM – International Committee for Museology. *Museological News, Semi-Annual Bulletin of the International Committee of ICOM for Museology*, 1992, June, no. 15.

the committee creates, between the years 1985 and 1986, a working group for the organization of a Treatise on museology joining ICOM’s project, dating from 1978, to organize a compendium of museum theory. Stránský was assigned to coordinate this group, proposing research on the already known theoretical works in museology.<sup>24</sup> Also in the 1980s, and in connection to this first project, Stránský was going to work for the organization of a *Dictionarium Museologicum*,<sup>25</sup> supposed to be based on terminological research and published in twenty different languages. Indeed, it was not “*the elaboration of a system of museology, but merely a classification of a relatively extensive set of words*.”<sup>26</sup> During the most part of that decade, he played a prominent role in these ICOFOM projects and in theoretical research both within this committee and in his own Department.

Later, during the ICOFOM annual symposium of 1993, in Athens, Greece, a permanent research project entitled Terminology of Museology was created, aiming to foster a system of basic terms and concepts for museology. The project evolved to the idea of creating a *Thesaurus Museologicus*, which would be coordinated by the French museologist André Desvallées. In 1997, the first results of this project were presented to the ICOFOM members in two separate sections: the first, a selection of terms organized by Desvallées, prioritizing the history of fundamental

24 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Working Group on the Treatise on Museology – aims and orientation. *Museological News, Semi-Annual Bulletin of the International Committee of ICOM for Museology*, 1985, September, no. 8, pp. 25–28.

25 An initiative of ICOM’s International Committee for Documentation – CIDOC and the UNESCO Center of Documentation, since 1976, joined by the International Committee for the Training of Personnel – ICOTOP, and, later, by ICOFOM.

26 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Working Group on terminology. *Museological News, Semi-Annual Bulletin of the International Committee of ICOM for Museology*, 1985, September, no. 8, p. 29.

terms and concepts for museology; the second, coordinated by Stránský, was presented in the form of an encyclopedical dictionary, which the author denominated “*a preliminary version of a Museological Encyclopedia*.”<sup>27</sup> The document by Desvallées was widely accepted, while Stránský’s version of a possible dictionary was rejected, being considered by most of the members and peers as “*incompatible with contemporary epistemology*.”<sup>28</sup>

Afterwards, the research done in this area naturally followed Desvallées’ methodology, and Stránský, especially after leaving the direction of the ISSOM, in 1998, decreased his participation at ICOFOM meetings. The desire for the organization of an integrated theory for museology in a great part influenced by Stránský’s thinking, however, have stayed in the center of the committee’s debates for the following years.<sup>29</sup>

### Concepts and theorizations: is there an integrated system for museology?

In 1980, based on his studies from the precedent decades, Stránský defined museology as “*a scientific autonomous discipline whose subject of knowledge is a specific approach of man to reality*”, establishing that

27 Stránský (1998) cited after SCHEINER, Tereza C. Termos e conceitos da museologia: contribuições para o desenvolvimento da Museologia como campo disciplinar. *Mast Colloquia*, 2008, vol. 10, p. 213. Documentação em Museus, Museu de Astronomia e Ciências Afins – Mast, Rio de Janeiro.

28 SCHEINER, Tereza C. Termos e conceitos da museologia: contribuições para o desenvolvimento da Museologia como campo disciplinar. *Mast Colloquia*, 2008, vol. 10, p. 213. Documentação em Museus, Museu de Astronomia e Ciências Afins – Mast, Rio de Janeiro.

29 The *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique de Muséologie*, directed by André Desvallées and François Mairesse, and published in 2011, is a testimony to that fact, as a product of all previous debates and showing a great influence from Stránský’s ideas and of his terminology. See, for example, the chapter “Objet [de musée] ou muséologie,” in DESVALLÉES, André and François MAIRESSE. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Colin, 2011, pp. 385–419.

“the nature of museology is that of a social science” contributing to the “understanding of human society.”<sup>30</sup>

It was not the first time that museology was being referred to as science, however, in most of the previous definitions, it was constantly identified as “the science which aim is the study of the mission and organization of museums.”<sup>31</sup> What had changed, then, in the Stránskian conception of the term?

What was distinct in this thinker’s approach from all the others before him was the fact that beyond merely stating that *museology is a science*, he tried to prove it. In his structural theory, Stránský was committed to the investigation of essential points considered by him as indispensable for the constitution of a scientific discipline:

(1) first, a science must have defined a specific *subject of study*; (2) then, a science must use its own set of *methods*; (3) a science must have a specific *terminology*, a language; (4) and, at last, it must be based on a theoretical system.<sup>32</sup> The search for scientific legitimation, thus, should be followed by the concomitant construction of a *theoretical system* of museology accordingly to the framework of contemporary sciences. This is due to the fact that,

So far it has not been possible to substantiate the delimitation of museology on an appropriate level as an individual branch of science, mainly because the basic questions of the subject, the methods and the system of museology were not decided and consequently, nei-

ther was its place in the system of sciences.<sup>33</sup>

Even so, Stránský has appointed that there were objective reasons for the “birth of museology as a science,”<sup>34</sup> however, its internal prerequisite, i.e., the logical structure, was inexistent. His question on the character of museology, then, made him think on the theoretical base of the very theory.<sup>35</sup> In other words, Stránský has built a metatheoretical problematic as the starting point for structuring the scientific discipline, introducing the notion of a *metamuseology*.<sup>36</sup> The term designates “the theory whose subject is museology in itself”, in a certain way being strictly bound to museology, but also related to philosophy, to history and to the theory of science and culture.

In his metamuseological approach, the first problem raised concerned museology’s subject of study. Stránský proposed some disconcerting questions for the field under development. With his initial declaration, in which he denies the museum as the scientific subject,<sup>37</sup> the author opens the way towards a long process of self-reflection that marked museology in its bases in Eastern Europe.

By stating that the “subject of museology is not and cannot be the

museum,”<sup>38</sup> Stránský intended to separate the “instrument” – or the means, i.e., the museum – and the “end” to which it serves. He alleges, in effect, what could have been considered obvious in the context of post-war museums, which is the fact that the museum, as an institution that serves to a certain end, could not be the study subject of a science. Nevertheless, and in a tautological approach, according to some of his critics,<sup>39</sup> he would propose that museology’s subject of study should be searched in the very museum work, in the “systematic and critical” task of producing the museum object or *musealia*, in Stránskian terminology.

This thinker was, then, responsible for the dislocation of museology’s subject from the museum, as a historic institution, to *museality* – understood as a “specific documentary value.”<sup>40</sup> This last concept, central to his theory, would lead Stránský to conceive the cognitive intention of museology as the scientific interpretation of an “attitude of man to reality”. In his opinion, this seizing of the museum character of things, which he called “museality”, must be “in the center of the gnoseological intention of museology”<sup>41</sup> as this discipline’s scientific task, delimiting its position within the system of sciences.

The rupture with the vague idea of a museology strictly devoted to the study of museums, as much as the proposition of the museality notion, allowed Stránský to associate museological theory to museum practice.

30 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a Science (a Thesis). *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, p. 39.

31 RIVIÈRE, Georges-Henri. *Stage régional d’études de l’Unesco sur le rôle éducatif des musées (Rio de Janeiro, 7–30 septembre 1958)*. Paris: UNESCO, 1960, p. 12.

32 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a Science (a Thesis). *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, p. 33–39.

33 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Brno: Education in Museology. *Museological Papers V, Supplementum 2*, 1974, p. 25.

34 Idem, p. 26.

35 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Předmět muzeologie. In STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálů prvního muzeologického symposia*. Brno: Moravian Museum, 1965, p. 31.

36 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Introduction à l’étude de la muséologie. Destinée aux étudiants de l’École Internationale d’Été de Muséologie – EIEM*. Brno: Université Masaryk, 1995.

37 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Předmět muzeologie. In STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálů prvního muzeologického symposia*. Brno: Moravian Museum, 1965, pp. 30–33.

38 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Předmět muzeologie. In STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálů prvního muzeologického symposia*. Brno: Moravian Museum, 1965, p. 33.

39 See DESVALLÉES, André and François MAIRESSE. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Colin, 2011.

40 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Brno: Education in Museology. *Museological Papers V, Supplementum 2*, 1974, p. 28.

41 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology and Museums. *ICOFOM Study Series – ISS*, 1987, no. 12, p. 289.

In this perspective, he would not disregard the museum as a subject of interest but he would understand it as only one of the possibilities of materializing this specific human approach to reality. What he intended, therefore, was to make museum work directly dependent on museological efforts.<sup>42</sup> In his perspective, the museum practice must not only be understood as indistinct from museological theory, but also it has in the second its main source for innovation and improvement:

Were we to hide our heads in the sand and stick to the traditional methods and procedures, and remain satisfied with the current practice, museum work would get into increasing contradiction with the general progress of society; museums would be pushed onto the periphery of social interest and in the end they would lose not only their social function but also their *raison d'être*.<sup>43</sup>

His metamuseological reflection was the mark zero for the development of a critical thinking on museology and its scientific subject in Central and Eastern Europe. *The theory of museology*, born from this reflection, was systematically taught to professionals and scholars from all around the world in the renowned ISSOM, at Masaryk University.<sup>44</sup> It was, also, widely debated, with the support of Jelínek and Sofka, from the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, within ICOFOM. Nevertheless, the theory as envisaged by Stránský and some of his followers would never exist as an integrated system.

<sup>42</sup> Idem, p. 290.

<sup>43</sup> STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Brno: Education in Museology. *Museological Papers V, Supplementum 2*, 1974, p. 26.

<sup>44</sup> The Masaryk University was founded in Brno in 1919 and it is currently the second largest university in the Czech Republic. In 1960, the university was renamed Jan Evangelista Purkyně University, taking the name of the Czech biologist. In 1990, following the Velvet Revolution it regained its original name.

On the contrary, at first, his theoretical conceptions, drawn from the possibilities of international dialogues, would promote a constant and critical look to museology, capable of the permanent questioning of its own structure. Such a critical museological consciousness, we may say that we have inherited it in our days.

### From metamuseology to just museology: Stránský's conceptual triad

By defending that “the museum phenomenon is truly the expression of a specific relation of man to reality,”<sup>45</sup> and that such a relation, to be studied and properly understood, demands specific knowledge that is not provided by other existent sciences, Stránský sustained the statute of science for museology, developing his metatheoretical conceptual base. His theory of theory had the purpose to, more than raise ontological questions for museology, or finding their answers, structuring a theoretical corpus of concepts and methods serving as a basis for the conscious practice.

The concepts formulated and defended by this author that have had a central role in his works, in fact, were not dealing with the museum in its organization and functions. Differently, they were presented to his students and readers as *museological* concepts, that would supposedly justify the existence of the scientific discipline he was defending:

In order to accomplish, at the same time, its scientific mission, but also its humanitarian mission, museology cannot limit itself to the problems of museum management, of showcases installation or the conservation of one object or another.

<sup>45</sup> STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Introduction à l'étude de la muséologie. Destinée aux étudiants de l'École Internationale d'Été de Muséologie – EIEM*. Brno: Université Masaryk, 1995.

It is true that all that is part of museology, but those are only means to achieve certain aims. Museology must explain why we do all that, why a certain object is musealized, why we contradict natural changes and disappearances and why [...] we preserve certain elements of reality.<sup>46</sup>

First approaching the very objects to justify the existence of this science of values – or the science of the construction of values – attributed to things, Stránský used the neologism *musealia* (“*muzeálie*”, in Czech), built from Latin, to refer, museologically, to the museum object. Namely, those objects whose value could be perceived beyond the specific quality they may present to the other fields of knowledge that study them in museums, but considering all their documentary possibilities from the point of view of museology. The term was introduced in the middle of the 1960s and it was refined in Stránský's works since then, as well as the other concepts that he proposed.

The *musealia*, or museum objects, have museological relevance because they can be perceived, as put by the anthropologist Jean Bazin, as “available objects”,<sup>47</sup> being available to different purposes and interpretations, or, as “becom-

<sup>46</sup> “Pour remplir à la fois sa mission scientifique, mais aussi sa mission humanitaire, la muséologie ne peut se limiter aux problèmes de la gestion du musée, de l'installation d'une vitrine ou de la conservation de tel ou tel objet. Il est vrai que tout ceci fait partie de la muséologie, mais ce ne sont que des moyens servant à atteindre certains objectifs. La muséologie doit expliquer pourquoi nous faisons tout cela, pourquoi tel objet est muséalisé, pourquoi nous contrarions les changements et les disparitions naturels et pourquoi [...] nous préservons certains éléments de la réalité.”, in the original. Translation by the author. See STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Introduction à l'étude de la muséologie. Destinée aux étudiants de l'École Internationale d'Été de Muséologie – EIEM*. Brno: Université Masaryk, 1995, p. 6.

<sup>47</sup> BAZIN, Jean. Des clous dans la Joconde. In BAZIN, Jean. *Des clous dans la Joconde. L'anthropologie autrement*. Toulouse: Anacharsis, 2008, p. 523.

ing-objects”<sup>48</sup> breaking with their symbolic or documentary unity. In effect, the museum object is not the same as the object *in a* museum, being its attributed value less related to an institutional status and more determined by the social frameworks that give them a museological status.

This would be the specific museological perspective on the objects on which Stránský has projected the notion of “bearers of museality”, introducing, thus, the second key-concept of his theory. As he put it:

The task of museology is therefore – at least in our opinion – to perceive and identify such documents which in every respect best represent certain social values and therefore warrant selection, collection and presentation in the interest of society’s development.

To give a name to this specific documentary value, conditioned by the quality of the bearer, we are trying to introduce the term Museality.

Simultaneously, to name the bearer document itself we prefer the expression Musealia.<sup>49</sup>

And he continues:

Summing up:

*The object of the knowledge-acquiring intention of museology is museality, conceived in the context of the entire historic, present and future social function.*<sup>50</sup>

Hence, the concept of museality (“*muzealita*”), understood as the “quality” or “value” of musealia, appeared in Stránský’s works in

1970,<sup>51</sup> being proposed as museology’s true subject of study. The first attempts to define the term, however, have presented logical problems. If museology studies the value existent in things, or their museum quality, this discipline would be closer to a prescriptive branch of knowledge than to a social science. Nevertheless, according to Stránský himself, the role of the museologist shouldn’t be one of pointing out the value in things, but the one of understanding how and why certain objects acquire value.

Due to this imprecision, the idea of an object *bearer* of museality and Stránskýan theory would suffer with severe criticism, notably throughout the 1980s. The museologist from the ancient German Democratic Republic, Klaus Schreiner, for instance, hasn’t conceived museality as the property of an object as such but as something that is attributed to the object only in the context of a particular, specialized discipline. According to Schreiner, there cannot be a value “in itself” and the concept of museality in the Stránskýan sense is the product of a “bourgeois-imperialist axiology”. He considers that the philosophical value propagated is “timeless, classness and generally not human” and that, as such, it “absolutizes the bourgeois class interests.”<sup>52</sup> As noted by Peter van Mensch, Stránský would modify the concept of museality over the years, changing its sense from a value category to the “specific value orientation” itself.<sup>53</sup>

The conceptual problem posed by these authors possibly led the Czech thinker to ask what distinguishes a musealia from other objects in collections. The question of value, or of its social attribution, would finally trigger in Stránský’s thinking an interest for the process of musealization, closing his conceptual triad for museology. The notion of “musealization” (“*muzealizace*”) was explored by Stránský only late in his works. In the journals of museology published by the Moravian Museum and the J. E. Purkyně University from 1969 to 1986, the term appears for the first time in 1972, and then it would reappear only in 1979.<sup>54</sup>

In effect, the term was not created by Stránský himself, it was appropriated by him. According to Václav Rutar, the term has appeared in museological textbooks in the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, being appropriated at the same time by authors from other fields of knowledge who have mentioned it in works from the same period, such as Jean François Lyotard and Jean Baudrillard, as well as in the works by the philosopher Hermann Lübbe, quoted by Stránský as the main source of this notion.<sup>55</sup>

Musealization has been defined by Stránský as “the acquisition of the museum quality”, or, even, an expression of the universal human tendency to preserve, against all natural change and degradation, the elements of objective reality which represent the cultural values

51 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Múzejníctvo v relácii teórie a praxe. *Múzeum*, 1970, roč. XV, no. 3, pp. 173–183.

52 SCHREINER, Klaus. Forschungsgegenstand der Museologie und Disziplinengese. *Neue Museumskunde*, 1987, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 4–8, passim.

53 MENSCH, Peter van. *Towards a Methodology of Museology. PhD Thesis* [online]. Záhreb: University of Záhreb, 1992 [cit. 2007-07-27]. Available from www: <[http://www.muuseum.ee/en/erialane\\_areng/museoloogiaalane\\_ki/p.van\\_mensch\\_towards/mensch04](http://www.muuseum.ee/en/erialane_areng/museoloogiaalane_ki/p.van_mensch_towards/mensch04)>.

54 RUTAR, Václav. Geneze pojmů muzeálie, muzealita a muzealizace na stránkách Muzeologických sešitů v letech 1969–1986. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2012, vol. 1, no. 1, p. 11.

55 Stránský (2000, p. 31) cited after RUTAR, Václav. Geneze pojmů muzeálie, muzealita a muzealizace na stránkách Muzeologických sešitů v letech 1969–1986. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2012, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 6–13.

48 BRULON, Bruno. Os objetos de museu, entre a classificação e o devir. *Informação & Sociedade: Estudos*, jan./abr. 2015, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 25–37, passim.

49 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Brno: Education in Museology. *Museological Papers V, Supplementum 2*, 1974, p. 28.

50 Idem, p. 28.

that man, as a cultural being, needs to preserve for its own purpose.<sup>56</sup>

With his appropriation of such a concept, Stránský *re-considers* “the subject of museology”, noting that it “must be, thus, centered in what motivates musealization, in what conditions the museality and non-museality of things.”<sup>57</sup> But as he recognizes: “it is only by museology’s specific methods that it is possible to discover what makes an ordinary object become a museum object.”<sup>58</sup> This process, conceived by him as a universal one, of attributing value to things, would demand that museology reconfigured its basic aim from the task of *inventing* values to the *investigation* of values themselves. These must be identified and studied by the instructed look of the museologist, according to an axiological methodology that would take the place of an ontological methodology established by museums.

This way, museology’s subject of study is once again dislocated, from museality, as a product or “quality”, to musealization, as the *process* that conducts to the specific appropriation – creating culture – of natural reality and human reality at the same time.<sup>59</sup> What distinguishes musealization from other forms of conservation, according to Stránský, is the decisive moment of transition from material reality as it is presented to its elevation towards the level of the cultural, museological reality.

56 “une expression de la tendance humaine universelle à préserver, contre le changement et la dégradation naturels, les éléments de la réalité objective qui représentent des valeurs culturelles que l’homme, en tant qu’être culturel, a besoin de conserver dans son propre intérêt.”, in the original. Translation by the author. See STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Introduction à l’étude de la muséologie. Destinée aux étudiants de l’École Internationale d’Été de Muséologie – EIEM*. Brno: Université Masaryk, 1995, pp. 28–29.

57 *Idem*, p. 19.

58 *Idem*, p. 20.

59 *Idem*, p. 29.

This musealized reality is commonly mistaken for the concept of cultural heritage, though, to Stránský, this expression is too vague, and it designates a passive approach. Musealization, on the contrary, depends on an active approach, that involves three ramifications foreseen in his theory for museology: selection, thesaurization and communication.

As selection, he understood the basic theory that allows to identify the “museality potential” in objects, which can be provided by different scientific disciplines. Selection in itself, i.e., the removal of a “bearer” from an original situation, would depend on the recognition of its “museum value”.<sup>60</sup> Thesaurization was understood as the process of inserting an object into the documentary system of the new reality of a collection or museum. Ultimately, museological communication is the process throughout which a collection acquires meaning becoming accessible and disseminating its scientific, cultural or social value. For Stránský, communication is the museological approach to reality and it creates, at the same time, a mutual bound with the original reality that is established “in a qualitatively elevated level.”<sup>61</sup> Therefore, the specificity of museological communication conditions the specificity of museological documentation.

In other words, the object that is thought by him as *a priori* the “bearer of museality”, is selected accordingly to its “potentiality” based on the existent values, and it may acquire new values when it is communicated in a museological speech. What could, at first, seem contradictory in Stránský’s theory, reflects the fact that his initial notion of museality was at-

60 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Brno: Education in Museology. *Museological Papers V, Supplementum 2*, 1974, p. 30.

61 *Idem*, p. 31.

tached to a net of values built by societies and, at the same time, fed by musealization. Thanks to the perception of museology as a science that studies, not the values in themselves, but the social construction of values, Stránský is led to assign relevance to the concept of musealization.

Derivative from these initial remarks on museology’s central concepts, other theoretical approaches to the discipline would be developed. In Stránský’s definition for theoretical museology we can envisage the foundation for what Peter van Mensch defined as just *museology*. This Dutch museologist proposes a structure for this “scientific discipline” according to five axes: general museology, theoretical museology (which would be equivalent to metamuseology), special museology, historic museology and applied museology.<sup>62</sup> To these five central areas, Stránský would include social museology, dedicated to the study of musealization in contemporary societies. Furthermore, van Mensch takes Stránský’s museology to another level, seeking its professionalization. In his works, the author proposes the PRC model, which refers to the museums basic functions of Preservation, Research and Communication, directly inspired in Stránský’s model for musealization, divided, as appointed above, in selection, thesaurization and communication.

Stránský’s museology, therefore, initially conceived of metatheoretical questions, would find some viable ways to the formulation of some hypotheses and other provocations. Finally, museology would

62 This five-fold structure is (since 1982) used by the *Reinwardt Academie*, in Amsterdam, to provide a framework for the curriculum of museology and to provide a basic classification principle for the library of this institute. MENSCH, Peter van. *Towards a Methodology of Museology. PhD Thesis* [online]. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, 1992 [cit. 2007-07-27]. Available from www: <[http://www.museum.ee/en/erialane\\_areng/museologiaa-lane\\_ki/p\\_van\\_mensch\\_toward/mensch04](http://www.museum.ee/en/erialane_areng/museologiaa-lane_ki/p_van_mensch_toward/mensch04)>.

find its subject of study in this inescapable process of *reflexive retention*, throughout which some things are kept so that they can transmit a certain knowledge through museological communication. The “specific approach of man to reality”, mentioned by Stránský, refers, then, to a *will of musealization* that leads to the social experience of museality.

### Stránský and Reflexive Museology

According to Joanna Overing, exploring a recent crisis of faith in philosophy over the empiricist’s paradigm of Rationality, within science the idea of a “single world” is being challenged.<sup>63</sup> Turning the look to themselves and their own actions, social scientists reveal that the world, from the perspective of our knowledge of it, is how we view it through the paradigms we create. These scientists, differently from philosophers who are usually not asking social questions, are asking about “*moral universes*” – in Overing’s terms – their basic duty being to understand the intentions and objectives of actors within particular social worlds.<sup>64</sup> Contrary to the modern Western science and the empiricist’s proposition that truth is amoral and facts are autonomous from value, facts and truths can be analyzed as being tied to different sets of social, moral and political values.

Thus, all truths have their moral aspect and to hope to find universal and independent criteria of truth has proven to be an unreachable goal that suits only to philosophers who are still defending their con-

trol over the construction of reality. This has been the case for museum professionals and their crave to control reality by selecting what should be preserved from it.

The task of social sciences, in a different sense, is to understand the knowledge actors have of their own moral universes, considering their standards of validation with respect to it.<sup>65</sup> The cognitive powers of the Western thought in controlling and knowing the material world are in the base of museums, but they cannot be the foundation of contemporary museology. What is being gradually perceived with the possibility of a science of the science is the fact that Rationality works as a limiting tool for the scientist viewpoint over the Others and specially over him/herself. The Western fetishism for epistemological objects such as *reason*, *truth* and *knowledge* – or, even, the *museum* – is little by little demolishing the ways we relate to moralities and epistemologies different from ours.

Throughout most part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, in the first years of the development of museology in the world, the thinkers of the “museum” were not separated from their supposed subject of study. Museum professionals were the ones conceiving “museology”. The separation between scientists and their subject of study – that is usually constructed by specific methods – hadn’t been fully accomplished in museology and maybe still isn’t in our days. Perhaps the reason we are still unable to define the subject of museology is that we are so close to museums we remain their faithful hostages.

What differentiates, though, museology from *museum theory* or *museum studies*, even today, is the desire of the first to be acknowledged as

a science in the contexts in which this term is being used. In order for that to happen, a distance must be created between scientists and their subject of study. The theory of museology produced in the past forty years is neither a product of museum practice nor the mere expression of couple of philosophical ideas disseminated from Eastern Europe. In fact, the theory is the result of a *reflection* developed by these thinkers confronted with certain museum practices in the different contexts they acted.

Methodologically speaking, the agents that make museums and their agencies must be studied by the scientists and researchers of museology today if we intend to understand musealization. Nevertheless, when the same people play both roles – the scientist that is also the museum professional – the scientific distance will depend on an exercise of *reflexivity* on his/hers own museal practice. Here the *museal* will be clearly separated from the *museological* with the artifice of performance.

The first works on museology, by *icofomian* theorists, were just theory and not science because they consisted in mere reflections lacking the reflexivity that is in part the acknowledgement of performance in the constructed truths and values. The study of the museum performance today allows any scientist to see him/herself as an actor in the stage of the museum representations. Such a *reflexivity* in the making of science may reveal to be a fundamental process that includes self-knowledge and the revision of paradigms.

Reflexive museology can be perceived, thus, as the *permanent consciousness* of museology. There is no denying that its first steps were in Stránský’s metamuseology. But some of the main social questions weren’t being posed when this

<sup>63</sup> Overing points out that for instance both Kuhn (1964) and Feyerabend (1975, 1978) forcefully argued against the belief of Western science in a unified objective world unaffected by the epistemic activities of the scientists themselves. OVERING, Joanna. Preface & Introduction. In OVERING, Joanna (ed.). *Reason and Morality*. London: Tavistock (A.S.A. Monographs 24), 1985, p. 2.

<sup>64</sup> Idem, p. 4.

<sup>65</sup> Idem, p. 5.

central thinker in the foundation of our discipline was working solemnly with the Western conception of man-reality relations. His philosophical assertion reifies the separation of man from reality and presupposes the existence of a (*material*) reality that is divorced from society.

Furthermore, if we perceive the museum as the instrument that performs the relation of man to reality, then *musealization* is the action towards which we should direct our interest as social scientists. In this sense, Stránský was being reflexive when affirming that the subject of a “social museology” would be, in his perspective, “the musealization of reality in the context of current society.”<sup>66</sup> Even so, the human, the actor of musealization, is not seen as reality, but as someone who will act on it.

In the case of musealization, it is not “man” or things that will prevail, but the multiple associations<sup>67</sup> between them. Because associations prevail, we can conceive, for instance, calculation without a calculator, acceleration without a car, or even education without a school.<sup>68</sup> Musealization, then, exists beyond the museum. As well as the hammer does not *impose* the hitting of the nail, museums do not impose musealization. In fact, museums are the mediators and not the main actors of musealization; they participate in the action, but they cannot configure, in any conceivable way, the sole subject of museology.

66 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Introduction à l'étude de la muséologie. Destinée aux étudiants de l'École Internationale d'Été de Muséologie – EIEM*. Brno: Université Masaryk, 1995, p. 28.

67 Here we use the term according to the sense given by Bruno Latour. See LATOUR, Bruno. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Net-work-Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

68 *Idem*, p. 71.

As a theoretical concept, musealization is the very practical action that has founded museums. The artificial separation between theory and practice, or museology and museography, for so long has represented a difficult breach to be supplanted in the heart of this discipline.<sup>69</sup>

Even today, in most contexts of the world, museum professionals do not identify as museologists, and the idea of a social science that studies the process of musealization in social terms is unclear. The idea to find a structure encompassing both practical museum work and theoretical museology was Stránský's biggest challenge. But his metatheory hasn't proved to be convincing enough for a real scientific revolution.

What is certain, today, is that we have moved from the prescriptive field of museum practice, to a *reflexive field* devoted to the critical study of the existent practice and we are finally able to produce theoretical questions in order to provoke change.

In this sense, how should a scientific discipline be formulating relevant questions for its own development? For instance, how conscious are we of our own role in building museality? How do we recognize ourselves, as scientists, in the process of musealization? Or in making museological communication with “true” objects? These are questions Stránský did not had the opportunity to ask, but we do, probably thanks to him.

### Some conclusions

As every metaphor has its limitations, in “geminal”, the prefix *gem*, in Latin, denotes “twin”, which is

69 See, for example, RIVIÈRE, Georges-Henri. *Stage régional d'études de l'Unesco sur le rôle éducatif des musées (Rio de Janeiro, 7-30 septembre 1958)*. Paris: UNESCO, 1960; and GLUZIŃSKI, Wojciech. Basic paper. *Methodology of museology and professional training. ICOFOM Study Series – ISS*, 1983, no. 1, pp. 24–35.

not at all the case between museum work and the theory of museology. A symbiosis would be the better metaphor to explain how the two fields interact today, constituting the sole field of museology, embracing theory and practice.

As Stránský has put it, if we intend to get into a creative relation with museum practice, then we have to accept that “all that arises the *need for museums* and all that finds its materialization in museums should be the subject of museology.”<sup>70</sup> There is nothing wrong with admitting that disciplinary museology comes from museums and it is still, in a certain level, attached to them. However, mostly thanks to Stránský's geminal ideas, museology is no longer limited to the museum. Even though a great part of its contemporary thinkers do not consider museology a science yet – although recognizing its potential to be perceived as a social or human science in the near future –, most of them consider the “new” subjects of study that have somehow given life to the discipline as it is being taught in universities.

What has changed, then? If in the beginning of the 1980s the first attempts to summarize a theory for museology was based on the authors singular museum experiences, later, some museologists<sup>71</sup> have appointed a more realistic solution for the scientific discipline. Research was the answer. The truth of the matter is that no philosophical system would generate a science or its subject without a considerable amount of empirical and theoretic-

70 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Museology and Museums. ICOFOM Study Series – ISS*, 1987, no. 12, p. 289.

71 MENSCH, Peter van. *Towards a Methodology of Museology. PhD Thesis* [online]. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, 1992 [cit. 2007-07-27]. Available from www: <[http://www.muuseum.ee/en/erialane\\_areng/museoloogialane\\_ki/p.van\\_mensch\\_toward\\_mensch04](http://www.muuseum.ee/en/erialane_areng/museoloogialane_ki/p.van_mensch_toward_mensch04)>; TEATHER, Lynne. Some brief notes on the methodological problems of museological research. *ICOFOM Study Series – ISS. Methodology of museology and professional training*, 1983, no. 5, pp. 1–9.

cal research on the very discipline and its constitutive processes.

What substantially prevents the existence of a science entitled *museology* today is still the fact that its theoretical production and its methods are marked by the Cartesian idea of the *museum* designed, as a metaphor and literally, in the rationalist system of knowledge fabricated in Western Modernity. In this “museum” that organized objects and ideas – or ideas as objects – *things* were created to be put in the shelves of knowledge in order to be observed, categorized, counted, weighted and measured by the encyclopedic scientist. *Man* was very much separated from *things*, and things were fully dominated as passive objects in the gnosological relation.

Museology, born in museums of this kind and conceived by the professionals working in these institutions, has inherited their dogmas. For sciences that strongly desire to control its own part of reality – as in the traditional human sciences in general – the notion according to which human beings invent their reality is debated with great difficulty. The apparent solution to supplant the problem is, in most of the cases, the centrality of empirical work aiming to deconstruct the established truths and implement the discussion of the methods in this process.

The discussion of a specific method for museology will raise two fundamental questions: first “how museology molds the practice?”, and second, “how the practice molds museology?”. Certainly, museology cannot be the science that studies the limited and undefined universe of the museum. The very concept of the “museum” is used to explain heterogeneous experiences, to which theorists refer as a “pheno-

menon”<sup>72</sup> related to the terms “museology”, “museography”, “theory of museum”, “museistic”,<sup>73</sup> and so on... It is fragrantly an artifice of method, created as such to justify the existence of a profession entitled museology.

We can witness today new approaches to museums, from a museological perspective, that only exist because some thinkers are no longer attached to their very subject of study. In some of these studies, the museum is a mere instrument for musealization, understood as a social process and critically analyzed considering its cultural and political implications beyond the institution. Their aim is to deconstruct the institutional forms of retaining meaning through the appropriation of heritage. Some of these studies, based on serious research, are deeply committed to the investigation of museology’s fundamental problems and they help to answer many of the questions posed in the present paper. The only reason they do so, is by working at once with practical issues and theoretical reflections.

If the study of museology is museology, thus, by considering the *reflexive* investigation of the mediations that formalize the wide process of musealization, we have a concrete empirical field for this discipline that is both theoretical and practical. It is clear, therefore, that an effective science may conceive musealization as an agency and all the persons and objects involved in it as agents. To find the tracing of these associations would be the work of the conscious museologist, who is not the museum professional

but the scientist who is also implicated in his/hers subject of study. As the epistemologist who thinks about “the meaning of meaning”, or the psychologist who thinks about how people think, the museologist can also be seen as the one who thinks about the museological “thinking” – and in this sense, Stránský wasn’t wrong by suggesting the existence of “metatheoretical problems” for *his* science.

## REFERENCES:

- AQUILINA, Janick Daniel. The Babelian Tale of Museology and Museography: a history in words. *Museology: International Scientific Eletronic Journal*, 2011, no. 6, pp. 1–20.
- BAZIN, Jean. Des clous dans la Joconde. In BAZIN, Jean. *Des clous dans la Joconde. L’anthropologie autrement*. Toulouse: Anacharsis, 2008, pp. 521–545.
- BRULON, Bruno. Os objetos de museu, entre a classificação e o devir. *Informação & Sociedade: Estudos*, jan./abr. 2015, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 25–37.
- CERÁVOLO, Suely Moraes. *Da palavra ao termo – um caminho para compreender a museologia*. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo, Escola de Comunicação e Artes, 2004. PhD Thesis.
- DESVALLÉES, André. Cent quarante termes muséologiques ou petit glossaire de l’exposition. In DE BARY, Marie-Odile and Jean-Michel TOBELEM (eds.). *Manuel de muséographie. Petit guide à l’usage des responsables des musées*. Biarritz: Séguier, 1998, pp. 205–251.
- DESVALLÉES, André and François MAIRESSE. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Colin, 2011. 722 p.
- DOLÁK, Jan. Museologist Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský – Basic Concepts. In BRULON SOARES, Bruno, Anaildo Bernando BARAÇAL and Luciana Menezes DE CARVALHO. *Stránský: a bridge Brno-Brazil/ Stránský: uma ponte Brno-Brasil*. Papers from the III Debates Cycle in Museology, Rio de Janeiro, Universidade Federal do Estado do Rio de Janeiro – UNIRIO,

72 SCHEINER, Tereza C. Musée et Muséologie – Définitions en cours. In MAIRESSE, François and André DESVALLEES (eds.). *Vers un redéfinition du musée*. Paris: L’Harmattan, 2007, pp. 147–165.

73 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. [Without title]. In SOFKA, Vinoš (ed.). *MUWOP: Museological Working Papers/DOTRAM: Documents de Travail en Muséologie. Museology – Science or just practical museum work?*, 1980, vol. 1, p. 43.



- International Committee for Museology – ICOFOM, unprinted.
- GLUZIŃSKI, Wojciech. Basic paper. *Methodology of museology and professional training*. ICOFOM Study Series – ISS, 1983, no. 1, pp. 24–35.
- ICOFOM – International Committee for Museology. *Museological News. Semi-Annual Bulletin of the International Committee of ICOM for Museology*, 1992, June, no. 15.
- JELÍNEK, Jan. Letter from the Chairman. *Museological News. Semi-Annual Bulletin of the International Committee of ICOM for Museology*, 1981, may, no. 1.
- LATOUR, Bruno. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005. 328 p.
- MENSCH, Peter van. *Towards a Methodology of Museology*. PhD Thesis [online]. Záhreb: University of Záhreb, 1992 [cit. 2007-07-27]. Available from [www: <http://www.muuseum.ee/en/erialane\\_areng/museoloogiaalane\\_ki/p\\_van\\_mensch\\_towar/mensch04>](http://www.muuseum.ee/en/erialane_areng/museoloogiaalane_ki/p_van_mensch_towar/mensch04).
- NASH, Suzanne. *Interview for the special Project The History of Museology, International Committee for Museology – ICOFOM*, 2 December, 2015.
- OVERING, Joanna. Preface & Introduction. In OVERING, Joanna (ed.). *Reason and Morality*. London: Tavistock (A.S.A. Monographs 24), 1985, pp. 1–28.
- RIVIÈRE, Georges-Henri. *Stage régional d'études de l'Unesco sur le rôle éducatif des musées (Rio de Janeiro, 7–30 septembre 1958)*. Paris: UNESCO, 1960. 63 p.
- RUTAR, Václav. Geneze pojmů muzeálie, muzealita a muzealizace na stránkách Muzeologických sešitů v letech 1969–1986. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2012, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 6–13.
- SCHEINER, Tereza C. Musée et Muséologie – Définitions en cours. In MAIRESSE, François and André DESVALLEES (eds.). *Vers un redéfinition du musée*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2007, pp. 147–165.
- SCHEINER, Tereza C. Termos e conceitos da museologia: contribuições para o desenvolvimento da Museologia como campo disciplinar. *Mast Colloquia*, 2008, vol. 10, pp. 202–233. Documentação em Museus, Museu de Astronomia e Ciências Afins – Mast, Rio de Janeiro.
- SCHREINER, Klaus. Forschungsgegenstand der Museologie und Disziplingenese. *Neue Museumskunde*, 1987, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 4–8.
- SOFKA, Vinoš. A message from Dr. Sofka. *Museological News, Semi-Annual Bulletin of the International Committee of ICOM for Museology*, 1981, may, no. 1.
- SOFKA, Vinoš (ed.). *MUWOP: Museological Working Papers/DOTRAM: Documents de Travail en Muséologie. Museology – Science or just practical museum work?*, 1980, vol. 1. 67 p.
- SOFKA, Vinoš (ed.). *MUWOP: Museological Working Papers/DOTRAM: Documents de Travail en Muséologie. Interdisciplinarity in Museology*, 1981, vol. 2. 98 p.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Brno: Education in Museology. *Museological Papers V, Supplementum 2*, 1974, pp. 7–12.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Introduction à l'étude de la muséologie. Destinée aux étudiants de l'École Internationale d'Été de Muséologie – EIEM*. Brno: Université Masaryk, 1995. 116 p.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology and Museums. *ICOFOM Study Series – ISS*, 1987, no. 12, pp. 287–292.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a Science (a Thesis). *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, pp. 33–39.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Múzejnictvo v relácii teórie a praxe. *Múzeum*, 1970, roč. XV, no. 3, pp. 173–183.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Předmět muzeologie. In STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálu prvního muzeologického symposia*. Brno: Moravian Museum, 1965, pp. 30–33.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. The first museology graduates in Brno. *ICOM News/Nouvelles de l'ICOM*, 1969, June, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 61–62.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. [Without title]. In SOFKA, Vinoš (ed.). *MUWOP: Museological Working Papers/DOTRAM: Documents de Travail en Muséologie. Museology – Science or just practical museum work?*, 1980, vol. 1, pp. 42–44.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Working Group on terminology. *Museological News, Semi-Annual Bulletin of the International Committee of ICOM for Museology*, 1985, September, no. 8, pp. 29–31.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Working Group on the Treatise on Museology – aims and orientation. *Museological News, Semi-Annual Bulletin of the International Committee of ICOM for Museology*, 1985, September, no. 8, pp. 25–28.
- TEATHER, Lynne. Some brief notes on the methodological problems of museological research. *ICOFOM Study Series – ISS. Methodology of museology and professional training*, 1983, no. 5, pp. 1–9.

### BRUNO BRULON SOARES

Universidade Federal do Estado do Rio de Janeiro – UNIRIO, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil  
[brunobrulon@gmail.com](mailto:brunobrulon@gmail.com)

Bruno Brulon Soares is a Brazilian museologist and historian, PhD in Anthropology, and, since 2013, Professor of Museology Theory in the Department of Museological Studies and Processes – DEPM, at the Universidade Federal do Estado do Rio de Janeiro – UNIRIO (Federal University of the State of Rio de Janeiro – UNIRIO), in Brazil. Currently he is the coordinator of the Research Group Experimental Museology and Image – MEI, at UNIRIO, and ICOFOM Vice-president (2016–2019).

Bruno Brulon Soares je brazilský muzeolog a historik, doktor antropologie (PhD.) a od roku 2013 profesor muzeologické teorie na Katedře muzeologických studií a procesů (DEPM) na Federální univerzitě Rio de Janeiro (UNIRIO) v Brazílii. V současnosti působí jako koordinátor výzkumné skupiny pro experimentální muzeologii a image (MEI) v rámci UNIRIO a je viceprezidentem ICOFOM (2016–2019).

## STUDIE/ARTICLES

## METAMUSEOLOGICAL CHALLENGES IN THE WORK OF ZBYNĚK STRÁNSKÝ

DOI: 10.5817/MuB2016-2-2

PETER VAN MENSCH

**ABSTRACT/ABSTRAKT:**

ICOFOM had always been a major platform for the recognition of Stránský as one of the key theoreticians from the Central European area. Outside ICOFOM his work has hardly been published in English, so in the English speaking museological (or, rather museum studies) world he thus remained largely unknown. Apart from the Czech and Slovak Republics, the most fertile soil for Stránský's ideas was and is Germany. Difference should be made between the former German Democratic Republic and the Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Among museologists of the German Democratic Republic, Stránský was well known and well respected. Before 1989, he was not very well received in the Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Mainly thanks to Friedrich Waidacher (Graz) and Christian Müller-Straten (Munich), Stránský's ideas became recently known to a wider German speaking audience.

In general, museologists all over the world were attracted to Stránský because he elaborated a consistent system of museology built around some discipline-specific concepts, such as musealisation and museality. Such a system was helpful in developing consistent study programmes. To Stránský developing a consistent system was crucial in his lifelong endeavour to prove that museology is a genuine academic discipline, but this concern was of little interest in "western" countries. Besides, in most of the new museology/museum studies programmes at European universities

the museum as subject matter field is claimed by other disciplines: art history, history, ethnography, and increasingly: cultural studies. In these contexts, there is no felt need to adopt a rather rigid system and methodology like the one advocated by Stránský.

Stránský's work on musealisation can still be of value in a further development of the concept. The challenge is to make a connection with the New Museology, Museum Studies and Critical Heritage Studies discourses. It would be worthwhile to make an in-depth comparison of the concepts of heritage as, for example, advocated by Laurajane Smith and Stránský's concept of museality.

**Metamuzeologické výzvy v díle Zbyňka Stránského**

ICOFOM představovala již od svého vzniku největší platformu pro etablování Stránského jako jednoho z klíčových teoretiků v rámci střeoevropského prostoru. Mimo rámec ICOFOM nebyly jeho práce prakticky vůbec publikovány v anglickém jazyce, v důsledku čehož zůstal pro muzeology (či spíše muzejníky) v anglicky mluvících zemích takřka neznámý. Kromě České a Slovenské republiky našly Stránského myšlenky živnou půdu zejména v Německu. Je však potřeba rozlišovat mezi dřívější Německou demokratickou republikou a Německou spolkovou republikou. Muzeologové z východního Německa Stránského dobře znali a respektovali. V západním Německu však před rokem 1989 nenašel příliš pozitivní

ohlas. Hlavní zásluhu na tom, že se Stránského myšlenky dostaly v nedávné době do povědomí širšího publika v německy mluvících zemích nesou Friedrich Waidacher (Štýrský Hradec) a Christian Müller-Straten (Mnichov).

Z obecného hlediska si Stránský získal pozornost muzeologů po celém světě tím, že vypracoval pevný systém muzeologie spočívající na některých specifických oborových principech jako jsou muzealizace a muzealita. Tento systém byl velmi užitečný při vytváření odpovídajících studijních programů a zásadní význam měl také pro Stránského celoživotní snahu o definování muzeologie jako autonomní vědy. Tento aspekt však v „západních“ zemích nezbudil příliš velký zájem. Kromě toho, ve většině současných studijních programů se zaměřením na muzeologii/muzejnictví si muzeum jako předmět studia nárokují jiné obory: dějiny umění, historie, etnografie a stále častěji také kulturologie. Proto zde není důvod zavádat tak přísný systém a metodologii jako vytvořil a obhajoval Stránský.

Stránského práce na téma muzealizace má i dnes svůj význam pro další rozvoj muzeologické teorie. Cílem je začlenění tohoto tématu do diskurzu v rámci nové muzeologie, muzejnictví a kritického studia kulturního dědictví. Stálo by za to porovnat do hloubky např. koncepci kulturního dědictví z pohledu Laurajane Smithové a Stránského konceptu muzeality.

**KEYWORDS/KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA:**

*museology – museum studies – new museology – critical heritage studies – musealisation – museality*  
*muzeologie – muzejnictví – nová muzeologie – kritické studium kulturního dědictví – muzealizace – muzealita*

Allow me to start with a personal anecdote. From 1977 to 1982 I was Head of the Department of Exhibitions and Education of the National Museum of Natural History at Leiden (Netherlands). As such I was invited to become member of the editorial board of the journal *Museologia*. The journal had a strong focus on the history, theory and practice of natural history museums. However, the publisher, Frans Heslinga, had the ambition to develop the journal into an (international) “magazine on theory and practice of museumwork”. Contrary to the members of the editorial board, he was aware of the professional discourse in Central Europe. For example, the Polish museologist Jerzy Świecimski (Kraków) was a regular contributor on the theory of museum exhibition. In 1979 the journal received a text from a certain Zbyněk Stránský from Brno on “Museology as a science”. Heslinga was enthusiastic, the members of the board were less convinced and actually shared some doubts about the validity of Stránský’s ideas. Anyway, the text was published.<sup>1</sup> In 1982 I became lecturer of museology (defined as museum theory) at the Reinwardt Academie, a higher vocational training institute for museum staff, founded in Leiden in 1976. At once I remembered

1 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Museology as a science* (A Thesis). *Museologia*, 1980, vol. 15, pp. 33–40. Together with his contribution to *Museological Working Papers 1* (STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. [Museology – science or just practical museum work]. *Museological Working Papers*, 1980, no. 1, pp. 42–44.), it was his first publication on the subject in English in a ‘western’ context. DOLÁK, Jan and Jana VAVŘÍKOVÁ. *Muzeolog Z. Z. Stránský. Život a dílo*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2006.

Stránský’s article and recognised its relevancy. My predecessor as lecturer of museology was the Academie’s director, Giljam Dusée. He had studied at the École du Louvre (Paris) and became supporter of the ideas of George Henri Rivière. Soon it became clear to me that Stránský’s approach, and the discourse in Central Europe in general, appealed to me much more than Rivière’s approach. This feeling was strengthened when I started to become active in the ICOM International Committee for Museology (in 1982). ICOFOM became an important platform to meet colleagues – and to learn about their museological thinking – from the Soviet Union (Razgon), German Democratic Republic (Jahn, Schreiner), Yugoslavia (Maroević, Šola), Poland (Gluziński, Świecimski), and Czechoslovakia (Beneš, Jelínek, Stránský). Eventually, I would earn my PhD degree in Zagreb (in 1993) with Ivo Maroević as my ‘Doktorvater’.

In my PhD thesis<sup>2</sup> I reflected upon the early history of ICOFOM and analysed the contributions made by afore mentioned museologists to the work of this committee. Interestingly, when I presented my thesis at the University of Zagreb, Yugoslavia didn’t exist any longer with Zagreb now being the capital city of Croatia. The German Democratic Republic was abolished, as was the Soviet Union. Czechoslovakia was soon to be split into two sovereign states. Marxism-Leninism was no longer the leading ideology in Central Europe and with the demise of this ideology, Marxist-Leninist inspired museology lost much of its credibility. The death of Klaus Schreiner – who was proud to be “the last Stalinist museologist” – in 1991, was a symbolic end of a period. In the new geopolitical context, the role of Central European museology in ICOFOM diminished. ICOFOM

2 MENSCH, Peter van. *Towards a methodology of museology*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, 1992. PhD thesis.

had in fact been created on the basis of an opportunity collaboration of French and Central European museologists, but from the 1990s onwards, the role of Latin American museologists became increasingly important and the discourse changed accordingly. ICOFOM had always been a major platform for the recognition of Stránský as one of the key theoreticians from the Central European area. Through ICOFOM, Stránský is still honoured in Brazil where recently a conference was dedicated to his work.<sup>3</sup> Outside ICOFOM his work has hardly been published in English.<sup>4</sup> In the English speaking museological (or, rather museum studies) world “this chap from Brno” (Susan Pearce) thus remained largely unknown.<sup>5</sup> The same can be said about the reception of his work in France even though he is frequently referred to in the *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*<sup>6</sup> and mentioned as one of the 18 most influential museologist of all time.<sup>7</sup>

3 Conference “Stránský: uma ponte Brno-Brasil”, Rio de Janeiro 13-16 Oct. 2015. *Chamada para textos e comunicações para o III Ciclo de Debates Internacional Stránský: uma ponte Brno-Brazil* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-27]. Available from www: <http://www.forumpermanente.org/noticias/2015/chamada-para-textos-e-comunicacoes-para-o-iii-ciclo-de-debates-internacional-stransky-uma-ponte-brno-brazil>.

4 DOLÁK, Jan and Jana VAVŘÍKOVÁ. *Muzeolog Z. Z. Stránský. Život a dílo*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2006. There are some English texts in *Muzeologické sešity* but the journal was not well known in the ‘western’ world. Several English texts were produced in the context of the International Summer School of Museology but their distribution was limited.

5 Among the references to Stránský’s work listed by Jan Dolák and Jana Vavříková no mention is made of English publications outside the ICOFOM sphere apart from obvious authors such as Tomislav Šola, Ivo Maroević, and myself. DOLÁK, Jan and Jana VAVŘÍKOVÁ. *Muzeolog Z. Z. Stránský. Život a dílo*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2006, pp. 40–45.

6 DESVALLÉES, André and François MAIRESSE. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Collin, 2011.

7 Idem. Desvallées worked with Stránský in ICOFOM; Mairesse participated in the International Summer School of Museology. Although they respect his work, they keep some distance from his ideas (see MENSCH, Peter van. *Museality at breakfast*. The concept of museality in contemporary museological discourse. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 14–19.).

## Stránský and Germany

Apart from the Czech and Slovak Republics, the most fertile soil for Stránský's ideas was and is Germany.<sup>8</sup> Difference should be made between the former German Democratic Republic and the Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Among museologists of the German Democratic Republic, Stránský was well known and well respected. In 1982 the Institut für Museumswesen published in its *Schriftenreihe* a volume on *Museologische Forschung in der ČSSR*.<sup>9</sup> Among the 13 texts from the period 1968–1982 two were written by Stránský. In his introduction editor Rolf Lang emphasised the key role of Stránský in the development of Czechoslovakian museology. The year before, Stránský has also started to contribute to *Neue Museumskunde*.<sup>10</sup> In the same period of time Klaus Schreiner started to publish serious criticism.<sup>11</sup> This Stránský-Schreiner controversy has been analysed by Andreas Hanslok.<sup>12</sup> Focussing on Stránský's concept of museality, Schreiner accused him of having adopted non-marxist bourgeois idealist points of view. Schreiner's ideas were not widely shared among museologists of the GDR, or at least they did not agree

8 Because of limited knowledge of the languages, I am not aware of the reception of Stránský's ideas in other countries of Central Europe.

9 LANG, Rolf (ed.). *Museologie in der Tschechoslowakischen Sozialistischen Republik*. Berlin, 1982.

10 In 1964 Stránský had already participated in a discussion on the specificity of museology. About this discussion, see SCHEUNEMANN, Jan. „Gegenwartsbezogenheit und Parteinahme für den Sozialismus“. *Geschichtspolitik und regionale Museumsarbeit in der SBZ/DDR 1945–1971*. Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2009, pp. 331–340. Scheunemann does not refer to Stránský's role.

11 For example in his PhD thesis (SCHREINER, Klaus. *Einführung in die Museologie – ein Beitrag zu den theoretischen Grundlagen der Museumsarbeit*. Neubrandenburg, 1982.), in Leipzig often referred to as „das grüne Ungeheuer“.

12 HANSLOK, Andreas. *Museologie und Archivwissenschaft in der DDR. Abgrenzung und Annäherung zweier Nachbarwissenschaften*. Marburg: Tectum Verlag, 2008, Chapter 14. Also in MÜLLER-STRATEN, Christian. *Wie in der DDR Museologie gemacht wurde: Die kommunistische Abrechnung mit Z. Z. Stránský*. *Museum aktuell*, 2005, Juli/August, pp. 40–41.

with the harsh tone of Schreiner's criticism. In fact, his reputation was hardly harmed. The Fachschule für Museologen<sup>13</sup> at Leipzig remained a strong institutional basis for this thinking. Also after 1989 the Fachschule supported Stránský's ideas, at least as long as Katharina Flügel was director.<sup>14</sup> Flügel's *Einführung in die Museologie* (first edition 2005) became a relatively widely used handbook at German museology courses.

Before 1989, Stránský was not very well received in the Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Wolfgang Klausewitz, board member of ICOFOM, made some efforts to introduce Stránský's thinking. He was one of the very few West-German museologist to create bridges between museology in the Bundesrepublik and the museologies that were advocated in the GDR and Czechoslovakia.<sup>15</sup> In 1988 Stránský was invited to speak at a joint conference of ICOM-Germany, ICOM-Austria and ICOM-Switzerland.<sup>16</sup> Considering the dis-

13 Since 1992 Studiengang Museologie at the Hochschule für Technik, Wirtschaft und Kultur Leipzig.

14 FLÜGEL, Katharina. *Einführung in die Museologie*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005; FLÜGEL, Katharina and Arnold VOGT (eds.). *Museologie als Wissenschaft und Beruf in der modernen Welt. Leipziger Gespräche zur Museologie*. Leipzig: Hochschule für Technik, Wirtschaft und Kultur, 1995. This Leipzig tradition is also reflected in the contents of the journal *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde* (since 2001). Editors are Katharina Flügel and Volker Schimpff (former lecturer at the Fachschule für Museologen). In 2015 the responsibility for the journal was handed over to the museology department of the University of Graz, Austria. BEIER, Hans-Jürgen and Volker SCHIMPF. Editorial. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2014–2015, no. 14–15, p. 2.

15 KLAUSEWITZ, Wolfgang. Zur Geschichte der Museologie (1878–1988). In AUER, Hermann (ed.). *Museologie. Neue Wege – Neue Ziele. Bericht über ein internationales Symposium, veranstaltet von den ICOM-Nationalkomitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Österreichs und der Schweiz vom 11. bis 14. Mai 1988 am Bodensee*. München: K. G. Sauer, 1989, pp. 20–37.

16 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. Die theoretischen Grundlagen der Museologie als Wissenschaft. In AUER, Hermann (ed.). *Museologie. Neue Wege – Neue Ziele. Bericht über ein internationales Symposium, veranstaltet von den ICOM-Nationalkomitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Österreichs und der Schweiz vom 11. bis 14. Mai 1988 am Bodensee*. München: K. G. Sauer, 1989, pp. 38–47.

ussion, his presentation and the others on museology and ICOFOM, did not attract much interest among the participants.<sup>17</sup> A few years later it was Friedrich Waidacher's *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*<sup>18</sup> that played a key role in introducing Stránský's thinking to a wider German speaking audience. Thanks to the legacy of Waidacher, the ideas of Stránský are adopted as key subject of interest at the University of Graz in Austria.<sup>19</sup> In Graz, Waidacher is considered an „in alle Richtungen strahlenden museologischen Komete“,<sup>20</sup> who developed the theory of museology on the basis of Stránský's work. Museality was

17 AUER, Hermann (ed.). *Museologie. Neue Wege – Neue Ziele. Bericht über ein internationales Symposium, veranstaltet von den ICOM-Nationalkomitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Österreichs und der Schweiz vom 11. bis 14. Mai 1988 am Bodensee*. München: K. G. Sauer, 1989, pp. 97–98. A similar conference on the characteristics of museology, organised in 1971 did not refer to discussions in Central and East Europe at all. DYROFF, Hans-Dieter (ed.). *Museologie. Bericht über ein internationales Symposium, veranstaltet vom Deutschen Nationalkomitee des Internationalen Museumsrates (ICOM) in Zusammenarbeit mit der Deutschen UNESCO-Kommission vom 8. bis 13. März 1971 in München*. Köln: Deutsche UNESCO-Kommission, 1973.

18 WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 1993.

19 BIEDERMANN, Bernadette, Marlies RAFFLER and Nikolaus REISINGER. Geleitwort. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2012–2013, no. 12–13, pp. 1–2; BIEDERMANN, Bernadette. Theoretische Modelle und aktuelles museales Ausstellungswesen im Spiegel des Theorems der Musealität. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 33–41; RAFFLER, Marlies. *Spiegel der Nation? Zugänge zur Historischen Museologie am Beispiel der Genese von Landes- und Nationalmuseen in der Habsburgermonarchie*. Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 2007, p. 48. In 2002 Waidacher was appointed as honorary professor of „Allgemeine Museologie“ at the Karl-Franzens Universität, Graz. BIEDERMANN, Bernadette and Marlies RAFFLER. Dem Museologen, Volkskundler, Jazzmusiker, Komponisten, Arrangeur, Pädagogen, Museumskonsulenten, Mentor, Philosophen, Polyhistor, Menschen und Freund Friedrich Waidacher zum 80. Geburtstag. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2014–2015, no. 14–15, pp. 3–14. He was succeeded by Marlies Raffler as professor of „Historische Museologie“.

20 BIEDERMANN, Bernadette and Marlies RAFFLER. Dem Museologen, Volkskundler, Jazzmusiker, Komponisten, Arrangeur, Pädagogen, Museumskonsulenten, Mentor, Philosophen, Polyhistor, Menschen und Freund Friedrich Waidacher zum 80. Geburtstag. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2014–2015, no. 14–15, p. 3.

re-branded as “*das Stránský-Waidacher Theorem der Musealität*”.<sup>21</sup>

Stránský's ideas are strongly supported by Christian Müller-Straten, publisher of, among others, the museums journal *Museum aktuell*.<sup>22</sup> *Museum aktuell* became Stránský's most important international platform in the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.<sup>23</sup> He used this platform to justify himself and to criticise others. The most explicit justification of his position was published in 2001.<sup>24</sup> He described how the communist regime opposed his work.<sup>25</sup> In particular he commented on the controversy with Klaus Schreiner concerning the concept of

museality.<sup>26</sup> In his text he referred to many authors that have adopted his ideas (such as Waidacher), but his opinion about his sympathizers is ambivalent. For example, in 2006 he criticised the handbooks published by two of his most ardent supporters pointing out that “*the methodological shortcomings and the confusion evident in both publications reflect the state of current professional museology*”.<sup>27</sup> The German text is even more impolite than the English summary: “*Beide Titel [...] signalisieren leider einen erheblichen Mangel an professioneller museologischer Durchdringung*“. “*Erhebliche Mangel*“, serious defects, a not very helpful qualification to create coalitions.

The increased focus on New Museology at museology and museum studies programmes in Germany, tends to marginalize the type of thinking of which Stránský was a representative, while at the same time doubts persisted as to the validity of museology as academic discipline,<sup>28</sup> or even the existence of a whole tradition of thinking about museums. In November 2016 a conference was organised by the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität (Münster) in the Bode-Museum at Berlin. In the brochure it is suggested that the aim of this conference is to establish a “*Philosophy of Museums*”, suggesting that fundamental

questions have not yet been dealt with by existing museum theories.<sup>29</sup>

### Three questions to answer

In the following I would like to find an answer to three questions: (1) what attracted people to Stránský's ideas, (2) why did these ideas not attract wider attention, and (3) what elements from Stránský's heritage could we use for future development. It is not my intention to analyse Stránský's ideas as such, neither will I explore their origin and development. Just one remark: little attention has been given to developments in Stránský's thinking. For example, his definition of museality has changed over the years.<sup>30</sup> In his *Introduction to museology* and other publications, Ivo Maroević has adopted the concept of museality, but refers to a definition of 1970.<sup>31</sup> As a consequence there is some tension between Maroević's concept of museality and Stránský's later approach.

### What attracted people to Stránský's ideas?

Contrary to Western Europe, there was a strong urge among Central and Eastern European museologists to prove that their specialist

21 BEIER, Hans-Jürgen and Volker SCHIMPF. Editorial. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2014–2015, no. 14–15, p. 1. This would make Christian Müller-Straten very angry. To him, Waidacher “remains a mere transporter of Stránský's original thoughts. But as Waidacher does a lot to disseminate Stránský's thinking, the only thing we all have to do is to get Waidacher back to earth and to speak absolutely clear on Stránský and his achievements to Museology”. MÜLLER-STRATEN, Christian. The contribution of Zbyněk Stránský to Museology and the contribution of the Brno Museology School. In *Muzealizace v soudobé společnosti a poslání muzeologie/Musealization in contemporary society and role of museology. Anthology from symposium with foreign participation on the occasion of anniversary of the founder of the Brno museology school Zbyněk Z. Stránský. Technical Museum in Brno, 8<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> November 2006*. Prague: Asociace muzeí a galerií České republiky, 2008, p. 30.

22 MÜLLER-STRATEN, Christian. The contribution of Zbyněk Stránský to Museology and the contribution of the Brno Museology School. In *Muzealizace v soudobé společnosti a poslání muzeologie/Musealization in contemporary society and role of museology. Anthology from symposium with foreign participation on the occasion of anniversary of the founder of the Brno museology school Zbyněk Z. Stránský. Technical Museum in Brno, 8<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> November 2006*. Prague: Asociace muzeí a galerií České republiky, 2008, pp. 27–35.

23 It is fair to say that Müller-Straten also published critical reviews of Stránský's ideas (for example MAROEVIĆ, Ivo. Zur Kritik der museologischen Theorien Zbynek Z. Stránskýs. *Museum aktuell*, 2001, Juli, pp. 2887–2892.).

24 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Ist Museologie eine kommunistische Wissenschaft? Eine Entgegnung auf deutsche Einstellungen. *Museum aktuell*, April 2001, p. 2758–2761.

25 On Stránský's struggles with the regime, see also KIRSCH, Otakar. Vysokoškolská výuka muzeologie v Brně v době normalizace a nástupu demokratického režimu. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 12–20.

26 See also HANSLOK, Andreas. *Museologie und Archivwissenschaft in der DDR. Abgrenzung und Annäherung zweier Nachbarwissenschaften*. Marburg: Tectum Verlag, 2008 and KIRSCH, Otakar. Vysokoškolská výuka muzeologie v Brně v době normalizace a nástupu demokratického režimu. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 12–20.

27 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Noch eine „knapp gefasste Museologie“. *Museum aktuell*, November 2008, p. 7.

28 HEESSEN, Anke te. *Theorien des Museums zur Einführung*. Hamburg: Junius Verlag, 2012.

29 “Die geplante Tagung ist der Bestandsaufnahme und der Grundlegung einer Philosophie des Museums gewidmet, deren Gegenstand [...] museumsphilosophische Fragen sind, die die etablierte Museumstheorie, aber auch die ‘New Museology’ allenfalls am Rande streifen“. In her own publications, the organiser Prof. Bernadette Collenberg-Plotnikov, specialist on the aesthetics of the Hegelian School, does not appear to be familiar with the key corpus of museological literature. COLLENBERG-PLOTNIKOV, Bernadette. Die Musealisierung des Alltäglichen. Zur Bedeutung der Institutionen für die Kunst. In WIESING, Lambert (ed.). *Ästhetik und Alltagserfahrung. VII. Kongress der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Ästhetik*. [Jena], 2008; COLLENBERG-PLOTNIKOV, Bernadette. Kunst zeigen – Kunst machen. Überlegungen zur Bedeutung des Museums. In COLLENBERG-PLOTNIKOV, Bernadette (ed.). *Musealisierung und Reflexion. Gedächtnis – Erinnerung – Geschichte*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2011.

30 MENSCH, Peter van. *Towards a methodology of museology*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, 1992, pp. 45 and 151. PhD thesis.

31 MAROEVIĆ, Ivo. *Introduction to Museology – the European Approach*. München: Verlag Dr. Christian Müller-Straten, 1998, pp. 130–132.

field should be accepted as genuine academic discipline. This may not have been Jelínek's intention when he initiated a museum studies department at the Jan Evangelista Purkyně University (Brno) in 1963. It became however a life-long endeavour of Stránský as the department's most important staff member.<sup>32</sup> On 22–24 March 1965, Stránský organised a conference in which the characteristics of museology as disciplines were discussed.<sup>33</sup> During the 1960s, this conference was followed by two other international conferences.<sup>34</sup> The conferences positioned Stránský as important thinker in the field and constituted the concept of the museological “School of Brno”.

As his international network gradually expanded, Stránský gained increased respect, also in the Soviet Union.<sup>35</sup> Leading Soviet museologist Awraam Razgon credited him as the person who has developed the theoretical foundation of museology as academic discipline at

its fullest.<sup>36</sup> This is also the opinion on Christian Müller-Straten has expressed at different occasions.<sup>37</sup> Müller-Straten even suggested that “*the main teaching museologists in Zagreb, Jyväskylä, Graz, Amsterdam as well as in Switzerland are based on the basic thoughts of Prof. Stránský. And as his thoughts are in a positive sense timeless and including all cultures of the world, his system of Museology can also be used in Africa, even if this was doubted some years ago by Tomislav Šola.*”<sup>38</sup> I do think Tomislav Šola was right, and I also think Müller-Straten overestimated the impact of Stránský's ideas in the four (five) teaching centres. These ideas did certainly influence teaching at those centres, but despite the alleged timelessness, this influence did not last into the present. However, it is not by coincidence that Müller-Straten mentioned four training centres. He could easily have mentioned more. What my colleagues and myself attracted

to Stránský was that he “invented a system”, to use Müller-Straten's words.<sup>39</sup> Such a system was helpful in developing a consistent study programme as became clear to us in the Netherlands in the early 1980s.

The most elaborate introduction of Stránský's system outside Czechoslovakia/Czech & Slovak Republics, is Waidacher's *Handbuch* (1993).<sup>40</sup> As most of the ICOFOM members were not aware of Waidacher's publication(s),<sup>41</sup> they mostly depended on two English texts presented by Anna Gregorová (Bratislava),<sup>42</sup> which they apparently seemed to find more comprehensive and more accessible than Stránský's own ICOFOM texts. Anyway, what appealed to many “teaching museologists” as referred to above, was the concept of a specific human relation

39 MÜLLER-STRATEN, Christian. The contribution of Zbyněk Stránský to Museology and the contribution of the Brno Museology School. In *Muzealizace v soudobé společnosti a poslání muzeologie/Museumization in contemporary society and role of museology. Anthology from symposium with foreign participation on the occasion of anniversary of the founder of the Brno museology school Zbyněk Z. Stránský. Technical Museum in Brno, 8<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> November 2006*. Prague: Asociace muzeí a galerií České republiky, 2008, p. 31.

40 Müller-Straten refers to Waidacher as “mere transporter of Stránský's original thoughts” having received more credits than justified. MÜLLER-STRATEN, Christian. The contribution of Zbyněk Stránský to Museology and the contribution of the Brno Museology School. In *Muzealizace v soudobé společnosti a poslání muzeologie/Museumization in contemporary society and role of museology. Anthology from symposium with foreign participation on the occasion of anniversary of the founder of the Brno museology school Zbyněk Z. Stránský. Technical Museum in Brno, 8<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> November 2006*. Prague: Asociace muzeí a galerií České republiky, 2008, p. 30 and 34. In the German Wikipedia page on “Museologie”, Müller-Straten (?) added that Waidacher's *Handbuch* was published before Stránský's concept of museology was fully developed. Museologie. In *Wikipedia. Die freie Enzyklopädie* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-27]. Available from [www: <https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Museologie>](https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Museologie).

41 Waidacher did not contribute to ICOFOM's publication series.

42 In *Museological Working Papers* 1 (1980) and 2 (1981). She also contributed to ICOFOM Study Series 10 (1986) and 12 (1987). In a private conversation, Stránský admitted that he found it difficult to accept that Gregorová was credited for ideas that she derived from him. See also STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Ist Museologie eine kommunistische Wissenschaft? Eine Entgegnung auf deutsche Einstellungen. *Museum aktuell*, April 2001, p. 2760.

32 About the early history of the department, see RUTAR, Václav. Vznik, vývoj a práce externí katedry muzeologie v Brně v letech 1963–1969. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 4–11 and KIRSCH, Otakar. Vysokoškolská výuka muzeologie v Brně v době normalizace a nástupu demokratického režimu. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 12–20.

33 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálů prvního muzeologického symposia*. Brno: Moravské muzeum, 1966.

34 RUTAR, Václav. Vznik, vývoj a práce externí katedry muzeologie v Brně v letech 1963–1969. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, vol. 3, no. 5, p. 8. The conference that was held on 20–21 October 1967 resulted in the creation of the ICOM International Committee for the Training of Personnel. KIRSCH, Otakar. Vysokoškolská výuka muzeologie v Brně v době normalizace a nástupu demokratického režimu. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, vol. 3, no. 5, p. 14.

35 GUBARENKO, Maria. Czech-Russian (Czechoslovak-Soviet) cooperation in the field of formation and development of museology as a science. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2016, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 15–25.

36 In HERBST, Wolfgang and Konstantin G. LEVYKIN (eds.). *Museologie. Theoretische Grundlagen und Methodik der Arbeit in Geschichtsmuseen*. Berlin: VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1988, p. 21. This publication was a joint project of GDR and USSR museologists. The chapter on “Museologie als wissenschaftliche Disziplin” was written by Razgon. Stránský described how he needed to meet Razgon in city parks in order not to be bugged. According to Stránský it was difficult for Razgon to be positive about his ideas, which seems to be in contradiction with the way Razgon wrote about Stránský in HERBST, Wolfgang and Konstantin G. LEVYKIN (eds.). *Museologie. Theoretische Grundlagen und Methodik der Arbeit in Geschichtsmuseen*. Berlin: VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1988.

37 MÜLLER-STRATEN, Christian. The contribution of Zbyněk Stránský to Museology and the contribution of the Brno Museology School. In *Muzealizace v soudobé společnosti a poslání muzeologie/Museumization in contemporary society and role of museology. Anthology from symposium with foreign participation on the occasion of anniversary of the founder of the Brno museology school Zbyněk Z. Stránský. Technical Museum in Brno, 8<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> November 2006*. Prague: Asociace muzeí a galerií České republiky, 2008, pp. 27–35.

38 MÜLLER-STRATEN, Christian. The contribution of Zbyněk Stránský to Museology and the contribution of the Brno Museology School. In *Muzealizace v soudobé společnosti a poslání muzeologie/Museumization in contemporary society and role of museology. Anthology from symposium with foreign participation on the occasion of anniversary of the founder of the Brno museology school Zbyněk Z. Stránský. Technical Museum in Brno, 8<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> November 2006*. Prague: Asociace muzeí a galerií České republiky, 2008, p. 27.

towards reality as object of interest in museology. Paradoxically, this might also be the very reason why at many places “teaching museologists” later lost interest in Stránský’s ideas.

#### *Why did Stránský’s ideas not attract wider attention?*

When we focus on the non-German speaking world, the first problem seems to be a language problem connected with differences in epistemological thinking.<sup>43</sup> Only a few texts of Stránský were published in English and they circulated mainly within a limited ICOFOM context.<sup>44</sup> It is obvious that the present international museological professional discourse is mainly dominated by authors from Great Britain, United States and Australia. This is, for example, clearly shown in the four volume *International Handbooks of Museum Studies*, published in 2015.<sup>45</sup> In the introduction to the first volume (*Museum Theory*), the editors, Kylie Message and Andrea Witcomb, give 54 publications in their bibliography, all in English. Bourdieu, Deleuze, Foucault and Habermas are mentioned (not surprising in this context), but they are the only continental-European authors referred to.<sup>46</sup> This is symptomatic of the *Handbooks* as a whole: the professional output from continental-Europe, Latin-America, Africa and Asia is almost completely ig-

nored.<sup>47</sup> Part of it is the implicit distinction between museum theory, museum studies and museology. When Message and Witcomb speak of “the first phase of museum studies” in the 1990s<sup>48</sup> they ignore the work of the ICOM International Committee for Museology and the discussions on museology that preceded its establishment (in 1977).<sup>49</sup>

One of the key concerns of Stránský, to prove that museology was a genuine academic discipline, was of little interest in “western” countries. Besides, new approaches towards the understanding of the development of scientific fields emerged.<sup>50</sup> As far as I know, the University of Graz is the only place outside the Czech and Slovak Republics where they still follow the Stránský/Waidacher system of museology.<sup>51</sup> In most of the new museology/museum studies programmes at European universities the subject matter field is claimed by other disciplines: art history, history, ethnography, and increasingly: cultural

studies.<sup>52</sup> In these contexts there is no felt need to adopt a rather rigid system and methodology like the one advocated by Stránský and Waidacher.

As mentioned above, many “teaching museologists” were attracted by the concept of a specific human relation towards reality as object of interest in museology, rather than the more tradition approach focussing on the museum institution. It seems that the field of Museum Studies as it emerged from the New Museology, has given a new dimension to the traditional museum focussed museology, whereas the related field of Critical Heritage Studies (also rooted in the British New Museology) has absorbed any approach focussing on specific relations toward reality as expressed in the concept of heritage.<sup>53</sup>

As is show, for example, in Markus Walz’s *Handbuch Museum*,<sup>54</sup> the “Anglosaxon” Museum Studies and Critical Heritage Studies approaches have hardly found their way into the German museology discourse.<sup>55</sup> Nevertheless, the broad adoption

43 MAIRESSE, François. Museology at a crossroads. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, p. 5.

44 Some ICOFOM texts were also published in French. Texts produced in connection with the International Summer School of Museology were also translated into French but were not distributed outside the ISSOM context.

45 MACDONALD, Sharon and Helen Rees LEAHY (eds.). *International Handbooks of Museum Studies*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015.

46 MESSAGE, Kylie and Andrea WITCOMB. Introduction: museum theory. An expanded field. In WITCOMB, Andrea and Kylie MESSAGE (eds.). *Museum Theory. The International Handbooks of Museum Studies 1*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015, pp. xxxv-lxiii.

47 MENSCH, Peter van. Needles in a haystack – Some reflections from the Working Group on Resources. *COMCOL Newsletter*, 2015, vol. 29, pp. 19–21.

48 MESSAGE, Kylie and Andrea WITCOMB. Introduction: museum theory. An expanded field. In WITCOMB, Andrea and Kylie MESSAGE (eds.). *Museum Theory. The International Handbooks of Museum Studies 1*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015, p. xxxvii.

49 In a similar way, Janet Marstine writes about “new museum theory” without any reference to museological work before the publication of Peter Vergo’s *New Museology* (1989), or discussions that took place, and still take place, outside the British-American-Australian part of the world. MARSTINE, Janet. Introduction. In MARSTINE, Janet (ed.). *New museum theory and practice*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008, pp. 1–36.

50 MAIRESSE, François. Museology at a crossroads. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, p. 6.

51 The university is described as “das letzte Refugium und künftig hoffentlich eine erneute Pflanzstätte der wissenschaftlichen Museologie im deutschen Sprachraum”. BEIER, Hans-Jürgen and Volker SCHIMPF. Editorial. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2014–2015, no. 14-15, p. 2.

52 WALZ, Markus. On the current ascendancy of special museology in Germany. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 20–27; LUDWIG, Andreas and Markus WALZ. Museen als Forschungsgegenstand anderer Wissenschaften. In WALZ, Markus. *Handbuch Museum. Geschichte – Aufgaben – Perspektiven*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2016, pp. 375–381. Markus Walz, however, does not mention cultural studies as one of the major academic fields claiming museums as a major subject matter. The explanation might be his focus on Germany.

53 MENSCH, Peter van. Museologie – Wissenschaft für Museen. In WALZ, Markus. *Handbuch Museum. Geschichte – Aufgaben – Perspektiven*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2016, pp. 373–374.

54 WALZ, Markus. *Handbuch Museum. Geschichte – Aufgaben – Perspektiven*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2016.

55 The recent (2015) appointment of Sharon Macdonald, one of the exponents of the New Museology, as professor at the Institut für Europäische Ethnologie (Humboldt Universität, Berlin) is an interesting development. At the one hand it gives New Museology a solid basis in Germany, at the other hand it is interesting that in the context of the Institute for European Ethnology she became director of the Centre for Anthropological Research on Museums and Heritage, thus illustrating the growing interest of other disciplines in the subject matter field that is traditionally claimed by museology.

of the concept of musealisation in Germany is an expression of a similar emerging interest as shown by the popularity of Critical Heritage Studies elsewhere. This has, however, very little to do with Stránský's work. German authors usually refer to a lecture of Hermann Lübbe from 1981.<sup>56</sup> The first word of this lecture is "Musealisierung" and throughout the text many times the words museology and museum philosophy are used. There are many references to contemporary publications in English and German, but not a single reference to museological texts published in the German Democratic Republic or Czechoslovakia. Neither does Lübbe refer to Jean Baudrillard and Henri Pierre Jeudy. As Eva Sturm has shown, these two French authors used "muséification" already in the 1970s.<sup>57</sup> Writing about musealisation, Eva Sturm and François Mairesse<sup>58</sup> discuss Stránský's ideas but by doing so, they tend to overestimate his contribution to the international discourse.<sup>59</sup> It is interesting that in developing ideas regarding establishing a museum philosophy, Bernadette Coltenberg-Plotnikov goes back to the musealisation theory of Hermann Lübbe, who is invited speaker at the November 2016 conference mentioned above.

*What elements from Stránský's heritage could we use for future development?*

56 For example: LÜBBE, Hermann. *Der Fortschritt und das Museum. Über den Grund unseres Vergnügens an historischen Gegenständen. The 1981 Bithell Memorial Lecture*. London: Institute of Germanic Studies, 1982.

57 STURM, Eva. *Konservierte Welt. Museum und Musealisierung*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1991.

58 MAIRESSE, François. Muséification. In DESVALLÉES, André and François MAIRESSE. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Collin, 2011, pp. 251–269.

59 Sturm refers to Stránský's lecture on museality at the Reinwardt Academie in 1986 (see MENSCH, Peter van. Museality at breakfast. The concept of museality in contemporary museological discourse. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 14–19).

François Mairesse has shown that Stránský's work on musealisation can still be of value in a further development of the concept.<sup>60</sup> Stránský himself reflected on the work of Lübbe, Baudrillard, Jeudy, and others, which also shows that there is a potential for further development.<sup>61</sup> The challenge is to make a connection with the New Museology, Museum Studies and Critical Heritage Studies discourses. Whereas the term has become a familiar component of the professional rhetoric in Germany (and many other countries), native speakers in Great Britain seem to feel uncomfortable with it. Anyway, the new interest in documenting the present<sup>62</sup> and the introduction of new concepts, such as "musealisation lite"<sup>63</sup> and "third space"<sup>64</sup> could help to find new directions in the discussion.

In an earlier issue of *Museologica Brunensia*, I have developed some thoughts about the concept of museality and its future.<sup>65</sup> At the end I was a bit ambivalent about the use of the term. I still think it would be worthwhile to make an in-depth comparison of the concepts of her-

60 MAIRESSE, François. Muséification. In DESVALLÉES, André and François MAIRESSE. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Collin, 2011, pp. 251–269.

61 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. Musealisierung und Paradigmenwechsel. *Museum aktuell*, Mai/Juni 2001, pp. 2802–2806; STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Muzealizace z hlediska noetiky a ontologie*. In *Muzealizace v soudobé společnosti a poslání muzeologie/Musealization in contemporary society and role of museology. Anthology from symposium with foreign participation on the occasion of anniversary of the founder of the Brno museology school Zbyněk Z. Stránský. Technical Museum in Brno, 8<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> November 2006*. Prague: Asociace muzeí a galerií České republiky, 2008, pp. 78–85.

62 ELPERS, Sophie and Anna PALM (eds.). *Die Musealisierung der Gegenwart. Von Grenzen und Chancen des Sammelns in kulturhistorischen Museen*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2014.

63 MENSCH, Peter van and Léontine MEIJER-VAN MENSCH. *New Trends in Museology II*. Celje: Muzej novejšje zgodovine, 2015, pp. 19–20.

64 MENSCH, Peter van. Museality at breakfast. The concept of museality in contemporary museological discourse. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 14–19.

65 MENSCH, Peter van. Museality at breakfast. The concept of museality in contemporary museological discourse. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 14–19.

itage as, for example, advocated by Laurajane Smith<sup>66</sup> and Stránský's developing concept of museality.

Müller-Straten may (partly) be right in his observation that a generation of museologists is gradually disappearing leaving "not enough prolific teachers in scientific Museology"<sup>67</sup> The observations of Walz underline the problem.<sup>68</sup> Nevertheless, I think there is again a growing number of young academics and museum workers that are interested in museums and musealisation, but they do perhaps not define themselves as museologists. For me, this is not important. In hindsight it might be a pity that Stránský spend much of his energy to prove that museology is a science. This is not the main issue today. What still remains relevant in contemporary society is a reflection on the specificity of the relation of people with their environment as expressed in the concept of heritage.

## REFERENCES:

AUER, Hermann (ed.). *Museologie. Neue Wege – Neue Ziele. Bericht über ein internationales Symposium, veranstaltet von den ICOM-Nationalkomitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Österreichs und der Schweiz vom 11. bis 14. Mai 1988 am Bodensee*. München: K. G. Sauer, 1989. ISBN 978-3-598-10809-9.

BEIER, Hans-Jürgen and Volker SCHIMPF. Editorial. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2014–2015, no. 14-15, pp. 1–2.

66 SMITH, Laurajane. *Uses of heritage*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006.

67 MÜLLER-STRATEN, Christian. The contribution of Zbyněk Stránský to Museology and the contribution of the Brno Museology School. In *Muzealizace v soudobé společnosti a poslání muzeologie/Musealization in contemporary society and role of museology. Anthology from symposium with foreign participation on the occasion of anniversary of the founder of the Brno museology school Zbyněk Z. Stránský. Technical Museum in Brno, 8<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> November 2006*. Prague: Asociace muzeí a galerií České republiky, 2008, p. 33.

68 WALZ, Markus. On the current ascendancy of special museology in Germany. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 20–27.



- BIEDERMANN, Bernadette. Theoretische Modelle und aktuelles museales Ausstellungswesen im Spiegel des Theorems der Musealität. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 33–41. ISSN 1805-4722.
- BIEDERMANN, Bernadette and Marlies RAFFLER. Dem Museologen, Volkskundler, Jazzmusiker, Komponisten, Arrangeur, Pädagogen, Museumskonsulenten, Mentor, Philosophen, Polyhistor, Menschen und Freund Friedrich Waidacher zum 80. Geburtstag. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2014–2015, no. 14-15, pp. 3–14.
- BIEDERMANN, Bernadette, Marlies RAFFLER and Nikolaus REISINGER. Geleitwort. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2012–2013, no. 12-13, pp.1–2.
- Chamada para textos e comunicações para o III Ciclo de Debates Internacional Stránský: uma ponte Brno-Brazil [online]. [cit. 2016-09-27]. Available from www: <<http://www.forumpermanente.org/noticias/2015/chamada-para-textos-e-comunicacoes-para-o-iii-ciclo-de-debates-internacional-stransky-uma-ponte-brno-brazil>>.
- COLLENBERG-PLOTNIKOV, Bernadette. Die Musealisierung des Alltäglichen. Zur Bedeutung der Institutionen für die Kunst. In WIESING, Lambert (ed.). *Ästhetik und Alltagserfahrung. VII. Kongress der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Ästhetik*. [Jena], 2008. Kongress-Akten der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Ästhetik 1.
- COLLENBERG-PLOTNIKOV, Bernadette. Kunst zeigen – Kunst machen. Überlegungen zur Bedeutung des Museums. In COLLENBERG-PLOTNIKOV, Bernadette (ed.). *Musealisierung und Reflexion. Gedächtnis – Erinnerung – Geschichte*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2011. ISBN 978-3-7705-4770-8.
- DESVALLÉES, André and François MAIRESSE. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Collin, 2011. ISBN 978-2-200-27037-7.
- DOLÁK, Jan and Jana VAVŘÍKOVÁ. *Muzeolog Z. Stránský. Život a dílo*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2006. ISBN 80-210-4139-0.
- DYROFF, Hans-Dieter (ed.). *Museologie. Bericht über ein internationales Symposium, veranstaltet vom Deutschen Nationalkomitee des Internationalen Museumsrates (ICOM) in Zusammenarbeit mit der Deutschen UNESCO-Kommission vom 8. bis 13. März 1971 in München*. Köln: Deutsche UNESCO-Kommission, 1973.
- ELPERS, Sophie and Anna PALM (eds.). *Die Musealisierung der Gegenwart. Von Grenzen und Chancen des Sammelns in kulturhistorischen Museen*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2014. ISBN 978-3-8394-2494-0.
- FLÜGEL, Katharina. *Einführung in die Museologie*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005. ISBN 978-3-534-73884-7.
- FLÜGEL, Katharina and Arnold VOGT (eds.). *Museologie als Wissenschaft und Beruf in der modernen Welt. Leipziger Gespräche zur Museologie*. Leipzig: Hochschule für Technik, Wirtschaft und Kultur, 1995. Schriftenreihe zur Museologie 3. ISBN 978-3-929742-56-5.
- GUBARENKO, Maria. Czech-Russian (Czechoslovak-Soviet) cooperation in the field of formation and development of museology as a science. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2016, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 15–25. ISSN 1805-4722. DOI: 10.5817/MuB2016-1-2
- HANSLOK, Andreas. *Museologie und Archivwissenschaft in der DDR. Abgrenzung und Annäherung zweier Nachbarwissenschaften*. Marburg: Tectum Verlag, 2008. ISBN 978-3-8288-9581-2.
- HEESEN, Anke te. *Theorien des Museums zur Einführung*. Hamburg: Junius Verlag, 2012. ISBN 978-3-88506-698-9.
- HERBST, Wolfgang and Konstantin G. LEVYKIN (eds.). *Museologie. Theoretische Grundlagen und Methodik der Arbeit in Geschichtsmuseen*. Berlin: VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1988.
- KIRSCH, Otakar. Vysokoškolská výuka muzeologie v Brně v době normalizace a nástupu demokratického režimu. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 12–20. ISSN 1805-4722.
- KLAUSEWITZ, Wolfgang. Zur Geschichte der Museologie (1878–1988). In AUER, Hermann (ed.). *Museologie. Neue Wege – Neue Ziele. Bericht über ein internationales Symposium, veranstaltet von den ICOM-Nationalkomitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Österreichs und der Schweiz vom 11. bis 14. Mai 1988 am Bodensee*. München: K. G. Sauer, 1989, pp. 20–37. ISBN 978-3-598-10809-9.
- LANG, Rolf (ed.). *Museologie in der Tschechoslowakischen Sozialistischen Republik*. Berlin, 1982. Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Museumswesen 17.
- LÜBBE, Hermann. *Der Fortschritt und das Museum. Über den Grund unseres Vergnügens an historischen Gegenständen. The 1981 Bithell Memorial Lecture*. London: Institute of Germanic Studies, 1982.
- LUDWIG, Andreas and Markus WALZ. Museen als Forschungsgegenstand anderer Wissenschaften. In WALZ, Markus. *Handbuch Museum. Geschichte – Aufgaben – Perspektiven*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2016, pp. 375–381. ISBN 978-3-476-02375-9.
- MACDONALD, Sharon and Helen Rees LEAHY (eds.). *International Handbooks of Museum Studies*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015. ISBN 978-1-4051-9850-9.
- MAIRESSE, François. Muséalisation. In DESVALLÉES, André and François MAIRESSE. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Collin, 2011, pp. 251–269. ISBN 978-2-200-27037-7.
- MAIRESSE, François. Museology at a crossroads. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 4–9. ISSN 1805-4722.
- MAROEVIĆ, Ivo. *Introduction to Museology – the European Approach*. München: Verlag Dr. Christian Müller-Straten, 1998. ISBN 3-932704-52-5.
- MAROEVIĆ, Ivo. Zur Kritik der museologischen Theorien Zbynek Z. Stránskýs. *Museum aktuell*, 2001, Juli, pp. 2887–2892.
- MARSTINE, Janet. Introduction. In MARSTINE, Janet (ed.). *New museum theory and practice*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008, pp. 1–36. ISBN 978-1-4051-4882-5.
- MENSCH, Peter van. Museality at breakfast. The concept of museality in contemporary museological discourse. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 14–19. ISSN 1805-4722.
- MENSCH, Peter van. Museologie – Wissenschaft für Museen. In WALZ, Markus. *Handbuch Museum. Geschichte – Aufgaben – Perspektiven*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2016, pp. 370–375. ISBN 978-3-476-02375-9.
- MENSCH, Peter van. Needles in a haystack – Some reflections from the Working Group

- on Resources. *COMCOL Newsletter*, 2015, vol. 29, pp. 19–21.
- MENSCH, Peter van. *Towards a methodology of museology*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, 1992. PhD thesis.
- MENSCH, Peter van and Léontine MEIJER-VAN MENSCH. *New Trends in Museology II*. Celje: Muzej novejšje zgodovine, 2015. ISBN 978-961-6339-39-1.
- MESSAGE, Kylie and Andrea WITCOMB. Introduction: museum theory. An expanded field. In WITCOMB, Andrea and Kylie MESSAGE (eds.). *Museum Theory. The International Handbooks of Museum Studies 1*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015, pp. xxxv-lxiii. ISBN 978-1-4051-9850-9.
- MÜLLER-STRATEN, Christian. The contribution of Zbyněk Stránský to Museology and the contribution of the Brno Museology School. In *Muzealizace v soudobé společnosti a poslání muzeologie/Musealization in contemporary society and role of museology. Anthology from symposium with foreign participation on the occasion of anniversary of the founder of the Brno museology school Zbyněk Z. Stránský. Technical Museum in Brno, 8<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> November 2006*. Prague: Asociace muzeí a galerií České republiky, 2008, pp. 27–35. ISBN 978-80-86611-28-0.
- MÜLLER-STRATEN, Christian. Wie in der DDR Museologie gemacht wurde: Die kommunistische Abrechnung mit Z. Z. Stránský. *Museum aktuell*, 2005, Juli/August, pp. 40–41.
- Museologie. In *Wikipedia. Die freie Enzyklopädie* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-27]. Available from www: <<https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Museologie>>.
- RAFFLER, Marlies. *Spiegel der Nation? Zugänge zur Historischen Museologie am Beispiel der Genese von Landes- und Nationalmuseen in der Habsburgermonarchie*. Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 2007. ISBN 978-3-205-77731-1.
- RUTAR, Václav. Vznik, vývoj a práce externí katedry muzeologie v Brně v letech 1963–1969. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 4–11. ISSN 1805-4722.
- SCHEUNEMANN, Jan. „Gegenwartsbezogenheit und Parteinahme für den Sozialismus“. *Geschichtspolitik und regionale Museum-sarbeitsarbeit in der SBZ/DDR 1945–1971*. Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2009. ISBN 978-3-940938-35-0.
- SCHREINER, Klaus. *Einführung in die Museologie – ein Beitrag zu den theoretischen Grundlagen der Museumsarbeit*. Neubrandenburg, 1982.
- SMITH, Laurajane. *Uses of heritage*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006. ISBN 978-0-415-31830-3.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. Die Museologie als selbständige Wissenschaft. In FLÜGEL, Katharina and Arnold VOGT (eds.). *Museologie als Wissenschaft und Beruf in der modernen Welt. Leipziger Gespräche zur Museologie*. Leipzig: Hochschule für Technik, Wirtschaft und Kultur Leipzig, 1995, pp. 11–29. Schriftenreihe zur Museologie 3. ISBN 978-3-929742-56-5.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. Die theoretischen Grundlagen der Museologie als Wissenschaft. In AUER, Hermann (ed.). *Museologie. Neue Wege – Neue Ziele. Bericht über ein internationales Symposium, veranstaltet von den ICOM-Nationalkomitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Österreichs und der Schweiz von 11. bis 14. Mai 1988 am Bodensee*. München: K. G. Sauer, 1989, pp. 38–47. ISBN 978-3-598-10809-9.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Ist Museologie eine kommunistische Wissenschaft? Eine Entgegnung auf deutsche Einstellungen. *Museum aktuell*, April 2001, pp. 2758–2761.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. Musealisierung und Paradigmenwechsel. *Museum aktuell*, Mai/Juni 2001, pp. 2802–2806.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Muzealizace z hlediska noetiky a ontologie. In *Muzealizace v soudobé společnosti a poslání muzeologie/Musealization in contemporary society and role of museology. Anthology from symposium with foreign participation on the occasion of anniversary of the founder of the Brno museology school Zbyněk Z. Stránský. Technical Museum in Brno, 8<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> November 2006*. Prague: Asociace muzeí a galerií České republiky, 2008, pp. 78–85. ISBN 978-80-86611-28-0.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. [Museology – science or just practical museum work]. *Museological Working Papers*, 1980, no. 1, pp. 42–44.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. Museology as a science (A Thesis). *Museologia*, 1980, vol. 15, pp. 33–40.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Noch eine „knapp gefasste Museologie“. *Museum aktuell*, November 2008, pp. 6–7.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálů prvního muzeologického symposia*. Brno: Moravské muzeum, 1966.
- STURM, Eva. *Konservierte Welt. Museum und Musealisierung*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1991. ISBN 978-3-496-01078-4.
- WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 1993. ISBN 978-3-205-98445-0.
- WALZ, Markus. *Handbuch Museum. Geschichte – Aufgaben – Perspektiven*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2016. ISBN 978-3-476-02375-9.
- WALZ, Markus. On the current ascendancy of special museology in Germany. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 20–27. ISSN 1805-4722.

#### PETER VAN MENSCH

freelance museologist, Berlin (Germany) and Loučná-Višňová (Czech Republic)  
[peter@menschmuseology.com](mailto:peter@menschmuseology.com)

Peter van Mensch is currently freelance museologist, and formerly professor of cultural heritage at the Reinwardt Academie (Amsterdam) and professor of museology at Vilnius University (Lithuania). Being a Dutch citizen, he lives partly in Berlin and partly in Loučná-Višňová (Czech Republic), reflecting his lifetime ambition to make a connection between the Central European tradition(s) concerning the theory of museology with contemporary museological thinking elsewhere.

Peter van Mensch je v současnosti muzeologem na volné noze. Dříve působil jako profesor kulturního dědictví na Reinwardt Academie (Amsterdam) a profesor muzeologie na Univerzitě ve Vilniusu (Litva). Je občanem Nizozemska, žije částečně v Berlíně a částečně v Loučné-Višňové (Česká republika). Odráží to jeho celoživotní snahu o propojení střeoevropské tradice v teorii muzeologie se současným muzeologickým myšlením jinde ve světě.

## STUDIE/ARTICLES

## WHAT IS ZBYNĚK Z. STRÁNSKÝ'S "INFLUENCE" ON MUSEOLOGY?

DOI: 10.5817/MuB2016-2-3

FRANÇOIS MAIRESSE

## ABSTRACT/ABSTRAKT:

This article seeks to examine the question of the short- and medium-term influence of Stránský on his museological colleagues and on the following two generations, both in Brno and on the International Committee for Museology (ICOFOM), but also on a more general level. After giving some elements of Stránský's conceptions of museology, this paper attempts to analyze his influence on posterity, especially on an international level. The article also raises the question of the notion of "influence", as the term might be analyzed from different perspectives.

### Jakým způsobem Zbyněk Z. Stránský „ovlivnil“ muzeologii?

Tento článek si klade za cíl prozkoumat, jaký vliv měl Stránský z krátkodobého a střednědobého hlediska na své současníky v oboru muzeologie a na příští dvě generace muzeologů v Brně a na půdě Mezinárodního výboru pro muzea (ICOFOM), ale také na obecnější úrovni. Text se zabývá některými prvky Stránského konceptu muzeologie a pokouší se analyzovat jeho vliv na příští generace, zejména v mezinárodním kontextu. Článek také pojednává o rozdílných názorech na samotný pojem „vliv“, jenž může být vnímán z různých úhlů pohledu.

## KEYWORDS/KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA:

*museology – Stránský – ICOFOM – museological system – metamuseology*

*muzeologie – Stránský – ICOFOM – systém muzeologie – metamuzeologie*

The etymology of the word "influence" refers to the medieval Latin: *influentia* or the "action assigned to the stars on human destiny."<sup>1</sup> If we stick to that principle, the influence of Z. Z. Stránský is particularly limited. In the thirteenth century, however, the term takes on a more human meaning, "slow and continuous action exercised by a person or a thing on another person or thing."<sup>2</sup> It is for this reason that we can question the influence of Stránský on museology or, more fairly, on his colleagues.<sup>3</sup>

Most of Stránský's career advanced in a very different context from today. He had known war and it was mainly during the Cold War that he developed his career. With the fall of the Berlin Wall, in his early sixties, he still had many years of scientific production before him, having launched the International Summer School of Museology (ISSOM) in 1987. Internationally, he is primarily considered as an "Eastern" thinker, a representative of a certain vision of the museum which proved to be very influential during the Cold War period, but which mostly disappeared after the 1990s. This article seeks to examine the question of the short- and

medium-term influence of Stránský on his colleagues and on the following two generations. I must in this context position myself, having followed Stránský's courses in Brno during an ISSOM session and having interacted with him as a (very young) ICOFOM colleague during the last years of his presence within the committee, at a time (the second half of the 1990s) when he was preparing to gradually withdraw from the international sphere. I am aware of the partly subjective perspective that this contribution could propose, which would necessarily differ from that of someone who had not met him.

### A major influence in the ICOFOM

Between 1980 and 1997, Stránský published over thirty articles and comments in *Museological Working Papers* and the *ICOFOM Study Series* published by ICOFOM, making him one of the most regular and prolific authors of the committee. His close involvement within the committee (founded and firstly chaired by Jan Jelínek) from its inception, as well as the quality of his contributions, render him a *de facto* key figure of the founding generation of ICOFOM. As it has already been noted,<sup>4</sup> for many Western scientists, the world of museology beyond the Iron Curtain was relatively unknown, and it was a considerable surprise for Western museologists to enter into a direct relationship with such

<sup>1</sup> *Trésor de la langue française informatisé* [online]. [cit. 2016-08-30]. Available from www: <http://atilf.atilf.fr>.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> I would like to thank Anna Leshchenko and my two reviewers for their corrections and comments on an earlier version of this paper.

<sup>4</sup> MAIRESSE, François and André DESVALLÉES. *Muséologie*. In MAIRESSE, François and André DESVALLÉES (eds.). *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Colin, 2011, pp. 343–384.

particular “Eastern”<sup>5</sup> views, especially the more theoretical aspects.

It would be incorrect to see Stránský as the only representative of this specific stream. In the two issues of *Museological Working Papers* (MuWoP, 1/1980), of the twenty-six authors, nine may be labeled as coming from the Eastern Bloc (Anna Gregorová, Ilse Jahn, Jiří Neustupný, Jurij Pisculin, Avraam Razgon, Klaus Schreiner, Tibor Sekelj, Zbyněk Stránský and Jerzy Świecimski) but three were Czechoslovak (Neustupný from Prague, Stránský from Brno and Gregorová from Bratislava). Schreiner, a native of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) and Avraam Razgon, from the Soviet Union, could also be considered as major figures of museology in the Eastern countries, and their thoughts sometimes differ widely from those of Stránský. It is worth noticing the place occupied by Czechoslovakia on the museum map during this period. If we add to the previously quoted authors the major role played by Jan Jelínek (Director of the Moravian Museum, founder of the Anthropos museum in Brno, President of ICOM from 1971 to 1977, then President of ICOFOM from 1977 to 1981) and the major role played by Vnoš Sofka (active in Brno until 1968, then resident in Stockholm, and President of ICOFOM from 1981 to 1989),<sup>6</sup> it would be appropriate to recognize the unique role played at that time by that country in world museology.

Neustupný was probably the first to develop, at an international level, specific views on museums, in the 1950s, and his book *Museum and research*, published in 1968,<sup>8</sup> inspired the father of French museology and permanent advisor of ICOM, Georges Henri Riviére. Josef Beneš, in Prague, was also a prominent figure in the teaching of museology at that time. But above all, we could not understand the importance of Brno on the museum map without considering the role of Jelínek in its international recognition.

The fact remains that Stránský’s efforts significantly intensified the relations between Brno and museology, especially because of the longevity of his interventions. Neustupný, who was among the founding fathers of ICOFOM, was born in 1905 and belonged to the previous generation, while Jelínek (born in 1926) left ICOFOM very early. There would not be many interventions by Avram Razgon (maybe the most outstanding museologist in the USSR at that time, who died in 1989) in ICOFOM; while Klaus Schreiner (from the GDR) died in 1990. However, Stránský’s position, besides his writing and academic activities in Brno, was hardly weakened during the years following the Velvet Revolution, maybe due to the opening of the Brno International Summer School of Museology (ISSOM) in 1987, which was supported by UNESCO and would host, for the next ten years,<sup>9</sup> young pro-

fessionals of museums from around the world.

The position of Stránský within ICOFOM, in this perspective, is highly significant until the early 2000s. Although he never ran for president, his place within the committee was central, not only of course due to the important number of his articles and contributions, but especially for their considerable influence on other colleagues. This includes the very definition of museology, a major topic discussed by the Committee<sup>10</sup> to which Stránský’s views contributed decisively (the role of Anna Gregorová should also be pointed out, with her definition of museology being given in the first MuWoP). Until then, the most common definition of museology was a “museum science”, originally conceived by Riviére and widely shared within the ICOM. Even the American George Ellis Burcaw, in his *Introduction of Museum Work*, quotes the definition while attributing it to the ICOM:

*“Museology is museum science. It has to do with the study of the history and background of museums, their role in the society, specific systems of research, conservation, education and organization, relationship with the physical environment, and the classification of different kinds of museums. In brief, museology is the branch of knowledge concerned with the study of the purposes and organization of museums. Museography is the body of techniques related to museology. It covers methods and practices in the operation of museums, in all their various aspects.”*<sup>11</sup>

The idea that museology would not refer to the museum but to “a hu-

5 As Nada Guzin remarked, the idea of an “Eastern museology” should be reconsidered, as many differences existed between communist countries at that moment. GUZIN LUKIC, Nada. *La muséologie de l’Est: la construction d’une discipline scientifique et la circulation transnationale des idées en muséologie. ICOFOM Study Series*, 2015, vol. 43a, pp. 111–125.

6 See MENSCH, Peter van. Some impressions concerning Vnoš Sofka (1929–2016): Lawyer, Bricklayer, Administrator, and Museologist. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2016, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 74–76.

7 It is known that museum courses were already being run in Brno in the 1920s, see JAGOŠOVÁ, Lucie and Lenka MRÁZOVÁ. Tradition of museum pedagogy in the Czech Republic and the role of Brno museology on its development. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 7, no. 4/2, pp. 56–64.

8 NEUSTUPNÝ, Jiří. *Museum and Research*. Prague: National Museum, 1968; see RIVIÉRE, Georges Henri. *La muséologie selon Georges Henri Riviére*. Paris: Dunod, 1989, p. 180 sq.

9 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. Ten years of the International Summer School of Museology. In STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. (ed.). *Museology for Tomorrow’s World: proceedings of the international symposium held at Masaryk University, Brno, Oct 9–11, 1996*. Munich: Verlag Müller-Straten, 1997, pp. 143–151.

10 See MAIRESSE, François and André DESVALLÉES. *Muséologie*. In MAIRESSE, François and André DESVALLÉES (eds.). *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Colin, 2011, pp. 343–384.

11 BURCAW, George Ellis. *Introduction to Museum Work*. Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1975, pp. 12–13.

man specific relationship to reality”<sup>12</sup> inspired most of the members of the committee. “*This is a kind of Copernican revolution in which the object of museology is reduced to this specific relationship, and in which the museum would be a particular realization,*”<sup>13</sup> writes Bernard Deloche. Peter van Mensch, with his thesis written in 1992, has probably offered the most comprehensive update on the place of Stránský in museology: the number of quotations given, as well as the position of Stránský concerning most key museological concepts, demonstrates the continued importance of the Brno master within the museological sphere.<sup>14</sup> It is not the purpose of this article to present a detailed study of the museological terms conceived by Stránský. However, it seems necessary to present some key elements if we want to try to evaluate his influence.

### Elements of Zbyněk Stránský’s museological conceptions

The position of Zbyněk Stránský on museology is well known: from a scientific point of view, museology (the term first appeared in the nineteenth century) is not and cannot be considered as a science within the current university system. “*The overall standard that museum theory has reached is not very satisfactory from the metatheoretical viewpoint, i.e. it is not quite up to the present criteria put on scientific theory.*”<sup>15</sup> For him, the core problems faced by museums (e.g. the museum crisis of 1971<sup>16</sup>) could not be solved in the

realm of practice, as they were too complex, but only through museum theory. The Brno scholar would devote most of his career to the identification and promotion of the necessary conditions to establish museology as a science. The necessary conditions for museology to become scientific in nature were described by Stránský as: it must have (1) a specific object of knowledge, (2) a method of its own, (3) a specific scientific language and (4) a theoretical system.<sup>17</sup> This proposition evolved little over the years, even with the major changes that completely modified the political landscape: Stránský maintained almost the same structure (object, methods, language and system) in *Museology, introduction to the study*, published in 1995.<sup>18</sup> The existence of museology as a science therefore seemed possible, provided that we could, on the one hand, meet a number of formal requirements related to its object and its method, and on the other hand, demonstrate them to be strictly useful. Stránský was certainly not the only one to develop these principles, and in fact, one of the major ICOFOM objectives was to establish museology as a discipline within the university framework. For instance, we may stress, in particular, the extremely consistent research conducted by Klaus Schreiner, Peter van Mensch and Ivo Maroević, which would lead to the drafting of comprehensive museological treaties.<sup>19</sup>

The (1) object of knowledge of museology is probably Stránský’s most significant contribution. As Bernard Deloche evokes above, it may indeed be considered as a Copernican reversal: it was not museology that was developed from the museum, but the opposite. Stránský saw the object of museological knowledge as the study of a specific relationship between man and reality, which seems to be a much more stable object of research than the museum itself, as this institution is fairly recent in the history of mankind (no more than three centuries for the modern museum). This means, moreover, that older forms existed before the museum, such as cabinets of curiosities, and that further forms would come into existence in the future: for example, communication science exists and not mobile phone science (or a so-called mobilephonology). Of course, history, sociology or other disciplines can contribute to the knowledge of this specific relationship, but the specificity of the topic should be recognized, as well as early attempts to theorize it, and several can be found in ancient literature dating back to Quiccheberg (the *Inscriptiones vel tituli theatri*, 1565).

The question of language and vocabulary (3) for a long time attracted Stránský’s attention. He collaborated on the *Dictionarium museologicum* project, by coordinating the Czech side,<sup>20</sup> but he was above all acknowledged for his decisive development of concepts such as musealization, musealia or museality.<sup>21</sup> The invention of new concepts (that may define the role of the

12 GREGOROVÁ, Anna. La muséologie, science ou seulement travail pratique du musée? *MuWoP/DoTraM*, 1980, no. 1, pp. 19–21.

13 DELOCHE, Bernard. Pour une muséologie contractuelle. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2015, vol. 43a, p. 84.

14 MENSCH, Peter van. *Towards a Methodology of Museology*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, Faculty of Philosophy, 1992. Doctor’s Thesis.

15 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. La muséologie – science ou seulement travail pratique du musée? *MuWoP/DoTraM*, 1980, no. 1, p. 44.

16 See for instance O’DOHERTY, Brian (ed.). *Museums in Crisis*. New York: Braziller, 1972.

17 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. Museology as a science (a thesis). *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, pp. 33–40.

18 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Muséologie Introduction aux études: destinée aux étudiants de l’Ecole Internationale d’Été de Muséologie – EIEM*. Brno: Université Masaryk, 1995.

19 See MENSCH, Peter van. *Towards a Methodology of Museology*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, Faculty of Philosophy, 1992. Doctor’s Thesis and SCHREINER, Klaus. *Einführung in die Museologie – ein Beitrag zu den theoretischen Grundlagen der Museumsarbeit*, 2 vol. Neubrandenburg: [s. n.], 1982; MAROEVIĆ, Ivo. *Introduction to Museology – the European Approach*. Munich: Verlag Christian Müller-Straten, 1998.

20 ÉRI, István and Végh BÉLA. *Dictionarium museologicum/Dictionnaire de muséologie*. Budapest: Hungarian Esperanto Association, 1986.

21 For more about these two terms, see the *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*, MAIRESSE, François and André DESVALLÉES. *Muséologie*. In MAIRESSE, François and André DESVALLÉES (eds.). *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Colin, 2011, pp. 343–384 and MENSCH, Peter van. *Towards a Methodology of Museology*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, Faculty of Philosophy, 1992. Doctor’s Thesis.

philosopher, as Deleuze proposes<sup>22</sup>) proves not to be a pleasant pastime, but a necessity, in order to work on a more accurate level. This can be revealed in an article Stránský devoted to the concept of heritage:<sup>23</sup> the specific actions related to the museum registration process, i.e. the operations of transmission from one generation to another, require the use of a specific term to differentiate them from commonly used, vague terms. For example, “heritage” is taken from juridical vocabulary and used for family transmissions of material goods, biological characteristics and values. We can accept or refuse a heritage, but our role is not very active. In this context, the term “heritage” does not refer to the real active process initiated by somebody (or society) to integrate the object received into a specific relationship with reality.

The system of museology (4) has also been deepened by Stránský, who sought throughout his career to improve its logic, including the evolution of museum practices in order to be in accordance with the western market-driven economy (Stránský spoke about management and marketing). From the outset, however, this type of museological system was already in place, partially outlined by Neustupný, who distinguished general museology from special museology.<sup>24</sup> The “system of museology” continued by Stránský, was already well established in the 1970s,<sup>25</sup> but it was refined over the years until the latest version of *Museology: Introduction to studies* (1995) which separates

theoretical museology and applied museology; in this work, theoretical museology is seen as comprising the theories of selection, thesaurisation and presentation. Applied museology includes management, marketing, architecture, conservation, information, expography, public relations and promotion.

On the contrary, the question of method (2) was not really addressed by Stránský (however it appears in the bulk of van Mensch’s PhD dissertation, *Towards a Methodology of Museology*, although the Dutch museologist only tried to build the method theoretically). If the specificity of museology’s research object can be considered as established, this discipline (or theoretical field, if not a science) is thus based on methods used by other scientific disciplines such as history or art history (history of the museum and collections), sociology or psychology (public studies and visitor studies) or physics and chemistry (the analysis of objects). As such, collection study, appears to be left totally to reference sciences (anthropology, archeology, and art history, based on collections<sup>26</sup>). The purpose of Stránský’s publications, like most ICOFOM members’ contributions, was driven by a philosophical (in its broad sense) approach, or an epistemological view of museology. Most of Stránský’s best articles could be considered as meta-museology, or a certain discourse on museology, much more than the results of a museological approach.<sup>27</sup> Obviously the development of a specific method may allow for some original results that could be discussed and adopted or abandoned. At the risk of oversimplification, we could say that if major progress had been

made by Stránský and the ICOFOM in general at that time, they did not directly lead to the introduction of methods applicable to the study of museums and collections. On the contrary, during Stránský’s early career (circa 1960s), several new approaches toward visitors were already being considered<sup>28</sup> which produced original and practical results and the constitution of a new field of research (visitor studies). The same could be said for conservation studies and, during the 1980s, the history of museums and collections.

### Stránský in posterity

Even if the master is quoted extensively in Brno, the Czech Republic, or within the ICOFOM, his reputation is far from being global, and his vision of the museum does not dominate today’s world of museums. As an indication, the number of references relating to him on Google scholar or Google books is much smaller than other eminent personalities like Georges Henri Rivi re, Stephen Weil or Susan Pearce.<sup>29</sup> If we find some (rare) Stránský references in general French textbooks,<sup>30</sup> we find no trace of him in the most common

22 DELEUZE, Gilles and Felix GUATTARI. *Qu’est-ce que la philosophie?* Paris: Les  ditions de Minuit, 1991.

23 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. Cultural Heritage: a Big Word, a Vague Term. *PACT*, 1997, pp. 635–638.

24 NEUSTUPNÝ, Jiř. *Museum and Research*. Prague: National Museum, 1968.

25 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Brno: Education in Museology*. Brno: Purkyně University and Moravian Museum, 1974 and STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Museology as a science (a thesis)*. *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, pp. 33–40.

26 DAVALLON, Jean. *Mus e et mus ologie*. Introduction. In *Mus es et recherche, Actes du colloque de Paris, 29 and 30 November and 1 December, 1993*. Dijon: OCIM, 1995, pp. 245–256.

27 Even though we know that Stránský also worked in museums and for museums, for instance collaborating on the design of the Exhibition of the Battle of Austerlitz (Slavkov), near Brno.

28 SCHIELE, Bernard. *Les  tudes de visiteurs. La formation, l’ volution et les d fis actuels du champ*. In DAIGNAULT, Lucie and Bernard SCHIELE. *Les mus es et leurs publics, savoirs et enjeux*. Qu bec: Presses universitaires de Qu bec, 2014, pp. 7–69.

29 When entering the name and surname of the author, associated with “museum”, on Google Scholar (which gathers worldwide academic articles and citations) one obtains the following result: Stránský: 308; Rivi re: 18 000; Weil: 21 200; and Pearce: 21 600. When searching for the name and surname of the author on Google books, one finds the following result: Stránský: 1 060; Rivi re: 111 000; Pearce: 114 000; and Weil: 198 000. Results collected on August 20, 2016. These results must be considered as approximate, as the search engine has its own specificity, and the results are just based on digitalized literature.

30 GOB, Andr  and No mie DROUGUET. *La mus ologie. Histoire, d veloppements, enjeux actuels*. 4th ed. Paris: Armand Colin, 2014; POULOT, Dominique. *Mus e et mus ologie*. Paris: La d couverte, 2005; both of which cite or briefly discuss the author.

Anglo-Saxon textbooks.<sup>31</sup> From the second *MuWoP*, one of the most prominent personalities of American museology at that time, George Ellis Burcaw, conveyed his difficulties in adopting the views expressed by most Eastern colleagues – above all those of Brno and Stránský, whom he quoted extensively – as most American museum workers were not dealing with museology: “*Eastern museology, as exemplified in Brno is founded more on philosophy than on pragmatism. In my opinion, the Western approach is likely to be more productive in the short run, but for efficiency and worth in the long run, the Eastern approach is needed.*”<sup>32</sup> Forty years later, we still seem to live in the short run evoked by Burcaw. In 1997, for the tenth anniversary of the ISSOM, Kenneth Hudson, invited by Stránský, strongly criticized anyone who pretended to develop museology as a scientific discipline:

*“It goes without saying, I should have thought, that one cannot have museologists without a subject called museology or financial advisers without a financial system, and second, that in order to defend their position, the practitioners must be able to justify the subject, at least to themselves. But it is important to realize that the people who decide, for whatever reasons, to be officially known as museologists are essentially the priests and in one or two instances the bishops and cardinals of the cult of museology.”*<sup>33</sup>

31 For example, AMBROSE, Timothy and Crispin PAINE. *Museum Basics*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2012; CARBONELL, Bettina Messias. *Museum Studies. An Anthology of Contexts*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2012; MACDONALD, Sharon (ed.). *A Companion to Museum Studies*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2011; MESSAGE, Kylie and Andrea WITCOMB (vol. eds). *Museum Theory. An Expanded Field*. MACDONALD, Sharon and Helen REES LEAHY (eds.). *The International Handbooks of Museum Studies*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2015, pp. xxxv–lxiii.

32 BURCAW, George Ellis. Comments on *MuWop* no 1. *MuWop/Do Tram*, 1981, no. 2, pp. 85–86.

33 HUDSON, Kenneth. Who are the ‘museologists’ and for whose benefit do they exist? In STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. (ed.). *Museology for Tomorrow’s World: proceedings of the international symposium held at Masaryk University, Brno, Oct 9–11, 1996*. München: Müller-Straten, 1997, p. 105.

There can be no doubt that in Hudson’s eyes, Stránský, if not the pope, held a very high position in the “cult of museology”. If there were other equally strong reactions, most Anglo-Saxons reacted with indifference (above all because most of his writings were not published in English), showing as a result that such museological ideas were far from being internationally widespread. Even in the ICOFOM, with notable exceptions, a kind of general indifference started to spread across the new generations, who were focusing on other topics, and most contributors of the *ICOFOM Study Series* of recent years do not seem to have followed (and quoted) Stránský’s ideas at all. If the debates on the future of museology as science are indeed not really on the agenda<sup>34</sup> anymore and if the influence of “Eastern” museology has largely decreased since the fall of the Berlin Wall, it would be wrong to underestimate the influence of Stránský, at least for some researchers.

It is interesting to note the evolution of Stránský’s references within the ICOFOM itself. One might consider, in this regard, four generational members’ movements. The first generation is related to its founders (1977 to 1985), the second developed in the 1980s (1985 to 1993 until the end of the presidency of van Mensch), its members having strong relations with the master of Brno. The third generation could be considered to run from 1993 to 2007 (up to the presidency of Hildeward Vieregge), and only some of its members got to know Stránský; the fourth would run from 2007 to the present date. Of course, very few members of the first generation of the ICOFOM are still active today, such as André Desvallées and later Peter van Mensch (who arrived in the early 1980s), and continue

34 DELOCHE, Bernard. Pour une muséologie contractuelle. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2015, vol. 43a, p. 84.

to quote Stránský as a reference regarding the foundations of museology. Ivo Maroević, who belonged to the same generation (he supervised van Mensch’s PhD in Zagreb), could also be considered as one of the propagators of Stránský’s ideas, although he himself proved to conceive numerous very original and important ideas on museology.<sup>35</sup> The same is true for many ICOFOM members who arrived in the mid-1980s and can be considered as being part of the second ICOFOM generation: Martin Schaerer (Switzerland, the ICOFOM President from 1993 to 1998), Bernard Deloche (France), Tereza Scheiner (Brazil, President from 1998 to 2001), Nelly Decarolis (Argentina, President from 2007 to 2010) and Norma Rusconi (Argentina). All of these people would largely continue to refer to (and expand on) Stránský’s ideas. It is worth mentioning the joint collaboration of Scheiner and Decarolis within the ICOFOM LAM subcommittee (bringing together museum professionals from Latin American countries) that was created in 1992. Strong supporters of Stránský’s ideas, both Scheiner and Decarolis spread his thinking through this very important Latin American network. The importance attributed by Scheiner to Stránský is worth noting. Thanks to her academic position within one of the very first universities to establish museum studies courses (University of Rio de Janeiro, in 1932), her teaching and writings clearly influenced several generations of Brazilian students, and contributed to the spreading of Stránský’s ideas across the Latin American conti-

35 MAROEVIĆ, Ivo. *Introduction to Museology – the European Approach*. Munich: Verlag Christian Müller-Straten, 1998. Besides these aforementioned members, some other Czechs should be quoted, such as Beneš or Šuleř. One should also remember Mathilde Bellaigue, who was very much dedicated to the Committee until she retired, in 1996. Of course, Suzan Nash, Vinoř Sofka’s wife, still continues to be very active in the Committee too. It is among this first generation that one should count the first presidents of the ICOFOM, Jelínek, Sofka and van Mensch. Desvallées and Maroević were also elected vice-presidents.

ment. Among the students trained by Scheiner were Bruno Brulon Soares (the current Vice President of the ICOFOM), Luciana Menezes de Carvalho and Bernardo Anaildo Baraçal (author of a master's thesis on Stránský).<sup>36</sup> The organization of a symposium in October 2015 at UNIRIO, for the 50th anniversary of Stránský first article on the subject of museology, reflects the importance given to the author by this university.

If some members directly related to the second generation of ICOFOM have been particularly receptive to the ideas of Stránský, we cannot generalize this for all of its members. For instance, exceptions include Lynn Maranda and Hildegard Vieregg (President from 2001 to 2007), who developed different interests more directly related to their fields of specialization (anthropology and museum history respectively). Thus, a double movement could be described, because in the first place there had been the dynamic approach of Vinoš Sofka, the second president (1981 to 1989) and strong leader of the committee for more than a decade, who upturned the listing, analysis and synthesis of the various strains of museum theory throughout the world (the results were published in the *ICOFOM Study Series*). This attempt proved, after some years, to deviate from its initial objective.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, several great personalities like van Mensch or Stránský gradually left the committee, no longer allowing younger generations to learn directly from

36 BARAÇAL, Anaildo Bernardo. *O objeto da museologia: a via conceitual aberta por Zbynek Zbyoslav Stránský*. Dissertação de Mestrado [online]. Rio de Janeiro: Unirio/MAST, 2008 (consultation August 2016) [cit. 2016-08-30]. Available from [www: <http://livros01.livrosgratis.com.br/cp102648.pdf>](http://livros01.livrosgratis.com.br/cp102648.pdf).

37 From the late 1990s, the journal, which was distributed several weeks before the symposium, read by everyone and then discussed by its participants during the symposium, started to be published and delivered just in time for the meeting, which made it difficult for its members to familiarize themselves beforehand with the other participants' way of thinking.

contact with them. With a few exceptions (particularly among Brazilian members), the following ICOFOM generations progressively distanced themselves from Stránský's influence, most of them having never really been confronted with Europe's Berlin Wall and the idea of an "Eastern" museology.

Apart from the ICOFOM's publications, Stránský's writings were mainly distributed through two other channels. Firstly, within the Czech Republic and especially Brno, some efforts were made to continue to disseminate his papers and books, even his very last contributions, such as *Archeologie a muzeologie* (2005),<sup>38</sup> while an inventory of all his publications was undertaken by Jan Dolák, at that point the holder of the UNESCO Chair of museology and world heritage in Brno, which led to the publication of his complete bibliography.<sup>39</sup> If Stránský is sometimes cited in France, as previously mentioned, it is primarily in German-speaking countries that his thought continues to be studied and valued. Katharina Flügel and Friedrich Waidacher, who edited influential textbooks on museology, quote him extensively.<sup>40</sup> Markus Walz, who just published an important reference on museums and museology, is also among the authors of the new generation who still refer to him.<sup>41</sup>

### What does "influence" mean?

As it was earlier pointed out, from a strictly museological point of view, if we stick to the main tenet

38 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Archeologie a muzeologie*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2005.

39 DOLÁK, Jan and Jana VAVŘÍKOVÁ. *Muzeolog Z. Z. Stránský. Život a dílo*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2006.

40 FLÜGEL, Katharina. *Einführung in die Museologie*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005; WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 2nd ed. Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 1996.

41 WALZ, Markus (ed.). *Handbuch Museum. Geschichte – Aufgaben – Perspektiven*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2016.

of Stránský's work – i.e. the recognition of museology as a scientific discipline – one can only note that this model still does not dominate the international scene. Museology (but also museum studies) is certainly very widespread in the academic world and the literature (including the number of academic journals) continues to grow. But in actuality, it is not the idea of a discipline but rather a field of research and practices, as developed in the Anglo-Saxon logic (e.g. Leicester in the UK) that dominates.

The term "influence", however (defined as "slow and continuous action exercised by a person or a thing on another person or thing") is much broader than what is reflected through the academic literature. Stránský's influence can also be analyzed on two other levels: 1) at the specific universities where his teachings on transmission have been a focus of study; and 2) through his research activities: his presence at symposia and national or international conferences. From 1964 onwards, Stránský met hundreds of students, mainly in Brno. Only some of them became museum curators, but most of them benefited from his particular thought and way of teaching. I cannot represent this topic regarding the Czechoslovakian or Czech university system, as I did not benefit from his teachings in this context. My (subjective) testimony focuses instead on his contribution to the ISSOM, which I attended in 1995 (I followed course A). From 1987 ISSOM's annual sessions were given to small groups of less than twenty students. The teaching course was run over a full month and was completed by study tours. The link between UNESCO and ISSOM allowed for a truly international admission process: for example, the 1995 cohort consisted of students, mostly young professionals or PhD students from Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Ivory Coast, the USA, Spain, Latvia,



Mexico, Portugal, Romania, etc. The course itself was not taught by Stránský alone, although he oversaw the most theoretical part of it. Many other Czech and foreign specialists gave lessons, such as (in 1995), Mathilde Bellaigue, Bernard Deloche, Michel van Praët and, of course, Vnoš Sofka. It would be wrong to pretend that all students passionately followed Stránský's lessons and would perfectly remember his teachings and concepts. For many international students, the approach of the master of Brno, based on *ex cathedra* education, greatly contrasted with the more interactive methods used in their basic teachings. Few students seemed familiar with the writings of Stránský, which were hardly accessible outside the circles of the ICOFOM, and some of his speeches sometimes appeared like a kind of shamanistic experience enhanced by secret formulas. Yet most of the people present were convinced that something important was happening. The fact remains that the continued presence of Stránský throughout the course and during trips, always at hand to answer questions, as well as the documents he referred to during the course (in particular the *Introduction to museology*) and the documentation he provided (e.g. *MuWoP* or van Mensch's PhD dissertation, which was barely available at the time) constituted quite a remarkable context for absorbing his specific logic, during a full intensive month, seven days a week, and 24 hours a day with the same museological colleagues.

It is impossible to define the influence that this experience had on all of the ISSOM students; for some, this episode was probably part of a relatively insignificant period of their intellectual maturation. I can, however, at least certify its importance for the development of my own thoughts. Having studied museology in Brussels and Amsterdam (where I met Peter van Mensch),

seduced by the rigorous reasoning of several ICOFOM members (including Deloche, Desvallées and van Mensch), I had already read the name of Stránský and probably some articles written by him, but I had no clear idea of his entire vision of museology. The constant presence of the master of Brno, the opportunity to ask all the questions I wanted, the provision of his museological articles and references – and of course their reading – supplemented by discussion among students (some are still friends I continue to meet) constituted a decisive moment in the structuring of my thoughts on museology, and my willingness to integrate into the ICOFOM and contribute to its work. This kind of testimony is not unique. The ISSOM also played a leading role in the creation of the Baltic Museology School (BMS), created in 2004 and still very active today. The BMS brings together the efforts of the three Baltic countries (Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia) in the development of museology.<sup>42</sup> Led by Jānis Garjāns and assisted by Anita Jirgensone, the Baltic Museology School organizes a conference each summer, over the course of one full week in one of the three Baltic countries, inviting one or two international researchers to share their knowledge. It is worth mentioning that the school management team and key leading figures of the Society of Promotion of Museology in the Baltics (including Agrita Ozola) have participated in several ISSOM sessions, and many guest speakers invited by the BMS were or have been close to the ICOFOM.

If the teaching period is one of the most important moments in terms of academic influence (even though students do not seem to realize it!), it goes without saying that this process continues through-

out the academic career through readings and references (already mentioned in this article) but above all through meetings. This happens of course during communications but principally through informal discussions. Stránský actively participated throughout his career in such meetings, organizing many events in Brno. Within the ICOFOM whose symposium traditionally privileged formal and informal discussions, he had acquired the status of a kind of “guru” in the eyes of some of his main admirers. If most of us remember his contribution to the elaboration of such concepts as musealization, museality, musealia or metamuseology, eventually, the most significant of Stránský qualities might be his insatiable desire to promote museology and favor the recognition it deserves on the scientific scene. All of his work is somehow supported by this passion which was pursued very consistently, throughout his life, even in his last writings featured in *Museologica Brunensia*.

## Conclusion

The notion of influence affects all of us. We did not grow alone but with the help of other people (or in opposition to them). This begins within the family circle and goes on into school or college years, but it also continues throughout our lives through friends, circles of colleagues, and networks to which we belong, as much as through our personal readings. The power of the influence of a scientist develops in two ways: through his writings and through direct or indirect personal contact. It goes without saying that one influences the other: we want to know and have discussions with someone whose writings interest us, and often we want to quote someone we have met and whose influence seems preponderant (or because we appreciate him).

<sup>42</sup> See the internet site of BMS: *Baltic Museology School* [online]. Society of Promotion of Museology in the Baltics, 2016 [cit. 2016-08-30]. Available from www: <<http://www.bms.edu.lv/>>.

It is difficult to know the real influence of somebody, as everything cannot be measured; this of course holds true within the academic community. The conventional “scientific” method for gauging the influence of a scientist is by measuring citations (bibliometrics or scientometrics). In a way, the number of citations of an author determines his reputation and his influence within the scientific community, despite all the difficulties and the risk of error that this exercise supposes.<sup>43</sup> Although no specific studies have been carried out concerning Stránský, the few indexes mentioned in this article (such as Google scholar) suggest that his influence would be relatively limited in a global context. However, such indexes, which will hopefully be countered by a more systematic study in the future, do not really help to clarify the influence that a scholar such as the Brno master could have in his own country or in his or her own field. Whether it is in the territory of the former Czechoslovakia (present Czech and Slovak Republics), as evidenced by the efforts made at Masaryk University, or on the platform of the ICOFOM, it goes without saying that this first impression could be contradicted from a more local point of view, especially when qualitatively based on the testimonies of students, scientists and colleagues who knew him. On the other hand, these depend on subjective appreciation, and not on specific measurements. In a way, these two modes of influence and recognition look like the two ways of conceiving heritage, through its tangible and its intangible sides. Material heritage is the territory of the classical museum (and library or archive) and can be preserved and transmitted easily with the help of some technical tools. On the contrary, intangible heritage, transmitted from

generation to generation and constantly recreated, requires the help of other people, with a process that does not differ from the traditional process of master-disciple transmission. This kind of process appears to be more fragile, even though some transmission processes (especially in spiritual traditions) can last dozens of generations. Similarly, this can be found within the academic system, and in the influence exerted by particularly important masters, who are or have been willing to preserve the knowledge they have received and developed and wish to convey to subsequent generations. Such is not the case for all museum or museological masters, and many of them, however strong their qualities might be, have little thought for the issues of transmission. On the contrary, some scientists, with relatively few written contributions during their career, have instead developed a strong relation with their students and colleagues, orally transmitting their way of being and thinking about the museum.<sup>44</sup>

In this perspective, the contribution of Stránský could also be considered beyond his own writings and the references related to him in the museum literature. Such influence has been felt, particularly within the ICOFOM, for at least two generations, preserving, but also recreating the work of Brno’s most famous museologist. It now depends on the next generations to recognize this heritage, to develop and transmit it (or not) to other generations. As far as museology is considered, museological heritage (an important but vague term, in the words of Stránský) also has its own history, its masters and its destiny.

## REFERENCES:

- AMBROSE, Timothy and Crispin PAINE. *Museum Basics*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2012. ISBN 978-0-415-61933-2.
- Baltic Museology School* [online]. Society of Promotion of Museology in the Baltics, 2016 [cit. 2016-08-30]. Available from www: <<http://www.bms.edu.lv/>>.
- BARAÇAL, Anaildo Bernardo. *O objeto da museologia: a via conceitual aberta por Zbynek Zbyslav Stransky*. Dissertação de Mestrado [online]. Rio de Janeiro: Unirio/MAST, 2008 (consultation August 2016) [cit. 2016-08-30]. Available from www: <<http://livros01.livrosgratis.com.br/cp102648.pdf>>.
- BURCAW, George Ellis. Comments on MuWop no 1. *MuWop/Do Tram*, 1981, no. 2, pp. 85–86.
- BURCAW, George Ellis. *Introduction to Museum Work*. Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1975. ISBN 978-0-910050-13-5.
- CALLON, Michel, Jean-Pierre COURTIAL and Hervé PENAN. *La Scientométrie*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1993. ISBN 978-2-13-045249-2.
- CARBONELL, Bettina Messias. *Museum Studies. An Anthology of Contexts*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2012. ISBN 978-1-4051-7381-0.
- DAVALLON, Jean. Musée et muséologie. Introduction. In *Musées et recherche, Actes du colloque de Paris, 29 and 30 November and 1 December, 1993*. Dijon: OCIM, 1995, pp. 245–256. ISBN 2-11-08-9008-8.
- DELEUZE, Gilles and Felix GUATTARI. *Qu'est-ce que la philosophie?* Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1991. Collection Critique. ISBN 978-2-7073-1386-7.
- DELOCHE, Bernard. Pour une muséologie contractuelle. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2015, vol. 43a, pp. 83–93.
- DOLÁK, Jan and Jana VAVŘÍKOVÁ. *Muzeolog Z. Z. Stránský. Život a dílo*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2006. ISBN 80-210-4139-0.
- ÉRI, István and Végh BÉLA. *Dictionarium museologicum/Dictionnaire de museologie*. Budapest: Hungarian Esperanto Association, 1986. ISBN 978-963-571-174-1.
- FLÜGEL, Katharina. *Einführung in die Museologie*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005. ISBN 978-3-534-73884-7.

<sup>43</sup> CALLON, Michel, Jean-Pierre COURTIAL and Hervé PENAN. *La Scientométrie*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1993.

<sup>44</sup> I have in mind Ignace Vandevivere, see VANDEVIVERE, Ignace. *Conversation avec François Mairesse et Bernard Van den Driessche*. Bruxelles: Tandem, 2008.

- GOB, André and Noémie DROUGUET. *La muséologie. Histoire, développements, enjeux actuels*. 4th ed. Paris: Armand Colin, 2014. ISBN 978-2-200-29118-1.
- GREGOROVÁ, Anna. La muséologie, science ou seulement travail pratique du musée? *Mu WoP/DoTraM*, 1980, no. 1, pp. 19–21.
- GUZIN LUKIC, Nada. La muséologie de l'Est: la construction d'une discipline scientifique et la circulation transnationale des idées en muséologie. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2015, vol. 43a, pp. 111–125.
- HUDSON, Kenneth. Who are the 'museologists' and for whose benefit do they exist? In STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. (ed.). *Museology for Tomorrow's World: proceedings of the international symposium held at Masaryk University, Brno, Oct 9–11, 1996*. München: Müller-Straten, 1997, pp. 102–110. ISBN 978-3-932704-57-4.
- JAGOŠOVÁ, Lucie and Lenka MRÁZOVÁ. Tradition of museum pedagogy in the Czech Republic and the role of Brno museology on its development. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 7, no. 4/2, pp. 56–64. ISSN 1805-4722.
- MACDONALD, Sharon (ed.). *A Companion to Museum Studies*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2011. ISBN 978-1-4051-0839-3.
- MAIRESSE, François and André DESVALLÉES. Muséologie. In MAIRESSE, François and André DESVALLÉES (eds.). *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Colin, 2011, pp. 343–384. ISBN 978-2-200-27037-7.
- MAROEVIĆ, Ivo. *Introduction to Museology – the European Approach*. Munich: Verlag Christian Müller-Straten, 1998. ISBN 978-3-932704-52-9.
- MENSCH, Peter van. Some impressions concerning Vinoš Sofka (1929–2016): Lawyer, Bricklayer, Administrator, and Museologist. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2016, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 74–76. ISSN 1805-4722. DOI: 10.5817/MuB2016-1-9
- MENSCH, Peter van. *Towards a Methodology of Museology*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, Faculty of Philosophy, 1992. Doctor's Thesis.
- MESSAGE, Kylie and Andrea WITCOMB (vol. eds.). *Museum Theory. An Expanded Field*.
- MACDONALD, Sharon and Helen REES LEAHY (eds.). *The International Handbooks of Museum Studies*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2015. ISBN 978-1-118-82905-9.
- NEUSTUPNÝ, Jiří. *Museum and Research*. Prague: National Museum, 1968.
- O'DOHERTY, Brian (ed.). *Museums in Crisis*. New York: Braziller, 1972. ISBN 978-0-8076-0629-2.
- POULOT, Dominique. *Musée et muséologie*. Paris: La découverte, 2005. ISBN 978-2-7071-6340-0.
- RIVIÈRE, Georges Henri. *La muséologie selon Georges Henri Rivière*. Paris: Dunod, 1989, p. 180 sq. ISBN 978-2-04-018706-4.
- SCHIELE, Bernard. Les études de visiteurs. La formation, l'évolution et les défis actuels du champ. In DAIGNAULT, Lucie and Bernard SCHIELE. *Les musées et leurs publics, savoirs et enjeux*. Québec: Presses universitaires de Québec, 2014, pp. 7–69. ISBN 978-2-7605-4148-1.
- SCHREINER, Klaus. *Einführung in die Museologie – ein Beitrag zu den theoretischen Grundlagen der Museumsarbeit*, 2 vol. Neubrandenburg: [s. n.], 1982.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Archeologie a muzeologie*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2005. ISBN 80-210-3861-6.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Brno: Education in Museology*. Brno: Purkyně University and Moravian Museum, 1974.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. Cultural Heritage: a Big Word, a Vague Term. *PACT*, 1997, pp. 635–638.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. La muséologie – science ou seulement travail pratique du musée? *MuWoP/DoTraM*, 1980, no. 1, pp. 42–44.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Muséologie Introduction aux études: destinée aux étudiants de l'Ecole Internationale d'Été de Muséologie – EIEM*. Brno: Université Masaryk, 1995. ISBN 80-210-0705-2.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. Museology as a science (a thesis). *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, pp. 33–40.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. Ten years of the International Summer School of Museology. In STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. (ed.). *Museology for Tomorrow's World: proceedings of the international symposium held at Masaryk University, Brno, Oct 9–11, 1996*. Munich: Verlag Müller-Straten, 1997, pp. 143–151. ISSOM Publications. ISBN 978-3932704574.
- Trešor de la langue française informatisé* [online]. [cit. 2016-08-30]. Available from www: <<http://atilf.atilf.fr>>.
- VANDEVIVERE, Ignace. *Conversation avec François Mairesse et Bernard Van den Driessche*. Bruxelles: Tandem, 2008.
- WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 2nd ed. Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 1996. ISBN 978-3-205-99130-4.
- WALZ, Markus (ed.). *Handbuch Museum. Geschichte – Aufgaben – Perspektiven*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2016. ISBN 978-3-476-02375-9.

### FRANÇOIS MAIRESSE

Université Paris 3 Sorbonne nouvelle, Paris, France  
[francois.mairesse@univ-paris3.fr](mailto:francois.mairesse@univ-paris3.fr)

François Mairesse teaches museology and cultural economics at the Université Paris 3 Sorbonne nouvelle. He also teaches museology at the Ecole du Louvre. After a Master in Management and a Master in Art History at the Université Libre de Bruxelles, he received his PhD in 1998 at the same university. He first worked at the Fonds National de la Recherche scientifique, and then moved to the Cabinet of the Minister President of the French speaking government of Belgium. He was formerly Director of the Musée royal de Mariemont (Morlanwelz) in Belgium. In 2002, he became Director of the Musée royal de Mariemont. He is the author of several articles and books on museology, among them: *La médiation culturelle*, Paris, Armand Colin, 2013 (with Serge Chaumier), *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*, Paris, Armand Colin, 2011 (edited with André Desvallées); *Le musée hybride*, Paris, la Documentation française, 2010; *L'inaliénabilité des collections de musées en question* (ed.), Morlanwelz, Musée royal de Mariemont, 2009, etc.

François Mairesse přednáší muzeologii a kulturní ekonomii na Université Paris 3 Sorbonne nouvelle a muzeologii na Ecole du Louvre. Po absolvování magisterského studia v oboru managementu a dějin umění na Université Libre de Bruxelles získal v roce

1998 na stejné univerzitě i titul Ph.D. Nejdřív pracoval v Národním fondu pro vědecký výzkum a poté přešel do Kabinetu Ministerského předsedy francouzsky mluvící vlády Belgie. V roce 2002 se stal ředitelem Královského muzea v Mariemont (Morlanwelz) v Belgii. Je autorem několika článků a knih o muzeologii, například: *La médiation culturelle*, Paris, Armand Colin, 2013 (spoluautor Serge Chaumier), *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*, Paris, Armand Colin, 2011 (Ed. společně s André Desvallées); *Le musée hybride*, Paris, la Documentation française, 2010; *L'inaliénabilité des collections de musées en question* (Ed.), Morlanwelz, Musée royal de Mariemont, 2009, atd.

## STUDIE/ARTICLES

## ZBYNĚK ZBYSLAV STRÁNSKÝ AND SPANISH MUSEOLOGY

DOI: 10.5817/MuB2016-2-4

FRANCISCA HERNÁNDEZ – J. PEDRO LORENTE

## ABSTRACT/ABSTRAKT

Z. Z. Stránský's commitment to the scientific character of museology as an established discipline should be specially highlighted as his greatest intellectual legacy, in as much as his contributions have influenced many museum thinkers from other countries. Spanish museologists entered in contact with Stránský's ideas through the debates in ICOFOM, his courses in ISSOM and some museological publications. His example as an academic and his own conception of metamuseology or other personal outputs served as a stimulus for the development of museology in Spain.

## Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský a španělská muzeologie

Za největší ideologický odkaz Z. Z. Stránského je možné považovat jeho úsilí o etablování muzeologie jako vědního oboru, stejně tak jako jeho vliv na rozvoj muzeologického myšlení doma i v zahraničí. Španělští muzeologové se měli možnost seznámit se Stránského myšlenkami prostřednictvím diskusí na půdě ICOFOM, vzdělávacích kurzů v rámci ISSOM a některých muzeologických publikací. Jeho zkušenosti jako akademického pracovníka a také jeho vlastní koncepce metamuzeologie či jiné tvůrčí výstupy skýtaly dostatek podnětů pro rozvoj muzeologie ve Španělsku.

## KEYWORDS/KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

Z. Z. Stránský – *museological theory – scientific discipline – Spanish museologists – museology training – museum studies*  
Z. Z. Stránský, *teorie muzeologie, vědní obor, španělská muzeologie, muzeologická příprava, studium muzeologie*

The death of Professor Z. Z. Stránský on 21 January 2016, after a long life devoted to studies, research and teaching, combining his knowledge of history, philosophy, archaeology, music theory and museology, has produced a great void in international academia. He not only was the leading figure of Czech museology during the second half of the twentieth century, but also a fundamental agent in developing the humanistic values of European society.<sup>1</sup> We intend to highlight here some of his influential contributions to the field of museology, to which he devoted much of his time and efforts; more specifically, this paper shows part of his impact, mostly through ICOFOM and ISSOM, in Spanish museologists.

## 1. Stránský and his concept of Museology

The Museology flourishing in Eastern European countries during the difficult years of the Cold War produced concepts that, until then, had not been used, but soon began to be familiar for museum curators all

over the world: museality, musealia, the museal condition, metamuseology, etc. Their universal spread reached momentum when ICOFOM started an international debate on such topics in 1980 discussing in the first issue of *Museological Working Papers* a difficult dilemma: “Museology – science or just practical museum work?” There were answers by museum thinkers from a variety of countries like France, Sweden, Canada, Great Britain, USSR, USA, the German Democratic Republic, Japan, Syria and, most of all, Czechoslovakia, whose Brno School of Museology was well represented with a paper by Z. Z. Stránský,<sup>2</sup> no Spaniard participated. Yet, the Spanish presence in the International Council of Museums was then gaining prominence at that time, since Luis Monreal Tejada was Secretary General of ICOM and actively organising museological meetings in his own city, Barcelona.<sup>3</sup> Thus, it was no coincidence that the 2<sup>nd</sup> issue of *MuWoP* in 1981, devoted to “Interdisciplinarity in museology” included some papers by members of the so-called “Grup Tècnic de Museologia”, just created within the *Associació de Treballadors de Museus de Catalunya*: notably, Domènec Miquel i Serra, a member of the Advisory Service Commission of Catalan Museums and Eulàlia Morral i Romeu, director of the Textile Museum of Ter-

1 DOLÁK, Jan a Jana VAVŘÍKOVÁ. *Muzeolog Z. Z. Stránský: Život a dílo*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2006.

2 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology – science or just practical museum work? *Museological Working Papers (MuWoP)*, 1980, no. 1, pp. 42–44.

3 BELLIDO BLANCO, Antonio. La renovación museológica en España durante los años setenta. *Museo*, 2005, vol. 10, p. 333.

rasa.<sup>4</sup> For these authors, museums were facing a profound crisis from which a renewal movement should begin questioning their definition, which could evolve from merely collecting policies to new interdisciplinary perspectives.

A little later joined these debates Rosario Carrillo de San Segundo, member of the Higher Council for Scientific Research in Madrid. Assuming that museology was a science in formation, she considered necessary to maintain cross-pollination with different branches of knowledge: for her, the interdisciplinary nature of the methodology used in exhibitions was paramount, taking into account the general theory of systems and analysis, theories of communication and decision-making, semiotic analysis, group dynamics, the theory of networks or aspects of ecology and economy. Hence the existence of a wide disparity of criteria and museological approaches: meanwhile, she saw the need to clarify the evolutionary stages hitherto, either from the point of view of museological historiography or concerning epistemology and history in general.<sup>5</sup>

4 MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec and Eulalia MORRAL I ROMEU. From pluridisciplinarity to interdisciplinarity: the experience of the local museums in Catalonia. *Interdisciplinarity in museology. Museological Working Papers (MuWoP)*, 1981, no. 2, pp. 43–45.

5 CARRILLO DE SAN SEGUNDO, Rosario. *Méthodologie Muséologique et Formation Professionnelle. Symposium Methodology of Museology and Professional Training*. Stockholm. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1983, vol. 5, p. 52. A trained painter and art historian with a Museology Diploma from the Louvre School in Paris, Rosario Carrillo founded in 1982 the group DIGMA (Difusión Cultural y Museológica): This group of people devoted to cultural dissemination and museology would be active in Madrid for more than thirty years, arranging weekly reading discussions, organizing lectures and travel visits to museums or cultural institutions. Ms. Carrillo in her forties in the 1980s when she served as elected member of the Board of ICOFOM, where her thinking became marked by the Theory of Systems – probably due to Stránský's influence – according to her own website, where more information can be found about her career and the DIGMA group, which was eventually linked to the staff of the Fábrica Nacional de Moneda y Timbre: *Rosario Carrillo* [online]. 2013 [cit. 2016-10-15]. Available from [www: <http://rosariocarrillo.com/>](http://rosariocarrillo.com/).

These discussions highlighted how different participants tried to re-define the concept of museological knowledge from their personal point of view, and it seems that most would agree with Stránský considering that museology was not yet consolidated as a science, because it did not have a unity of criteria, methods or vocabulary. But, most of all, it lacked universally recognized authorities in the field; thus the influence of Stránský or other authors was still scarce. The Spaniards were already assuming the terminological difference between “museology“, i.e. theoretical thinking, and “museography“ or practical issues. However Stránský was a difficult read for them, not just due to language barriers but also because his theoretical stance, always prone to high epistemological levels. Nevertheless, he would often say that the most important goal was to combine both theoretical knowledge and practical work, serving to modify the reality of the museum and the world around, which certainly opened other doors in the minds of environmentally and socially committed museum people.

## 2. The role of museums regarding issues of ecology and collections

In a society increasingly aware of the need to protect the environment, it is no wonder that museums were called to participate actively to promote ecological concerns, integrate the values of nature and humankind. Accordingly, Stránský urged to conceive exhibitions constructed on an ecological basis, keeping in mind that any activity of the museum must be geared accordingly.<sup>6</sup> That meant that museums have to face a new methodology on how to collect, document and expose the collections. The Spanish

6 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museum-Territory-Society. *Symposium Museum-Territory-Society. New Tendencies/New Practices*. London. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1983, vol. 2, p. 30.

contribution on the subject of ecology and museums was then treated within ICOFOM by Jaume Terradas, professor of ecology at the Faculty of Sciences of the Autonomous University of Barcelona, highlighting the need of scientific studies of the environment.<sup>7</sup> He demanded more ecological and environmental education in order to sensitize individuals and society about environmental issues, following the examples of Anglo-Saxon and French-speaking countries. Like Stránský, he stated that museological methodologies should be focused on direct contact with reality. Later the argument was complemented by three compatriots, Domènec Miquel, Andrea García Sastre and Eulàlia Morral, proclaiming that museum objects were no longer to be considered as mere material items.<sup>8</sup> All natural elements forming the environment in which we live, become tangible and intangible testimonies, regardless of their physical condition. What is required is a subject able to recognize such complex evidences within the museum and to communicate them to the public. During this process three elements should be present: the document read as witness, its elucidation offered by the museum to the public, and the added value that is given through this interpretation. This kind of theoretical elaboration was then further vindicated, in the context of the debate on “Collecting Today for Tomorrow“, by Dolors Forrellad, who lamented that collection-oriented museum professionals had little interest in the study of museology, preferring to dump their efforts in the everyday aspects

7 TERRADAS, J. A. *Écologie, Environnement, Education. Le rôle des musées. Symposium Museum-Territory-Society. New Tendencies/New Practices*. London. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1983, vol. 2, pp. 8–14.

8 MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec, Andrea GARCÍA and Eulalia MORRAL I ROMEU. *Objects de musée: Critères de Selection. Quelques reflexions. Symposium Collecting Today for Tomorrow*. Leiden. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1984, vol. 7, p. 6.

of the museum.<sup>9</sup> In a later paper, discussing the issue of substitute museum-items, she pondered about copies serving as replacements for the originals that have disappeared or are in danger of disappearing, or used in museums to didactically explain the objects and processes that are not obvious. In proper museological accuracy, she stated that copies could enhance the collection but should never be confused with originals and the public must be warned, especially when it comes to little-known works.<sup>10</sup> In that same debate, Domènec Miquel and Eulàlia Morral stated that objects in museums can be viewed from different perspectives, either as material items, or as emotional elements that give us a contextualized information.<sup>11</sup> From the moment we see an object, our glance is influenced by a distance factor, be it chronological or cultural, interposed between visitors and the object, always wrapped by that additional intermediation, which may distort the authentic information it offers. In substitutes, however, this value does not exist because we lack that distance: even if the material used can match exactly the original object, its substitute replaces in the museum the physical presence of the original. But could it replace the documentary value of the original?

9 FORRELLAD I DOMÈNECH, Dolors. Contributions to the symposium. Sub-topic no. 4: Current acquisition policy and its appropriateness for tomorrow needs. Symposium *Collecting Today for Tomorrow*. Leiden. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1984, vol. 4, pp. 122–127; FORRELLAD I DOMÈNECH, Dolors. *Collecter aujourd'hui pour demain. Quelques réflexions*. Symposium *Collecting Today for Tomorrow*. Leiden. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1984, vol. 4, p. 27.

10 FORRELLAD I DOMÈNECH, Dolors. Sub-topic no. 4: Substitutes – The implications for the work of museums. Symposium *Originals and Substitutes in Museums*. Zagreb. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1985, vol. 8, p. 161ff.

11 MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec and Eulàlia MORRAL I ROMEU. Sub-topic no. 3: Substitutes. Typology of substitutes. Symposium *Originals and Museums*. Zagreb. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1985, vol. 3, pp. 127–133.

### 3. Museology, social identity and people's development

Coinciding with the outburst of the “new museology“, the strive of museums for social engagement and development was a recurrent topic in ICOFOM, with different approaches from Spain or from Stránský and his circle. Catalan concerns for cultural identity were somehow inspiring the contribution to the colloquium on “Museology and Identity“ by Domènec Miquel and Eulàlia Morral.<sup>12</sup> They pointed out that the problem of cultural uniformity appears when dominant majorities undermine other idiosyncrasies; but the situation of domination does not always mean assimilation. Acculturation is a lack of internal cohesion of the group and, in fact, the lack of a model with which to identify because it is not possible. It can happen to immigrants who create a new mestizo identity. The crisis and acculturation lead to situations of anxiety. Museums play a crucial role in such endeavours, preserving the testimonies of development, the signs of identity and collective memory, offering the elements that allow us to identify ourselves as members of a particular group model. But they can also be used to destroy certain identities, presenting unrealistic models that leave the individual defenceless in the face of aggressive colonizing cultures. Here comes ethics into play. Museums have always been close to the dominant minorities, those with the real and effective power; but they should be useful in other ways, not just for the ideological controls of the population. Miquel and Morral speak of identity as a dynamic concept, always in evolution and transformation, which implies differences, either in conscious and unconscious

12 MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec and Eulàlia MORRAL I ROMEU. Contributions to the colloquium on Identity. Symposium *Museology and Identity*. Buenos Aires. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1986, vol. 10, pp. 211–218.

aspects, composed of different ingredients that can be diverse as a cultural product.<sup>13</sup> The museum had played a crucial role in Western cultural identity during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as social mechanism of passage and self-affirmation of ourselves, as expansion valves nourishing our need for admiration. Foucault might have agreed with these arguments, based on Marxist theories, yet Stránský ironically dodged this topic in the symposium on “Museology and Museums“, commenting that everyone should discover that the museum is not the centre of the social world. Our relationship with the testimonies of the past is something that can be questioned according to the needs of the changing present. The museum, according to Stránský, is a solution to a problem raised in its dual dimension of space and time, but not necessarily the only or the best answer.<sup>14</sup> He wondered if museology was a consequence of the existence of museums or it already existed before they were created. Are museums the subject of museology or, rather, should they be regarded as a means to promote the rapprochement of museology to reality? But Domènec Miquel and Eulàlia Morral as most members of ICOFOM in the 1980s, placed the museum in the centre of the debate: museology exists because there are museums.<sup>15</sup> For her side, Dolors Forrellad stated then that museums are created in the community in

13 MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec and Eulàlia MORRAL I ROMEU. Comments and views on basic papers presented in ISS no. 10. Symposium *Museology and Identity*. Comments and Views. Buenos Aires. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1986, vol. 11, pp. 41–43.

14 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Breaking down the topic. What are the right questions? Symposium *Museology and Museums*. Helsinki-Espoo. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1987, vol. 12, p. 16.

15 MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec and Eulàlia MORRAL I ROMEU. Contributions au colloque. Symposium *Museology and Museums*. Helsinki-Espoo. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1987, vol. 12, pp. 199–209; MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec and Eulàlia MORRAL I ROMEU. Comments and views on basic papers presented in ISS 12. Symposium *Museology and Museums*. Helsinki-Espoo. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1987, vol. 13, pp. 53–55.

order to fulfil their duties.<sup>16</sup> The interaction museum-society exists thanks to the efforts of broadcasting professionals. They ensure that museums no longer remain a deposit of material evidence, enjoyed only by some sectors of society, to become a source of information and research for everyone. The history of museums had as a starting point some inherited collections, but they often have nothing to do with the present goals extolled today to serve the community. Museology needs to become better known, more precisely defined, but within a framework based on experiences, methods and systems relating to the people. Summarizing general considerations about museums and development, Eulàlia Morral retorted that no one could doubt about the evolution attained.<sup>17</sup> Museums were under pressure to be transformed, a situation that divided authors: some remained protected behind the official definition of museums and closed to other options, while others were adapting to institutional renewal and new realities.

“New museology” bloomed in other continents as well with revolutionary museological returns in Europe. Quoting Stránský, Rosario Carrillo considered the “musealization phenomenon” and its use in and by developing countries.<sup>18</sup> She noted that already in 1982, during the International Seminar on Financing of Culture, a study on “Museums, an investment for development” was presented describing the correlation between the situation of museums

16 FORRELLAD I DOMÈNECH, Dolors. Contributions au colloque. Symposium Museology and Museums. Helsinki-Espoo. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1987, vol. 12, pp. 105–107.

17 MORRAL I ROMEU, Eulalia. Viewpoint 3: The museum and development – inside and outside. Trends observed and forecasted. Symposium Museology and Museums. Helsinki-Espoo. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1987, vol. 13, pp. 133–135.

18 CARRILLO DE SAN SEGUNDO, Rosario. Museology and its use or misuse in the world. Symposium Museology and Developing Countries – Help or Manipulation? Hyderabad-Varanasi-New Delhi. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1988, vol. 14, p. 108.

and the level of development: while industrial countries had a ratio of one museum for 30,500 inhabitants, in Africa the proportion was 1,500,000 h per museum. For her, museology could be applied to the solution of practical problems but this application should respond naturally to the need to use the specificities of its scientific knowledge within the global context. In European countries we are accustomed to seeing the museum as an element of our history. By contrast, in other continents, museums were founded as a cultural imposition, which played a more or less explicit role in colonization processes and thus epitomized the intrusion of a foreign culture, interfering with autochthonous identities. However, as these countries regained their freedom, they did not put an end to museums because they remained a useful instrument for the new ruling minority, in a process of Westernization that seemed irreversible. Eventually, this legacy was challenged by the proposals emerging from the new concepts of heritage emerging in the Third World after the impact of liberation theories, and that point of view framed postmodern thinking even among European museologists. In that context Domènec Miquel also reflected on museology and museum institutions as active agents of change.<sup>19</sup> He pointed that in 1987 van Mensch had proposed a two-way reflection: on the one hand, the analysis of the basic characteristics of the development of museums and, secondly, the fact that, in the face of this development, there are diverse theoretical positions that try to give different answers. Therefore, it was necessary to overcome Western ethnocentrism and stop considering the museum as an institution of a single culture, which

19 MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec. Contributions to the symposium. La Museologie et les Institutions Museales comme Agents Actifs de Changement. Symposium Forecasting – A Museological Tool? Museology and Futurology. Den Haag. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1989, vol. 16, pp. 179–183.

is supposed to be the only valid one, since there are other cultures that have different visions on the museum, which are better suited to their needs. In her contribution to the volume on “Museology’s future. Some heterodox thoughts”, Eulàlia Morral praised heritage as a social connection, leading us from memory to identity; but, on the one hand, she doubted that heritage could be equated to memory because its preservation was to be considered as the outcome of a contingency or a subjective choice.<sup>20</sup> The emphasis was then put in the processes of differentiation, out of aesthetic and folkloric common canons!

#### 4. Fostering museology in university careers and textbooks

As an academic, Stránský wanted museology to be a recognized scientific field of study that could be taught in universities. This ran counter to what many museum workers assumed as “proper professional training”, assuming a certain inertia in “intellectual immaturity”.<sup>21</sup> But the University of Brno had pioneered Museology studies from the 1920s until 1951 and, following that precedent, a Department of Museology was created afterwards at the Moravian Museum in Brno, which then became a bridgehead to found the Museology Department within the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy at the University. A further development of major importance was the organization there, in cooperation with UNESCO, of the International Summer School of Museology (ISSOM), directed by Stránský from 1986 to 1996. People

20 MORRAL I ROMEU, Eulalia. Contribution to the symposium. Muséeologie, future. Quelques réflexions hétérodoxes. Symposium Forecasting – A Museological Tool? Museology and Futurology. Den Haag. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1989, vol. 16, pp. 185–188.

21 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. The Department of Museology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University of Brno and the Questions of Defining a Profile of the Museology Curriculum. Symposium Museums, Space and Power. Athens-Thessaloniki. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1993, vol. 22, pp. 127–131.



from all over the world peregrinated to Brno in order to attend these courses. Thus many museum curators or students from Spain were taught by Stránský there and spread henceforward his museological thinking. These courses had a good reputation and were well publicized in this country.<sup>22</sup>

The new aspiration for formal museology training was gaining support in Spain, and therefore it was no wonder that a Spanish author participated then in the debate devoted in one of the sections of number 22<sup>nd</sup> of ICOFOM Study Series published in 1993, to the theme “From Theory to Practice: Museum Training in Europe“. Well-established courses and masters at the Faculty of Arts of Masaryk University in Brno, the Department of Museums Studies at the University of Leicester, the Reinwardt Academy in Amsterdam, the École Nationale du Patrimoine of Paris, or the University of Basel in Switzerland, were highlighted in monographic articles, and the same honour was given to the Escuela Europea de Patrimonio de Barcelona, in an enthusiastic report signed by its founder, Xavier Ballbé. In fact, that so-called European School of Heritage was a short-lived initiative created by him in 1991 as director of a private cultural foundation receiving support of the European Social Fund and the Municipality of Barcelona. This praiseworthy initiative was based on an integral concept of cultural heritage, taking into account different historical, archaeological, ethnographic and artistic issues, in order to ensure an interdisciplinary training for workers in museums, archives, monuments and natural parks or other interrelated

areas of cultural management.<sup>23</sup> While he offered lip praise to new training programs tailored to the specific needs of such cultural professions in universities, cultural organizations and various public authorities, he only mentioned as comparable examples the most prestigious training programs in other countries, with no reference whatsoever to the studies already offered at that time in several Spanish universities. To set things right, it must be said that back in 1989 three Postgraduate courses of Museology had been respectively established already at the University of the Basque Country, the University of Saragossa and the Complutense University of Madrid. Moreover, since 1992 the Antonio Camuñas Foundation in Madrid was offering a Master in Museology and Technical Expography and in 1995 the Faculty of Fine Arts of Madrid had started the Magister in Museology and Exhibitions. Henceforth, many other flourished in numerous universities of the most important cities in the country, such as Barcelona, Gerona, Granada, Valladolid or Santiago de Compostela, offering sometimes broad museological approaches and in some cases more specific training in museum education, conservation or other specialities.<sup>24</sup>

By the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Spanish universities were at last emulating the precedent set in Brno many decades before, although this parallelism went no further, to the point that we still lack Museology Chairs or Departments. Nonetheless, even though Stránský had published both in English and French a booklet synthesizing his lectures at UNESCO's International Summer

School of Museology,<sup>25</sup> his essays were rarely mentioned in our handbooks of museology or in academic references, with just some rare exceptions. One was a scholarly manual written by Luis Alonso, lecturer at the Complutense University, who made the effort to review the international origins of museology and its foundations as an established discipline before gloating over the triumphant “new museology“, ultimately the main thrust of that textbook.<sup>26</sup> Another example was the doctoral thesis on the history of documentation management in museums, produced in 1999 at the University of Murcia by Maria Teresa Marín Torres, who had been a student of the 1996 Summer School of Museology in Brno, which may explain her references to Stránský, featuring again when that dissertation was published as a book.<sup>27</sup>

The role-model followed in Spain as academic canonical paradigm had always been French, British and North-American universities, whose publications and faculty were eagerly quoted here, while the scientific outputs of Eastern-European museologists or from other international campuses often fell into oblivion. Even the philosophical debates of ICOFOM tended to be disregarded by this developing academe, which might explain our conspicuous absence in that forum all over the golden years of postmodern theories, until the participation in 2002 of Silvia Ventosa Muñoz, curator of the Museum of Decorative Arts Barcelona, followed by those of Francisca Hernandez, lecturer at the Complutense University of Madrid, who decisively incorporated

22 For example, in 1994 the Newsletter of PH, the journal published by the Andalusian Institute for Historical Heritage announced in its number 7, page 20, the eight issue of ISSOM courses in Specialized Museology to be held from the 9<sup>th</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup> of September 1994 at Masaryk University, Žerotínovo Square, Brno, and featuring the name of Stránský as their leading figure.

23 BALLBÉ, Xavier. Cultural Assets and the New Professional: The Experience of the Escola Europea in Barcelona. Symposium Museums, Space and Power. Athens-Thessaloniki. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1993, vol. 22, pp. 125–126.

24 LORENTE, Jesús-Pedro. Los estudios de Museología en las universidades españolas. *Revista de Museología*, 2010, vol. 47, p. 75.

25 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Introduction to the Study of Museology, for the Students of the International Summer School of Museology*. Brno: Masaryk University–ISSOM, 1995.

26 ALONSO FERNÁNDEZ, Luis. *Introducción a la nueva museología*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1999, pp. 33, 48, 49, 55, 72, 163, 165, 166.

27 MARÍN TORRES, María Teresa. *Historia de la documentación museológica: La gestión de la memoria artística*. Gijón: Trea, 2002, p. 301 footnote 13, and p. 373.

semiotics and other theories to the museological debate in her regular papers for ICOFOM.<sup>28</sup> More importantly, she disseminated the museological contributions by Stránský or other Eastern-European in Spanish through a best-selling book widely distributed on both sides of the Atlantic.<sup>29</sup>

A few years later, she was seconded by her colleague from Saragossa University, Jesus-Pedro Lorente, in a similar endeavour to synthesize a historical narrative of museological theories – where, of course, Stránský deserves a high-ranking position. Lorente's participation at the international conference “Museology-Museum Studies in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: issues of studies and teaching“, jointly organized by Saint Petersburg State University and ICOFOM in May 2010, was hence published in Russian,<sup>30</sup> then in an expanded English version,<sup>31</sup> which was the basis of a Spanish handbook on the history of museology.<sup>32</sup> Since then, he and other Spanish museologists have joined other ICOFOM activities that are increasingly appreciated as an international benchmark for the newest theories; but also to reclaim the historical bases of museology, paying homage to pioneers such as Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský and his colleagues from Eastern-European

universities. In fact, the latest trend in this academic field seems to be a broadening of the discipline, which now claims to be called “heritology” in English, “patrimoniologie” in French or “patrimonilogía” in Spanish; but that designation was first coined by Tomislav Šola, and it barks back to the broad term “museality” proposed by Stránský to encompass not just museum items and curatorship but also the museum-like care taken of other cultural treasures out of museum walls. In many ways, we all still keep on building on to Stránský's legacy. Therefore, as a final word, we would like to emphasize our gratitude to his example, dedicating to his memory our sincere tribute, in recognition of his scientific and philosophical works, which showed us the way forward for the future development of museology in Spain and in the rest of the world.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY:

### Monographies

- ALONSO FERNÁNDEZ, Luis. *Introducción a la nueva museología*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1999. ISBN 978-84-206-5748-6.
- DOLÁK, Jan and Jana VAVŘÍKOVÁ. *Muzeolog Z. Z. Stránský: Život a dílo*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2006. ISBN 80-210-4139-0.
- HERNÁNDEZ HERNÁNDEZ, Francisca. *Plantamientos teóricos de la museología*. Gijón: Trea, 2006. ISBN 978-84-9704-225-3.
- LORENTE, Jesús-Pedro. *Manual de historia de la Museología*. Gijón: Trea, 2012. ISBN 978-84-9704-668-8.
- MARÍN TORRES, María Teresa. *Historia de la documentación museológica: La gestión de la memoria artística*. Gijón: Trea, 2002. ISBN 978-84-9704-047-1.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Introduction to the Study of Museology, for the Students of the International Summer School of Museology*. Brno: Masaryk University–ISSOM, 1995.

### Articles in periodicals

- BELLIDO BLANCO, Antonio. La renovación museológica en España durante los años setenta. *Museo*, 2005, vol. 10, pp. 329–345.
- LORENTE, Jesús-Pedro. Los estudios de Museología en las universidades españolas. *Revista de Museología*, 2010, vol. 47, pp. 72–80.
- LORENTE, J. Pedro. Razvitie muzeologii kak universitetskoj distsipliny ot tekhnicheskoi podgotovki k kriticheskoj muzeologii. *Voprosy muzeologii*, 2011, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 45–64.
- LORENTE, J. Pedro. The development of museum studies in universities: from technical training to critical museology. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 2012, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 237–252. DOI: 10.1080/09647775.2012.701995
- MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec and Eulalia MORRAL I ROMEU. From pluridisciplinarity to interdisciplinarity: the experience of the local museums in Catalonia. Interdisciplinarity in museology. *Museological Working Papers (MuWoP)*, 1981, no. 2, pp. 43–45.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology – science or just practical museum work? *Museological Working Papers (MuWoP)*, 1980, no. 1, pp. 42–44.
- Articles in collective volumes**
- BALLBÉ, Xavier. Cultural Assets and the New Professional: The Experience of the Escola Europea in Barcelona. Symposium Museums, Space and Power. Athens-Thessaloniki. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1993, vol. 22, pp. 125–126.
- CARRILLO DE SAN SEGUNDO, Rosario. *Méthodologie Muséologique et Formation Professionnelle*. Symposium Methodology of Museology and Professional Training. Stockholm. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1983, vol. 5, pp. 52–61.
- CARRILLO DE SAN SEGUNDO, Rosario. Museology and its use or misuse in the world. Symposium Museology and Developing Countries – Help or Manipulation? Hyderabad-Varanasi-New Delhi. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1988, vol. 14, pp. 105–113.
- FORRELLAD I DOMÈNECH, Dolors. Contributions to the symposium. Sub-topic no. 4: Current acquisition policy and its appropriateness for tomorrow needs. Symposium Collecting Today for Tomorrow

<sup>28</sup> Starting from HERNÁNDEZ HERNÁNDEZ, Francisca. The museological discourse and critical interpretation of History. *Museology – A field of Knowledge. Museology and History*. Córdoba, Argentina. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2006, vol. 35, pp. 306–312.

<sup>29</sup> HERNÁNDEZ HERNÁNDEZ, Francisca. *Plantamientos teóricos de la museología*. Gijón: Trea, 2006, pp. 72, 75–77, 109, 111, 113, 129, 133, 137, 138, 146, 149, 161, 285–286.

<sup>30</sup> LORENTE, J. Pedro. Razvitie muzeologii kak universitetskoj distsipliny ot tekhnicheskoi podgotovki k kriticheskoj muzeologii. *Voprosy muzeologii* (The Problems of Museology, Journal of the University of St-Petersburg), 2011, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 45–64.

<sup>31</sup> LORENTE, J. Pedro. The development of museum studies in universities: from technical training to critical museology. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 2012, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 237–252.

<sup>32</sup> LORENTE, Jesús-Pedro. *Manual de historia de la Museología*. Gijón: Trea, 2012, pp. 51, 61, 111.

- row. Leiden. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1984, vol. 6, pp. 122–127.
- FORRELLAD I DOMÈNECH, Dolors. Collecter aujourd'hui pour demain. Quelques réflexions. Symposium Collecting Today for Tomorrow. Leiden. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1984, vol. 7, pp. 26–28.
- FORRELLAD I DOMÈNECH, Dolors. Sub-topic no. 4: Substitutes – The implications for the work of museums. Symposium Originals and Substitutes in Museums. Zagreb. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1985, vol. 8, pp. 161–167.
- FORRELLAD I DOMÈNECH, Dolors. Contributions au colloque. Symposium Museology and Museums. Helsinki-Espoo. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1987, vol. 12, pp. 105–107.
- HERNÁNDEZ HERNÁNDEZ, Francisca. The museological discourse and critical interpretation of History. *Museology – A field of Knowledge. Museology and History*. Córdoba, Argentina. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2006, vol. 35 pp. 306–312.
- MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec, Andrea GARCÍA and Eulalia MORRAL I ROMEU. Objects de musée: Critères de Selection. Quelques réflexions. Symposium Collecting Today for Tomorrow. Leiden. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1984, vol. 7, pp. 5–10.
- MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec and Eulalia MORRAL I ROMEU. Sub-topic no. 3: Substitutes. Typology of substitutes. Symposium Originals and Museums. Zagreb. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1985, vol. 8, pp. 127–133.
- MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec and Eulalia MORRAL I ROMEU. Contributions to the colloquium on Identity. Symposium Museology and Identity. Buenos Aires. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1986, vol. 10, pp. 211–218.
- MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec and Eulalia MORRAL I ROMEU. Comments and views on basic papers presented in ISS no. 10. Symposium Museology and Identity. Comments and Views. Buenos Aires. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1986, vol. 11, pp. 41–43.
- MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec and Eulalia MORRAL I ROMEU. Contributions au colloque. Symposium Museology and Museums. Helsinki-Espoo. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1987, vol. 12, pp. 199–209.
- MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec and Eulalia MORRAL I ROMEU. Comments and views on basic papers presented in ISS 12. Symposium Museology and Museums. Helsinki-Espoo. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1987, vol. 13, pp. 53–55.
- MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec. Contributions to the symposium. La Museologie et les Institutions Museales comme Agents Actifs de Changement. Symposium Forecasting – A Museological Tool? Museology and Futurology. Den Haag. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1989, vol. 16, pp. 179–183.
- MORRAL I ROMEU, Eulalia. Viewpoint 3: The museum and development – inside and outside. Trends observed and forecasted. Symposium Museology and Museums. Helsinki-Espoo. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1987, vol. 13, pp. 133–135.
- MORRAL I ROMEU, Eulalia. Contribution to the symposium. *Muséologie, future. Quelques réflexions hétérodoxes*. Symposium Forecasting – A Museological Tool? Museology and Futurology. Den Haag. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1989, vol. 16, pp. 185–188.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museum-Territory-Society. Symposium Museum-Territory-Society. New Tendencies/New Practices. London. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1983, vol. 2, pp. 27–33.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Breaking down the topic. What are the right questions? Symposium Museology and Museums. Helsinki-Espoo. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1987, vol. 12, p. 16.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. The Department of Museology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University of Brno and the Questions of Defining a Profile of the Museology Curriculum. Symposium Museums, Space and Power. Athens-Thessaloniki. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1993, vol. 22, pp. 127–131.
- TERRADAS, J. A. Écologie, Environnement, Education. Le rôle des musées. Symposium Museum-Territory-Society. New Tendencies/New Practices. London. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1983, vol. 2, pp. 8–14.

### Web sites

- Rosario Carrillo [online]. 2013 [cit. 2016-10-15]. Available from www: <<http://rosariocarrillo.com/>>.

### FRANCISCA HERNÁNDEZ

Departamento de Prehistoria, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, España  
[francisc@ghis.ucm.es](mailto:francisc@ghis.ucm.es)

Lecturer of Museology and Cultural Heritage at the Complutense University of Madrid. She has been Academic Director of the Master of Museology taught at that university in 1989–1999. Member of ICOM and ICOFOM, participating assiduously in ICOFOM Study Series, she currently devotes her research to the study of theoretical and practical museology and its interrelationship with the natural and cultural heritage.

Přednáší v oboru Muzeologie a kulturní dědictví na Univerzitě Complutense v Madridu. V letech 1989–1999 působila na univerzitě jako studijní poradkyně pro magisterské studium muzeologie. Je členkou ICOM a ICOFOM, často publikuje v periodiku Studie ICOFOM. V současnosti se její výzkumná činnost zaměřuje na teoretickou a praktickou muzeologii a její vztah k přírodnímu a kulturnímu dědictví.

### J. PEDRO LORENTE

Departamento de Historia del Arte, Universidad de Zaragoza, España  
[jpl@unizar.es](mailto:jpl@unizar.es)

Professor of Art History, Museology and Cultural Heritage at the University of Saragossa, where he is Academic Coordinator of the Master of Museums: Education and Communication and leader of a research team on Art in the Public Sphere. Member of ICOM and ICOFOM, he currently devotes his research to the study of the history of Museology, Art Criticism and Art History.

Profesor v oboru Dějiny umění, muzeologie a kulturní dědictví na Univerzitě v Zaragoze, kde působí jako studijní koordinátor pro magisterské studium Muzejní edukace a komunikace a vedoucí výzkumného týmu zabývajícího se uměním ve veřejné sféře. Je členem ICOM a ICOFOM a jeho výzkumná činnost se v současnosti zaměřuje na historii muzeologie, uměleckou kritiku a dějiny umění.

## STUDIE/ARTICLES

# TOO EARLY, TOO LATE: THE RELEVANCE OF ZBYNĚK Z. STRÁNSKÝ FOR GERMAN MUSEOLOGY

DOI: 10.5817/MuB2016-2-5

MARKUS WALZ

**ABSTRACT/ABSTRAKT:**

Zbyněk Stránský's influence on German museology has three facets: in the GDR, he contributes publications and lectures to an intense process of defining museology as an academic discipline, starting in the late 1970ies. Controversies concern his concept of museality – with the accusation of a non-Marxist and therefore non-scientific position. Western Germany starts a discussion about the discipline in 1988. After the German unification, the interest in museology as an academic field nearly vanished although Stránský publishes several German texts with new intellectual accents in the periodical *Museum aktuell*. Friedrich Waidacher's free variations of Stránský's theoretical models receive much more reception. Therefore it doesn't surprise that most of the teaching staff of museum related study programmes in Germany declare little knowledge or interest concerning Stránský and his thoughts. A search of Stránský's neologism museality by library catalogues, Google and Google Scholar (in German) presents a similar result: a "correct" use of the term by the museological inner circle, rare cases of indifferent use, and some new trials to create this term with another meaning.

**Příliš brzy, příliš pozdě: význam Zbyňka Z. Stránského pro německou muzeologii**

Vliv Zbyňka Stránského na německou muzeologii má tři aspekty:

v NDR přispěl svými publikacemi a přednáškami k intenzivnímu procesu formování muzeologie jako vědního oboru, který započal koncem 70. let 20. století. Jeho koncept muzeality však narazil na odpor – bylo mu vyčítáno, že není marxistický a tudíž není vědecký. V západním Německu se začalo o muzeologii jako vědě diskutovat v roce 1988. Po sjednocení Německa zájem o muzeologii jako akademickou disciplínu značně ochabl, ačkoli Stránský publikoval v periodiku *Museum aktuell* několik textů v německém jazyce, které obsahují nové intelektuální podněty. Mnohem více pozornosti vzbudil Friedrich Waidacher se svými volnými variacemi na Stránského teoretické modely. Proto není nijak překvapivé, že většina pedagogů, kteří v Německu působí v studijních programech zaměřených na muzeologii, ví o Stránském jen málo a nejeví o jeho myšlenky dostatečný zájem. Při hledání Stránského neologismu *muzealita* v katalogích knihoven, či na serverech Google a Google Scholar (v němčině) narazíme na podobný výsledek: „správné“ používání termínu v muzeologických odborných kruzích, vzácné případy indiferentního použití a několik nových pokusů o použití tohoto pojmu v odlišném významu.

**KEYWORDS/KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA:**

*museology – GDR – Germany – museality – cultural memory  
muzeologie – NDR – Německo – muzealita – kulturní paměť*

**Stránský and the “museological season” in the GDR**

The late 1970ies and the 1980ies are a period of vivid interest in museological theory in the GDR: a new scientific periodical, *Museologische Forschung*, starts in 1982, the Berlin University accepts the *Introduction to Museology*<sup>1</sup> by Klaus Schreiner, director of the museum of agricultural history at Alt-Schwerin, as dissertation. The GDR's most important natural history museum – a part of the Berlin University – establishes Ilse Jahn as docent of natural history museology in 1980. Museological thoughts out of other states in the Eastern bloc are of high interest. In 1981, the “Institut für Museumswesen” pragmatically offers a typewritten translation of Stránský's *Úvod do studia muzeologie* (1979). Stránský contributes two texts in German to the journal *Neue Museumskunde*, dealing with the educational relevance of museum exhibitions<sup>2</sup> and the development of museological terminology.<sup>3</sup>

This “museological season” is based on a bottom-up campaign for museology as a new research field and study programme; this will not be

1 SCHREINER, Klaus. *Einführung in die Museologie – ein Beitrag zu den theoretischen Grundlagen der Museumsarbeit*. Neubrandenburg, 1982 [published as typescript].

2 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Die Bildungs- und Erziehungsziele der Museumsausstellung als pädagogisch-museologisches Anliegen. *Neue Museumskunde*, 1982, vol. 25, pp. 45–51.

3 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologische Terminologie. *Neue Museumskunde*, 1988, vol. 31, pp. 12–17.

successful in a centralistic dictatorship without a solid (and ideologically proofed) scientific reason. Therefore, the GDR – contrasting to the Federal Republic – knows discussions about the research interest, methodology, terminology, and structure of the discipline.

Several phenomena are proposed as the object of museological research interest – quite similar to the international discourse. Schreiner refuses Stránský's museality (as a special documentary value of the asset) like any additional value to the scientific evidence of the object. He criticizes museality (as a human relationship to the environment) because of its *"questionable closeness to bourgeois values"* by using anthropological arguments and neglecting the Marxist dialectic materialism.<sup>4</sup> Five years later, he writes a serious parody on Stránský: the specific documentary value of assets can't be the object of museological research interest – parallel to Stránský's reflections – because these values were not existing within the material but only by evaluation; using the Marxist point of view, these evaluations – Stránský's younger definition of museality – can't be permanent but have to change with the linear development of society. For Schreiner, the contrary position disguises bourgeois-imperialistic class interests<sup>5</sup> – a precise shot against Stránský's opinion that the cultural values of museality are transtemporary and transpersonal<sup>6</sup> although Stránský accepts that the criteria and hierarchies of values are temporary and therefore changeable phenomena.<sup>7</sup>

4 SCHREINER, *Einführung in die Museologie* (see reference 1), vol. 2, pp. 11–12.

5 SCHREINER, Klaus. Forschungsgegenstand der Museologie und Disziplingenese. *Neue Museumskunde*, 1987, vol. 30, p. 7.

6 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museumsgegenstand – eine Welt sui generis. *Metaphysik des Museumsgegenstandes. Neues Museum. Die österreichische Museumszeitschrift*, 1993, iss. 3/4, p. 55.

7 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Metamuseologie. *Museum aktuell*, 2003, iss. 92, p. 3977.

Schreiner notes that Stránský's ideas have 'infected' many museologists in the GDR, but mentions as well that he didn't get the approval of the "Institut für Museumswesen" for publishing ideological comments against Stránský.<sup>8</sup> Schreiner's definition of museality as the *"suitability of an asset for the museum collection"*<sup>9</sup> avoids any relation to Stránský. Stránský himself remembers an antagonism of "Stránskýsts" and "Anti-Stránskýsts" in the GDR culminating in Schreiner's letter campaign *"plus and minus of some of Stránský's museological opinions"* criticizing a non-Marxist and therefore non-scientific position. Stránský himself interpreted this critic as a comment on his – within publications never declared – intellectual connection to the West German philosophers Martin Heidegger and Karl Popper.<sup>10</sup>

Like final point, a handbook of the museology of history is published in 1988, a cooperation of the Soviet Union and the GDR. This book defines: *"Museology is a social science which researches the processes and laws of the conservation of social information and of the communication of knowledge and emotions by museum assets."*<sup>11</sup> And, closer to Stránský: *"Museology researches that specific relation of the human being and her/his environment which causes that museum meaning and a museum value is attributed to certain assets."*<sup>12</sup>

8 HANSLOK, Andreas. *Museologie und Archivwissenschaft in der DDR. Abgrenzung und Annäherung zweier Nachbarwissenschaften*. Marburg: Tectum, 2008, p. 113.

9 SCHREINER, Klaus. *Museologische Termini – Auswahl*. Neubrandenburg, 1982 [published as typescript], p. 51.

10 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Ist Museologie eine kommunistische Wissenschaft? Eine Entgegnung auf deutsche Einstellungen. *Museum aktuell*, 2001, iss. 68, p. 2759.

11 RAZGON, Avram M. Museologie als wissenschaftliche Disziplin. In HERBST, Wolfgang and Konstantin G. LEVYKIN (eds.). *Museologie. Theoretische Grundlagen und Methodik der Arbeit in Geschichtsmuseen*. Berlin (East): Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1988, p. 19 [translation M. W.].

12 Ibidem, p. 27 [translation M. W.].

The discourse concerning the internal structure of museology ventilated some terms which are well known from the international level – and of course from the Brno ISSOM – like theoretical and applied museology or the history of museums and museology. The curriculum of the first realized study programme, natural history museology, showed a solitary solution with the division in general museology (the museology of natural history museums!) and special museologies, from anthropology to zoology.<sup>13</sup>

### From the "old" Federal Republic to Unified Germany

A Bavarian discussion about museological study programmes starts in 1978. Ten years later, this – still unsuccessful – idea motivates the topic "museology – new ways, new aims" for a joint conference of ICOM Austria, ICOM Germany (Federal Republic), and ICOM Switzerland. The Bavarian reflections are presented, and Stránský gives a lecture on museology as a separate discipline.<sup>14</sup>

After the German unification, the former GDR college for museologists is transformed to a study programme of the Leipzig University of Applied Sciences. This institution starts a series of museological conferences. Stránský speaks on museology as a separate discipline again. Retrospectively, it can be recognized that Stránský gets his only German intellectual echo – except of the ideological controversy with Schreiner – at Leipzig: the professor of museum pedagogic at this uni-

13 JAHN, Ilse. Zum Gegenstand der Museologie und seine Umsetzung in Erfahrungen mit Lehrprogrammen „Museologie“ im Museum für Naturkunde Berlin. *Museologische Forschung. Beiträge und Informationen*, 1982, iss. 2, pp. 32, 36.

14 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Die theoretischen Grundlagen der Museologie als Wissenschaft. In AUER, Hermann (ed.). *Museologie. Neue Wege – Neue Ziele. Bericht über ein internationales Symposium, veranstaltet von den ICOM-Nationalkomitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Österreichs und der Schweiz 11.–14. Mai 1988 am Bodensee*. München: K.G. Sauer, 1989, pp. 38–47.

versity discusses the relation of museum education and museology; he recurs to Stránský's graphic model of the intersections of museology and other disciplines and depicts an analogous multi-dimensional model.<sup>15</sup>

In the beginning millennium, Stránský tries to open new museological horizons by publishing some essays in German. He touches evidences of the sub-atomic physic and Pierre Noras's concept of "lieux de mémoire".<sup>16</sup> Indirectly, he mentions contact points between museality and the influential theory of the cultural memory, introduced since 1992 by the German scientists Jan and Aleida Assmann – with his obvious preference compared to any discourse on cultural heritage.<sup>17</sup> The German museological discourse runs just the opposite way without any reaction to Stránský.

The Austrian Friedrich Waidacher, 1977–94 director of the *Landesmuseum Joanneum* at Graz, has the greatest importance for the dissemination of Stránský's ideas in German language by writing a voluminous *Handbook of General Museology* (1993). This publication got a second, revised, and a third edition (1996, 1999) and four translations (1999 Slovakian, 2005 Chinese and Ukrainian, 2007 Lithuanian) – certainly the best known museological publication in German language.

The relation between Stránský's ideas and Waidacher's handbook seems quite fragile, although Waidacher indicates that the structure of his

book basically follows Stránský.<sup>18</sup> It is typical for Waidacher's writing strategy to quote precisely that Stránský created the term museality, but to continue with his own definition; any discussion or genealogy of this definition is missing.<sup>19</sup> Clearly, Stránský's anonymous critic concerning academic authors who avoid correct references to originators<sup>20</sup> aims to Waidacher.

Waidacher's museology has four sub-disciplines: meta-museology, historical, theoretical, and applied museology. Special museologies – as well as an aspect in Stránský's thoughts – are refused with a single sentence.<sup>21</sup> Consequently, the book irritates with its title "general museology" but no mentioned contrary. Stránský criticises on the one hand that the model is not new but nearly identical with the structure of his own Brno study programme since the 1980ies; on the other hand, he refuses the integration of epistemological aspects in the system of the science itself (meta-museology).<sup>22</sup> Ten years after Waidacher's handbook, Stránský presented his revised structure of museology in German language: now with four sections because of the additional "abstract" or "structural museology" as a synchronous analytical equivalent to the diachronous historical museology ("genetic museology").<sup>23</sup>

Realizations of both imaginations are missing in Germany till today except of some parallels within study programmes of applied museology. A discussion about disciplinary structures does also

not happen. Symptomatically, an introduction to museology explains that Stránský developed the three sub-disciplines, it mentions the term "genetic" instead of "historical" but nothing about the "abstract museology"; the illustration follows Waidacher while the text does not at all explain his fourth sub-discipline, meta-museology.<sup>24</sup>

### The reception of Stránský's ideas in Germany today

For gaining an impression of Stránský's recent academic relevance in Germany, I held an e-mail survey in April/May of 2016 addressed to the teaching staff of university study programmes. Although museums might be a topic of a wide range of disciplines – from art history to zoology – a narrow sample was preferred in order to avoid either a majority of missing answers or a lot of not interpretable negative answers. Therefore, the survey was limited to the nine German programmes concerning museum work or cultural heritage: "Art and Culture Mediation" (Bremen), "Historical and Cultural Anthropology" (Tübingen), "Jewish Museology" (Heidelberg), "Museography" (Berlin), "Museology" (Leipzig), "Museology" (Würzburg), "Museum and Exhibition" (Oldenburg), "European Cultural Heritage" (Frankfurt/Oder), and "Cultural Heritage" (Paderborn). "Art History and Museology" (Heidelberg) was excluded because the museological part is completely imported by the École du Louvre, Paris; Tübingen was included in view of the denomination "cultural anthropology, museum science" of one professorship.

My simple e-mail questionnaire was reduced to three open questions: first the relevance of Stránský's ideas and theories for the recent individual academic work, second refer-

15 VOGT, Arnold. *Museologie und Museumspädagogik. Ihre Rahmenbedingungen und Perspektiven in Wissenschaft und Praxis.* In FLÜGEL, Katharina and Arnold VOGT (eds.). *Museologie als Wissenschaft und Beruf in der modernen Welt.* Weimar: Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaften, 1995, pp. 60–61, 65.

16 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Cyberraum und Museumskultur.* *Museum aktuell*, 2007, iss. 133, pp. 20–24.

17 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Metamuseologie.* *Museum aktuell*, 2003, iss. 92, pp. 3975–3976.

18 WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie.* 2nd, revised edition. Wien: Böhlau, 1996, p. 140.

19 Ibidem, pp. 33–34.

20 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Noch eine „knapp gefaßte Museologie“.* *Museum aktuell*, 2006, iss. 131, p. 6.

21 Ibidem, p. 44.

22 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Metamuseologie.* *Museum aktuell*, 2003, iss. 93, p. 4028.

23 Ibidem, pp. 4029, 4153.

24 FLÜGEL, Katharina. *Einführung in die Museologie.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005, pp. 17–18.

ences to Stránský's ideas within the individual lectures, and third the preferred authors if other thoughts are estimated as more inspiring. The invitation to free-text answers seemed to be sufficient for gaining a first impression and as well individual verbalizations. This very basic way instead of standardized answering proposals was chosen by supposing that an elaborated online questionnaire might deter more from answering than three, directly visible questions.

I got 19 replies to 36 sent e-mails (53 %), two oral answers included. Eight of the nine universities are represented; eight answers (42 %) have their origin in the same institution. Most of the replies don't follow the three questions and answer in a shorter way.

The answers can be categorized into four positions. The majority (10 of 19) signalizes little knowledge or interest. One answer was given orally in another situation: During an academic round table discussion, a Dutch colleague asked for the museological position of this institute and – I think – he got the answer to my questions (“we do not at all deal with topics like Stránský”). The second group (4 of 19) signalizes knowledge (“I know Stránský's relevance for the scientific museology”) but as well Stránský's irrelevance for their individual research and lectures (“I refer to other thoughts and don't remark any fruitful use of Stránský's ideas for my subject”). One person answers that individual relevance is missing but that another colleague – who didn't answer – refers to Stránský as part of the history of the discipline. The third group (4 of 19) gives some details. Two persons historize Stránský (“mentioned as one of the founders of museology”), two persons report an indirect reference (“more often, we use Waidacher who follows Stránský intensely”). A single answer touches the topic

closely by stressing the relevance of fundamental definitions, interdisciplinary sight, and philosophical foundation; further on, individual effects are mentioned (“Stránský inspires me with his theories of the authenticity of musealia and with his idea of the irreplaceable musealia”).

Only three answers touch the question concerning alternative literature. All of them name Waidacher; other mentioned authors are Gottfried Korff, Krzysztof Pomian, and Anke te Heesen. One person additionally sent the actual literature list of the introductory module. Explanations of these preferences or comparisons to Stránský's work are missing.

#### **The actual use of the term museality in German language**

A second impression of Stránský's contemporary relevance can be received by a search of his neologism museality (in its German expression “Musealität”) with the meta-catalogue of German libraries (including the German National Library), Google, and Google Scholar. The results belong to three categories: a museological or an indifferent use of the term, and new trials to create this term.

The museologically informed use of the term is limited to authors who are part of the museological discourse like the Swiss Schärer or the Austrian Waidacher, expanded by one academic librarian. All of them certainly know some of Stránský's texts. A broader appearance of the term in its museological meaning is missing.

The indifferent position is clearly shown by some texts with the title word “Musealität” but without any explanation in the body text – for example, the art historian and museum director Kraus gives “Musealität” an unclear meaning between

the use as museum exhibit and the status of a musealium;<sup>25</sup> for Jeggle, professor for European Ethnology, museality means professional museum work.<sup>26</sup> Some examination theses (concerning different topics) integrate one or another museological publication into their footnotes but don't correctly connect these texts with their understanding of museality: Weber quotes Waidacher and Flügel and uses one time the term – without definition – to announce her chapter about the historical development of a museum type;<sup>27</sup> Kühl quotes a definition of museology by Waidacher and continues that it is easy to identify museality in exhibitions because the exhibition context helps the visitors to reconstruct a past relation of man to reality;<sup>28</sup> Huber explains museality as the presentation of authentic assets within a museum exhibition.<sup>29</sup> In September 2016, the “Klassik Foundation Weimar” organizes a conference dealing with collections and exhibitions concerning the literary subject Faust; the title is “Faust collections: genealogies, media, museality”.

Some people without any contact to museology feel themselves free to create the neologism again. Nell (the only German language monograph with the title word “Musealität”) defines that the process of musealization leads to the state mu-

25 KRAUS, Stefan. *Künstlerbücher: Über die Musealität eines zeitgenössischen Mediums. Das Münster. Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst und Kunstwissenschaft*, 2011, vol. 64, pp. 354–365.

26 JEGGLE, Utz. *Subjektive Heimat – objektive Musealität. Zum Verhältnis von subjektiver Erlebnisfähigkeit und objektiven Ereignissen*. In EBELING, Susanne (ed.). *Literarische Ausstellungen von 1949 bis 1985. Diskussion, Dokumentation, Bibliographie*. München: Walter De Gruyter, 1991, pp. 77–93.

27 WEBER, Lena. *Klostermuseen im deutschsprachigen Raum*. Bonn, University, 2013, p. 20. Dissertation.

28 KÜHL, Alicia. *Modenschauen. Die Behauptung des Neuen in der Mode*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2015, p. 77.

29 HUBER, Leonhard. *Wunderkammer Cyberspace? Gestaltung und Rolle digitaler Museumsinformationssysteme*. Eisenstadt, Fachhochschule, 2002, p. 1. Diplomarbeit.

seality.<sup>30</sup> The working group “aesthetic of religion” of the German association of comparative religion studies (DVRW) organizes its third conference May 2009 in Munich: “*the development of basic terms of the aesthetic of religion by the example museality*”. The published lectures<sup>31</sup> show an understanding of the term similar to Nell (without a reference).

Obviously, museality is neither a very common nor a clearly defined German term. One reason for this situation can be found in the genesis of the term and the actual museological discourse. Stránský introduces museality while reflecting the documentary value of authentic assets. All of Stránský’s German texts concerning museality were published in the 1980ies or later and present the younger definition as a specific relation of man to reality expressed by selecting and conserving objects which represent certain cultural values. It might be a problem of translations that the musealia are sometimes representations or representatives,<sup>32</sup> sometimes the carrier of museality.<sup>33</sup> What an object is carrying belongs to it and no more to the selecting person – the older definition of museality seems to be mixed into the younger one. A similar misunderstanding can be found in the phrase that museology identifies things as “*representants of the memory value,*

*of museality*”<sup>34</sup> or that the musealia as carriers of museality “*acquire the cultural value of memory*”.<sup>35</sup>

This shift of meaning is less noticed. Even the newest museological encyclopedia recurs to Stránský but defines museality only with the cultural value of musealia.<sup>36</sup> Some German-language authors follow this way like the Swiss Roger Fayet<sup>37</sup> or use museality without definition in the phrase “*objects as carrier of museality*”<sup>38</sup> like the Austrian Marlies Raffler.

The best known definition of museality in German language is written by Waidacher and follows Stránský’s younger position: “*a specific recognizing and valuating relationship of the human being to reality. [...] It means that the human being estimates selected objects as evidences of certain phenomena in that way that he/she wants to conserve them without limitation and to communicate them to society.*”<sup>39</sup> The glossary of Waidacher’s last book presents a similar definition but the body text speaks of musealia which can “carry” or “express” museality; as well it is mentioned that an object gains museality by detailed research and documentation.<sup>40</sup>

In the same way, the Swiss Martin Schärer first quotes Waidacher’s definition of museality, but further on, he writes about the “museality of things”, museality as a quality of musealia by referring to a specific relation between man and reality, and about pieces of modern art which have got museality just at their origin.<sup>41</sup> In another argumentation (without references), he uses museality as the term for a quality which is won by an asset on the occasion of its musealization.<sup>42</sup> The academic librarian Thomas Fuchs first quotes Waidacher’s anthropological constant museality, but in the following sentence, he writes about museality in the meaning of a specific quality of musealia as a vehicle of remembrance.<sup>43</sup>

## Conclusion

Within 40 years, Stránský contributed to museological theory and epistemology. He repeated his central points and developed them by repeating. On the other hand, he had an open mind for new ideas and published those as well. He crossed the border of understanding the Czech language by publishing as well in German. But the remarkable fruits are quite poor even as his arguments are welcome like in the GDR.

Stránský originated several aspects and terms, but a broader reception in German language begins with Waidacher’s handbook – in Stránský’s eyes, an illegitimate daughter version. Stránský’s later proposals

30 NELLE, Anja. *Musealität im städtischen Kontext. Untersuchung von Musealitätszuständen und Musealisierungprozessen am Beispiel dreier spanisch-kolonialer Welterbeortschaften*. Cottbus, Technical University, 2007, p. 11. Dissertation.

31 *Journal of Religion in Europe*, 2011, vol. 4, iss. 1.

32 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Museumsgegenstand – eine Welt sui generis. Metaphysik des Museumsgegenstandes. Neues Museum. Die österreichische Museumszeitschrift*, 1993, iss. 3/4, p. 54.

33 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Hat die Museologie einen Sinn?* In SCHIMPF, Volker and Wieland FÜHR (eds.). *Historia in Museo. Festschrift für Frank-Dietrich Jacob zum 60. Geburtstag*. Langenweißbach: Beier & Beran, 2004, p. 475.

34 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Museumsgegenstand – eine Welt sui generis. Metaphysik des Museumsgegenstandes. Neues Museum. Die österreichische Museumszeitschrift*, 1993, iss. 3/4, pp. 53–54.

35 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Metamuseologie. Museum aktuell*, 2003, iss. 92, p. 3977.

36 DESVALLÉES, André and François MAIRESSE (eds.). *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Colin, 2011, p. 625.

37 FAYET, Roger. *Das Vokabular für Dinge. Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften*, 2007, vol. 18, p. 7.

38 RAFFLER, Marlies. *Museum – Spiegel der Nation? Zugänge zur Historischen Museologie am Beispiel der Genese von Landes- und Nationalmuseen in der Habsburgermonarchie*. Wien: Böhlau, 2007, p. 63.

39 WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 2nd, revised edition. Wien: Böhlau, 1996, p. 34 [translation: M. W.].

40 WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Museologie – knapp gefasst*. Wien/Köln/Weimar: Böhlau, 2005, pp. 28, 59, 320.

41 SCHÄRER, Martin R. *Die Ausstellung. Theorie und Exempel*. München: Müller-Straten, 2003, pp. 47, 51, 61, 64.

42 SCHÄRER, Martin R. *Hat das Kunstwerk einen besonderen Status? Oder: Sind alle Objekte museologisch gleich?* [online]. [cit. 2016-08-25] Available from www: <<http://edoc.hu-berlin.de/kunsttexte/2009-3/schaerer-martin-r.7/PDF/schaerer.pdf>>.

43 FUCHS, Thomas. *Bibliotheken zwischen kultureller Memoria, Wissenschaft und Musealität*. In FUCHS, Thomas (ed.). *Das Buch in Antike, Mittelalter und Neuzeit. Sonderbestände der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012, p. 5.



were published without an echo: German museum professionals seem to be content with a voluminous but ageing handbook.

Stránský hoped for intellectual collaboration but got quotations of different quality. He criticized the introductions of Flügel and Waidacher for writing individual opinions instead of searching evidence. He noted that these university docents didn't show enough professional museological penetration of the topic – for instance in Flügel's manner to present a voluminous bibliography which predominantly consists of authors who share her own opinion.<sup>44</sup>

Looking back, Stránský declares to be satisfied that the functionality of his neologism museality is proofed by its use<sup>45</sup> – in what manner ever. Regarding the developments on this low level, Stránský could repeat his critical note of 1988 in 2016 without actualizing it: “We can't carry on contenting ourselves with a simply intuitive understanding of some terms, using them without connection to the terminological system [...]. Some theoretical publications show ignorance about existing literature, the domestic as well as the foreign one. Further on, authors often aren't capable of arguing on the necessary theoretical level. On this way, we'll hardly acquire objective terms [...].”<sup>46</sup>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY:

DESVALLEES, André and François MAIRESSE (eds.). *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Colin, 2011. ISBN 978-2-200-27037-7.

<sup>44</sup> STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Noch eine „knapp gefaßte Museologie“. *Museum aktuell*, 2006, iss. 131, p. 6.

<sup>45</sup> STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museumsgegenstand – eine Welt sui generis. Metaphysik des Museumsgegenstandes. *Neues Museum. Die österreichische Museumszeitschrift*, 1993, iss. 3/4, p. 53.

<sup>46</sup> STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologische Terminologie. *Neue Museumskunde*, 1988, vol. 31, p. 15 [translation: M. W.].

FAYET, Roger. Das Vokabular der Dinge. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften*, 2007, vol. 18, pp. 7–31.

FLÜGEL, Katharina. *Einführung in die Museologie*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005. ISBN 978-3-534-09232-1.

FUCHS, Thomas. Bibliotheken zwischen kultureller Memoria, Wissenschaft und Musealität. In FUCHS, Thomas (ed.). *Das Buch in Antike, Mittelalter und Neuzeit. Sonderbestände der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012, pp. 1–35. ISBN 978-3-447-06689-1.

HANSLOK, Andreas. *Museologie und Archivwissenschaft in der DDR. Abgrenzung und Annäherung zweier Nachbarwissenschaften*. Marburg: Tectum, 2008. ISBN 978-3-8288-9581-2.

HUBER, Leonhard. *Wunderkammer Cyberspace? Gestaltung und Rolle digitaler Museumsinformationssysteme*. Eisenstadt, Fachhochschule, 2002. Diplomarbeit.

JAHN, Ilse. Zum Gegenstand der Museologie und seine Umsetzung in Erfahrungen mit Lehrprogrammen „Museologie“ im Museum für Naturkunde Berlin. *Museologische Forschung. Beiträge und Informationen*, 1982, iss. 2, pp. 21–36.

JEGGLE, Utz. Subjektive Heimat – objektive Musealität. Zum Verhältnis von subjektiver Erlebnisfähigkeit und objektiven Ereignissen. In EBELING, Susanne (ed.). *Literarische Ausstellungen von 1949 bis 1985. Diskussion, Dokumentation, Bibliographie*. München: Walter De Gruyter, 1991, pp. 77–93. ISBN 978-3-11-153950-8.

*Journal of Religion in Europe*, 2011, vol. 4, iss. 1.

KRAUS, Stefan. Künstlerbücher: Über die Musealität eines zeitgenössischen Mediums. *Das Münster. Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst und Kunstwissenschaft*, 2011, vol. 64, pp. 354–365.

KÜHL, Alicia. *Modenschauen. Die Behauptung des Neuen in der Mode*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2015. ISBN 978-3-8376-2885-2.

NELLE, Anja. *Musealität im städtischen Kontext. Untersuchung von Musealitätszuständen und Musealisierungprozessen am Beispiel dreier spanisch-kolonialer Welterbeortschaften*. Cottbus, Technical University, 2007. Dissertation.

RAFFLER, Marlies. *Museum – Spiegel der Nation? Zugänge zur Historischen Museologie am Beispiel der Genese von Landes- und Nationalmuseen in der Habsburgermonarchie*. Wien: Böhlau, 2007. ISBN 978-3-205-77731-1.

RAZGON, Avram M. Museologie als wissenschaftliche Disziplin. In HERBST, Wolfgang and Konstantin G. LEVYKIN (eds.). *Museologie. Theoretische Grundlagen und Methodik der Arbeit in Geschichtsmuseen*. Berlin (East): Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1988, pp. 16–43. ISBN 978-3-326-00229-3.

SCHÄRER, Martin R. *Die Ausstellung. Theorie und Exempel*. München: Müller-Straten, 2003. ISBN 978-3-932704-75-8.

SCHÄRER, Martin R. *Hat das Kunstwerk einen besonderen Status? Oder: Sind alle Objekte museologisch gleich?* [online]. [cit. 2016-08-25] Available from www: <<http://edoc.hu-berlin.de/kunsttexte/2009-3/schaerer-martin-r.7/PDF/schaerer.pdf>>.

SCHREINER, Klaus. *Einführung in die Museologie – ein Beitrag zu den theoretischen Grundlagen der Museumsarbeit*. Neubrandenburg, 1982 [published as typescript].

SCHREINER, Klaus. Forschungsgegenstand der Museologie und Disziplinogenese. *Neue Museumskunde*, 1987, vol. 30, pp. 4–8.

SCHREINER, Klaus. *Museologische Termini – Auswahl*. Neubrandenburg, 1982 [published as typescript].

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Cyberraum und Museumskultur. *Museum aktuell*, 2007, iss. 133, pp. 20–24.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Die Bildungs- und Erziehungsziele der Museumsausstellung als pädagogisch-museologisches Anliegen. *Neue Museumskunde*, 1982, vol. 25, pp. 45–51.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Die theoretischen Grundlagen der Museologie als Wissenschaft. In AUER, Hermann (ed.). *Museologie. Neue Wege – Neue Ziele. Bericht über ein internationales Symposium, veranstaltet von den ICOM-Nationalkomitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Österreichs und der Schweiz 11.–14. Mai 1988 am Bodensee*. München: K.G. Sauer, 1989, pp. 38–47. ISBN 978-3-598-10809-9.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Hat die Museologie einen Sinn? In SCHIMPFF, Volker and

Wieland FÜHR (eds.). *Historia in Museo. Festschrift für Frank-Dietrich Jacob zum 60. Geburtstag*. Langenweißbach: Beier & Beran, 2004, pp. 471–477. ISBN 978-3-930036-94-3.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Ist Museologie eine kommunistische Wissenschaft? Eine Entgegnung auf deutsche Einstellungen. *Museum aktuell*, 2001, iss. 68, pp. 2758–2761.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Metamuseologie. *Museum aktuell*, 2003, iss. 92, pp. 3974–3978; 2003, iss. 93, pp. 4028–4030; 2003, iss. 96, p. 4153.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologische Terminologie. *Neue Museumskunde*, 1988, vol. 31, pp. 12–17.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museumsgegenstand – eine Welt sui generis. *Metaphysik des Museumsgegenstandes. Neues Museum. Die österreichische Museumszeitschrift*, 1993, iss. 3/4, pp. 48–56.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Noch eine „knapp gefaßte Museologie“. *Museum aktuell*, 2006, iss. 131, pp. 6–7.

VOGT, Arnold. Museologie und Museumspädagogik. Ihre Rahmenbedingungen und Perspektiven in Wissenschaft und Praxis. In FLÜGEL, Katharina and Arnold VOGT (eds.). *Museologie als Wissenschaft und Beruf in der modernen Welt*. Weimar: Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaften, 1995, pp. 53–80. ISBN 978-3-929742-56-5.

WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 2nd, revised edition. Wien: Böhlau, 1996. ISBN 978-3-205-98445-0.

WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Museologie – knapp gefasst*. Wien/Köln/Weimar: Böhlau, 2005. ISBN 978-3-205-77268-2.

WEBER, Lena. *Klostermuseen im deutschsprachigen Raum*. Bonn, University, 2013. Dissertation.

## MARKUS WALZ

Hochschule für Technik, Wirtschaft und Kultur Leipzig, Fakultät Medien, Leipzig, Bundesrepublik Deutschland  
markus.walz@htwk-leipzig.de

Markus Walz is Professor of Theoretical and Historical museology at the University of Applied Sciences in Leipzig (HTWK). He studied European ethnology and doctoral studies in History. He did research traineeship at the Landesmuseum Koblenz, worked as Museum consultant for Eastern Westphalia and Lippe in the Westphalian Museum Office in Münster. Since 2001 he works at the University of Applied Sciences in Leipzig.

Markus Walz je profesorem teoretické a historické muzeologie na Vysoké škole pro technologii, hospodářství a kulturu v Lipsku (HTWK). Studoval evropskou etnologii a doktorská studia v oboru historie. Absolvoval vědeckou stáž v Zemském muzeu v Koblenzi, pracoval jako muzejní poradce pro Východní Vestfálsko a Lippe na Vestfálském úřadu pro muzea v Münsteru. Od roku 2001 působí na Vysoké škole pro technologii, hospodářství a kulturu v Lipsku.

## STUDIE/ARTICLES

# THE THEORY OF MUSEOLOGY. MUSEOLOGY AS IT IS – DEFINED BY TWO PIONEERS:<sup>1</sup> ZBYNĚK Z. STRÁNSKÝ<sup>2</sup> AND FRIEDRICH WAIDACHER<sup>3</sup>

BERNADETTE BIEDERMANN

DOI: 10.5817/MuB2016-2-6

**ABSTRACT/ABSTRAKT:**

This paper reflects upon the connections between two museological pioneers, Z. Z. Stránský and F. Waidacher. Stránský developed the object of knowledge of museology in Brno, while Waidacher submitted a state of research and established a museological terminology especially for German-speaking areas.

The connections between the two museologists have not been researched in detail until now. Therefore, this paper focuses on the publications of the two authors concerning the development of museology as an academic discipline. For the first time, these publications are

used as primary sources to try to show the progression of museology as an academic discipline.

**Teorie muzeologie. Definice muzeologie podle Zbyňka Z. Stránského a Friedricha Waidachera**

Tento příspěvek se zamýšlí nad spojením mezi dvěma průkopníky v oboru muzeologie, Z. Z. Stránským a F. Waidacherem. Stránský v Brně rozvíjel teorii o tom, co je předmětem zkoumání muzeologie, zatímco Waidacher shrnul stav bádání a vytvořil muzeologickou terminologii platnou zejména pro německy mluvící oblast.

Spojení mezi těmito dvěma museology zatím nebyla věnována dostatečná pozornost. Tento příspěvek se proto zaměřuje na publikované práce těchto dvou autorů pojednávající o rozvoji muzeologie jako samostatné vědy. Tyto publikace jsou poprvé využity jako primární prameny dokládající prosazování muzeologie jako akademické disciplíny.

**KEYWORDS/KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA:**

*museology – theoretical museology – history of museology – museality muzeologie – teoretická muzeologie – dějiny muzeologie – muzealita*

Friedrich Waidacher named Zbyněk Z. Stránský the “pioneer of modern

*museology*”<sup>4</sup> because the philosopher, who had experience in practical museum work, formulated the concepts of museality and musealisation and thereby created the basis for the development of museology as an academic discipline.

The system of museology Stránský established makes him a key figure in the development of museology.<sup>5</sup> As he argues, it corresponds to the epistemological basis of a “scientific discipline”,<sup>6</sup> which has not yet been

4 Original: „Pionier der zeitgemäßen Museologie“, see WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 3rd ed. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1999, p. 14.

5 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Der Begriff der Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, pp. 14–39; STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, pp. 40–66; STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologie as a Science. *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, pp. 33–40; STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologie als Wissenschaft. In *Museologie in der Tschechoslowakischen sozialistischen Republik*. Berlin: Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Museumskunde, 1982, pp. 213–232; STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologische Terminologie. *Neue Museumskunde*, 1988, no. 1, pp. 12–17; STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologie als selbständige Wissenschaft. In FLÜGEL Katharina and Wolfgang ERNST (eds.). *Museologie als Wissenschaft und Beruf in der modernen Welt*. Weimar: Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaft, 1995, pp. 11–29; STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Metamuseologie oder: Museologie im Metatext und Kontext. Teil 1. *Museum aktuell*, Mai/Juni 2003, pp. 3974–3978; STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Metamuseologie. Teil II. Modelle einer Gliederung der Museologie. *Museum aktuell*, Juli 2003, pp. 4028–4030; STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Nachtrag zur „Meta-Museologie“. *Museum aktuell*, Oktober 2003, p. 4153.

6 Stránský did not reflect the term “Wissenschaft” respectively “science” in his German and English publications. He simply mistook “science” (“Naturwissenschaften”) for the general term “Wissenschaft”. Of course he only dealt with “humanities” (“Geisteswissenschaften”), which clearly refer to an “object of knowledge”. The paper uses the adjective “scientific” for proceedings related to or based on science which is done in a methodological and organized way. It uses “academic discipline” for museology referring to Stránský emphasizing that museology as academic discipline operates scientifically.

1 This paper presents the statements in English translation by the author. Because of the relevance of the wordings, the original German quotes are given in the footnotes.

2 Zbyněk Z. Stránský is the key figure in the rise of museology as an academic discipline. The philosopher, museum director and museologist was born in 1926 and died in 2016 in the Czech Republic. In 1962 he began to work at the Moravian Museum in Brno and established a museology department at Purkyně University (now Masaryk University) in Brno, where he habilitated in 1993; for his CV see for example *ICOFOM: ICOM International Committee for Museology* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <<http://network.icom.museum/icofofom/>>; Zbyněk Zbyněk Stránský. In *Wikipedie: Otevřená encyklopedie* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zbyn%C4%9Bk\\_Zby%C3%A1nsk%C3%BD](https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zbyn%C4%9Bk_Zby%C3%A1nsk%C3%BD)>.

3 Friedrich Waidacher was born in 1934 in Graz, where he studied music, ethnography, art history and philosophy; from 1977 to 1994, he was director of the provincial museum in Graz (today: “Universalmuseum Joanneum”), since 2002 he has been honorary professor at the University of Graz; for his CV see for example Member of H-MUSEUM Advisory Board. Prof. Dr. Friedrich Waidacher. In *H-Museum* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <<https://www.h-net.org/~museum/waidacher.html>>.

falsified.<sup>7</sup> In this context, he primarily tried to develop suitable methods. Stránský – like Waidacher – did not only deal with epistemological questions of museology and questions about the quality of museality, but also with the relationship between museality and practical museum work. In this context, museality refers to questions of core museum tasks such as collecting, preserving, investigating and exhibiting museum objects.<sup>8</sup> For Stránský, the museum itself was not the object of investigation in museology; instead, the museum itself is an expression of a time-independent relationship between man and his reality. He named this relationship “museality” and, at the same time, this term defines the cognitive intention of museology. By following Stránský and Waidacher, this aspect differentiates museology from other object-centred approaches,<sup>9</sup> from source disciplines,<sup>10</sup> cultural studies<sup>11</sup> and museum studies.<sup>12</sup>

In addition, Stránský was involved in training students in museological affairs. He wanted museum staff to be museologically educated. Accordingly, in 1986, he established an international summer school of museology in Brno in the context of the chair of museology<sup>13</sup> in which Friedrich Waidacher was also involved.<sup>14</sup> While Stránský developed a “Brno school” of museology,<sup>15</sup> Waidacher established a “school” of museology in Graz, where museological Stránský-Waidacher thoughts are currently adopted and reflected upon in several museology courses.<sup>16</sup>

Stránský published nearly 400 scientific works,<sup>17</sup> primarily written in Czech. As a philosopher he participated in societal affairs until late in life, analysing them from a critical distance. This is shown by his later publications that deal, for example, with museums in the digital age<sup>18</sup> as well as with museums in the

post-communist era.<sup>19</sup> But Stránský also had to oppose critics of his system of museology, rejecting the charge that museology is a “communist science”.<sup>20</sup> Accordingly, only a few works developed his approach.<sup>21</sup> To date, his theories have rarely been adopted in Anglophone areas.<sup>22</sup>

There are several connections between the two museological pioneers Z. Z. Stránský and F. Waidacher, on which this article will focus.<sup>23</sup> These connections between the two museologists have not been subject to detailed research until now.<sup>24</sup> This paper especially refers to the concept of museality as point of reference for the development of museology as an academic discipline. It therefore draws on Stránský’s and Waidacher’s published works on the mentioned topic. The paper uses, for the first time, these publications as primary sources completed by an interview with

7 DESVALLÈES, Andre and Francois MAIRESSE (eds.). *Key Concepts of Museology* [online]. Paris: Armand Collin, 2010, pp. 53–56 [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/pdf/Key\\_Concepts\\_of\\_Museology/Museologie\\_Anglais\\_BD.pdf](http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/Key_Concepts_of_Museology/Museologie_Anglais_BD.pdf)>.

8 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologie – akademische Disziplin für die Museumspraxis. *Museum aktuell*, März 1998, pp. 1048–1054. STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Einleitung zur Vitrinologie. *Museum aktuell*, Dezember 1996, pp. 420–425.

9 For material culture studies in the context of museum studies see for example PEARCE, Susan M. *Museum Studies in Material Culture*. In PEARCE, Susan M. (ed.). *Museum Studies in Material Culture*. London: Leicester University Press, 1989, pp. 1–10; BUCHLI, Victor (ed.). *The Material Culture Reader*. Oxford, New York: Berg, 2002.

10 Meaning several disciplines concerned with objects such as archeology, art history, anthropology, geology, mineralogy, botany and zoology.

11 See for example KORFF, Gottfried. *Museumsdinge. Deponieren – Exponieren*. Köln, Weimar, Wien: Böhlau, 2007; BAUR, Joachim (ed.). *Museumsanalyse. Methoden und Konturen eines neuen Forschungsfeldes*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2010.

12 For objects as signs see PEARCE, Susan M. *Museums, Objects and Collections. A Cultural Study*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992; MARSTINE, Janet. Introduction. In MARSTINE, Janet. *New Museum Theory and Practice. An Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006, pp. 1–36. CARBONELL, Bettina M. (ed.). *Museum Studies. An Anthology of Contexts*. New York: Wiley, 2012.

13 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museum studies auf der Suche nach sich selbst. *Museum aktuell*, April 2005, pp. 33–40.

14 So in 1987, 1989, 1992 and 1995; Friedrich Waidacher, interviewed on 2016-08-29.

15 About museological training at Brno university, see e.g. RUTAR, Václav. Vznik, vývoj a práce externí katedry muzeologie v Brně v letech 1963–1969. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, vol. 3, pp. 4–11; KIRSCH, Otakar. Vysokoškolská výuka muzeologie v Brně v době normalizace a nástupu demokratického režimu. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 12–20; MRÁZOVÁ, Lenka and Lucie JAGOŠOVÁ. Obsahové proměny kurikula brněnské muzeologie v letech 1964–2014. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, no. 3, pp. 28–42.

16 REISINGER, Nikolaus. Musealisierung als Theorem der Museologie. Zur Musealisierung von Großobjekten und Landschaften am Beispiel der Eisenbahn und des „Südbahnmuseums Mürzzuschlag“. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2012–2013, no. 12–13, pp. 55–68; BIEDERMANN, Bernadette and Nikolaus REISINGER. Die Stadt als Lebensraum und museale Inszenierung zwischen Erinnerung, Assoziation und Wahrnehmung. Am Beispiel der Grazer Altstadt. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2012–2013, no. 12–13, pp. 129–148.

17 DOLÁK, Jan and Jana VAVŘÍKOVÁ. *Muzeolog Z. Z. Stránský. Život a dílo*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2006.

18 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Cyberraum und Museumskultur. *Museum aktuell*, Februar 2007, pp. 20–24.

19 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Die Museen im Osten im Umbruch – Märkte und Kontexte. *Museum aktuell*, Mai 2005, pp. 6–10.

20 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Ist Museologie eine kommunistische Wissenschaft? *Museum aktuell*, April 2001, pp. 2758–2761.

21 Waidacher, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1999; MAROEVIĆ, Ivo. *Introduction to Museology*. München: Müller-Straten, 1998; MENSCH, Peter van. Museology as a scientific basis for the museum profession. In MENSCH, Peter van (ed.). *Professionalising the Museums*. Amsterdam: AHA Books – Art History Architecture, 1989.

22 DESVALLÈES, Andre and Francois MAIRESSE (eds.). *Key Concepts of Museology* [online]. Paris: Armand Collin, 2010, pp. 53–56 [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/pdf/Key\\_Concepts\\_of\\_Museology/Museologie\\_Anglais\\_BD.pdf](http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/Key_Concepts_of_Museology/Museologie_Anglais_BD.pdf)>.

23 It was Friedrich Waidacher who paved the way for Stránský to publish his considerations on museology in German-speaking journals; see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologie: Mode oder tatsächliche Notwendigkeit? In *Jahresbericht/Landesmuseum Joanneum*, 1982, Graz, 1983, no. 12, pp. 161–165. Friedrich Waidacher also supported museology as an academic science at international congresses, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Thema mit Variationen zu Friedrich Waidacher. *Museum aktuell*, September 2004, p. 12.

24 MÜLLER-STRATEN, Christian. The Contribution of Zbynek Z. Stransky to Museology within the Frame of the Brno Museology School. *Museum aktuell*, Januar 2007, pp. 19–22.

F. Waidacher which was not published until now.<sup>25</sup>

Contributing to the history of science and examining the development of museology, this paper looks at the scientific and personal connections and relationships between the Czech philosopher and museologist and the Austrian ethnologist and museologist. Accordingly, it particularly investigates the exchanges between the two scientists, the development of museology as an academic discipline, the development of the system of museology, its methods and its terminology, as well as the corresponding training opportunities in museology.

The two museologists are not only linked by their professional connection but also by a deep personal friendship, characterized by mutual appreciation. In both cases, their focus on museology is likely to have resulted from their years of experience with everyday museum work, which Stránský called “Vitrinologie”.<sup>26</sup> Additionally, both were confronted with “*widespread tunnel vision on the part of museum staff working with source disciplines.*”<sup>27</sup> This ultimately resulted in their need to “*look beyond the borders.*”<sup>28</sup>

25 Many thanks for checking and translating Stránský's publication list written in Czech to Dr. Otakar Kirsch. We found out that key concepts of his relevant available publications are translated to English and German. Because Stránský spread his relevant ideas on the development of museology also in English and German it is justified that this article focuses on these publications. Additional research on the basis of archival and not published literature at the department of museology at Masaryk University in Brno and other archives could bring some detailed but probably not extreme fresh insights to the development of museology. This undertaking would require a separate research project.

26 This concept could be translated as “show-caseology”.

27 Original: „*weit verbreiteter Tunnelblick der an Museen arbeitenden Vertreter der Quellenfächer,*“ Friedrich Waidacher, interviewed on 2016-08-29; for the term “source disciplines” see also footnote 35.

28 Original: „*einem Blick über die Grenzen,*“ Friedrich Waidacher, interviewed on 2016-08-29.

### “Museology as a Science”<sup>29</sup>

As early as 1971, Stránský submitted two articles entitled “Der Begriff der Museologie”<sup>30</sup> and “Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie”,<sup>31</sup> which discussed the object of knowledge and the system of the discipline.

Making use of available papers, which dealt with theories and investigations in museums, museology and museography, Stránský had already differentiated between a history of museums as a history of the museum phenomenon (defining the museum as an expression of museality) and a history of museology as an academic discipline. This distinction was to be developed further in the museological studies by Friedrich Waidacher, who divided the section “historical museology” into a “history of the museum phenomenon” and a “development of museology”.<sup>32</sup>

In his two fundamental texts, Stránský attaches particular importance to the investigations of J. Neustupný,<sup>33</sup> who, for example, distinguishes between a general and a special museology. The term “special museology” in particular is

later used by Stránský.<sup>34</sup> Waidacher<sup>35</sup> calls the same quality “museological source sciences”, referring to multiple disciplines concerned with museum objects, such as art history, ethnology, archaeology, zoology and geology. Additionally, Waidacher introduced the term “neighbour sciences”, defining several disciplines extending beyond source disciplines, such as psychology, sociology, communication studies and aesthetics. According to Waidacher, in an interdisciplinary discourse, museology includes several methods used by source disciplines as well as by neighbour sciences.<sup>36</sup> With regard to G. H. Rivière<sup>37</sup> and J. Neustupný, Stránský gave a name to the “number of scientific subjects represented in museums” as “special museology” by summarizing Waidacher's “source disciplines” and “neighbour sciences”.<sup>38</sup>

Studying the question of a suitable object of knowledge<sup>39</sup> for the discipline, Stránský especially refers to the considerations of Z. W. Gluziński.<sup>40</sup> According to his opinion, museums are places of “*accumulation, storage, processing and, finally, exhibition of museum objects. This four-unit complex, and only this,*

34 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a Science. *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, p. 37.

35 Private archive of Prof. Dr. Friedrich Waidacher. Friedrich Waidacher's letter to Zbyněk Z. Stránský on December 26, 1996.

36 Waidacher, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 3rd ed. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1999, pp. 182, 303.

37 See also RIVIÈRE, George H. The museum – the intensification of scientific research and the growth of art production. In *International symposium on museums in the contemporary world*. Paris: UNESCO, 1969.

38 „Zahl der wissenschaftlichen, in den Museen vertretenen Fächer“, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Der Begriff der Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, pp. 28, 29.

39 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Der Begriff der Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, p. 22; STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, pp. 40–41.

40 GLUZIŃSKI, Wojciech. *Problemy współczesnego muzealnictwa*. Warszawa, 1963.

29 Referring to Stránský's paper with the title STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a Science. *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, p. 37.

30 “Concept of museology”, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Der Begriff der Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, pp. 14–15.

31 “Fundamentals of General Museology”, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, pp. 40–66.

32 Waidacher, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 3rd ed. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1999.

33 See STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Der Begriff der Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, p. 29. See also NEUSTUPNÝ, Jiří. *Muzeum a věda*. Praha: Národní muzeum, 1968; NEUSTUPNÝ, Jiří. Die Museologie als wissenschaftliche Disziplin. In *Museologische Forschung in der ČSSR*. Berlin: Institut für Museumswesen, 1980, pp. 207–212.

*decides about the museum.*"<sup>41</sup> Therefore, the starting point of scientific interest in museology was to be found in concrete museum objects. The object of the science of museums was the "acquisition of complex knowledge of those remnants of the past, which are stored in museums and held in their collections and which represent immediately given historical facts."<sup>42</sup>

Following these thoughts,<sup>43</sup> Stránský was of the opinion that museology did not at that time correspond to the methodological requirements of an academic discipline due to the lack of an object of knowledge. None of the authors had so far posed a defined object of cognitive intention, specific methods, a theoretical system or an individual scientific language, aspects that characterize a science or scientific theory.<sup>44</sup> A theory is, in Stránský's opinion, more restricted than a science: "A theory represents the accomplishment of the endeavours of science to acquire new knowledge, without reflected [sic] these efforts itself. Scientific theories fix the results achieved by science, they form phases of science, as Thomas S. Kuhn gives in his well known work 'The Structure of Scientific Revolutions'."<sup>45</sup>

41 Original: „Museumswesen eine Anhäufung, Verwahrung, Verarbeitung und schließlich Ausstellung musealer Objekte. Dieser viergliedrige Komplex, und nur er, entscheidet über das Museumswesen“, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Der Begriff der Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, p. 25.

42 Original: „Erwerbung komplexer Kenntnisse von jenen Überresten der Vergangenheit, welche in den Museen aufgespeichert und in ihren Sammlungen aufbewahrt sind, die unmittelbar gegebene historische Fakten darstellen“, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Der Begriff der Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, p. 25.

43 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Der Begriff der Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, pp. 14–39.

44 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Der Begriff der Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, p. 31.

45 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a Science. *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, p. 36.

In 1980, Stránský extended his considerations on museology as an academic discipline. He defined three approaches that reflected on museology within a scientific discourse: according to these approaches, museology was both an independent scientific discipline and an applied science that encompasses theory and technique of museum work or museum theory by foregrounding methods and techniques of museum work. The third assumption was a general one meaning that museum theory makes no sense at all.<sup>46</sup>

Taking into account K. R. Popper's scientific epistemology of falsification,<sup>47</sup> Stránský concluded that, in an academic discipline, neither the museum nor the museum objects could be the object of investigation in museology.<sup>48</sup> As Stránský wrote in 1971 and 1980, this empirical thinking controlling museological approaches is based on a misunderstanding of the historical and social contexts of the development of museums: "The view according to which the museum is the object of museology is a result of the empirical thinking redominating in the present museology and of the false understanding of the historical and social conditionality of the existence of museums. The contemporary museum represents only one form of all historical forms of man's specific attitude to reality which, in the course of history, has imparted him the inclination to preserve and show selected

46 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a Science. *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, p. 33.

47 POPPER, Karl. *Logik der Forschung*. 9<sup>th</sup> ed. Tübingen, 1989.

48 Stránský was able to study Popper's work for the first time when visiting the former home of the Waidacher family in Graz. Since free travel was not possible under the communist regime, Stránský had chosen to change trains in Graz where he stayed overnight. He was able to spend the whole night reading in Waidacher's library. Friedrich Waidacher, interviewed on 2016-08-29. Compare the terms „Museumswissenschaften“ (“museum sciences”) and “museum studies”; see VIHEREG, Hildegard. *Museumswissenschaften*. Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink, UTB, 2006; WALZ, Markus (ed.). *Handbuch Museum: Geschichte, Aufgaben, Perspektiven*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2016.

objects. Consequently, this form is not unchangeable."<sup>49</sup> The subject of “museum theory” thus comprises the “entire area of the museum or activity of the museum.”<sup>50</sup> But the “museum reality” is more, namely “the expression of human activity”. It “carries a certain benefit for society.”<sup>51</sup>

This thinking has, to a large extent, determined debates on museum-related topics until today. This is also shown by current museological concepts and ideas, by the way in which museology is used as a synonym for museum studies – studies on the museum as an institution.<sup>52</sup> The German translation reproduces museology both as “Museumswissenschaften” (museum studies) and “Museumskunde”. Accordingly, current international discourses define five concepts of museology or museum studies: “the first and most commonly accepted meaning applies the term museology to anything relating to museums,”<sup>53</sup> which is also called “museal”. The second definition views museum studies as an applied science, the third refers to the Stránský system regarding museality, and the fourth to “new museology”. The fifth definition aims to include all the mentioned concepts, summarizing them as a kind

49 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a Science. *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, p. 36.

50 Original: „gesamte Gebiet der Museumstätigkeit oder des Museums“, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Der Begriff der Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, p. 33.

51 Original: „der Ausdruck menschlicher Aktivität“. Sie „trägt der Gesellschaft einen bestimmten Nutzen“, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Der Begriff der Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, p. 33.

52 DESVALLÈES, Andre and Francois MAIRESSE (eds.). *Key Concepts of Museology* [online]. Paris: Armand Collin, 2010, p. 54 [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/pdf/Key\\_Concepts\\_of\\_Museology/Museologie\\_Anglais\\_BD.pdf](http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/Key_Concepts_of_Museology/Museologie_Anglais_BD.pdf)>.

53 DESVALLÈES, Andre and Francois MAIRESSE (eds.). *Key Concepts of Museology* [online]. Paris: Armand Collin, 2010, p. 54 [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/pdf/Key\\_Concepts\\_of\\_Museology/Museologie\\_Anglais\\_BD.pdf](http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/Key_Concepts_of_Museology/Museologie_Anglais_BD.pdf)>.

of philosophical metatheory for the process of documentation.<sup>54</sup>

According to Stránský, the museum reflects a special expression of a time-independent relationship of man to reality and, therefore, does not serve as an object of knowledge of an academic system. Concerning these considerations, Stránský definitively defined the object of knowledge of museology: *“The aim which the museum serves, and which also all the preceding forms of the museum in the lapse of time served, is the expression of Man’s specific attitude to reality. This attitude is intrinsically linked with the historical existence of Man which finds its expression in the inclination to acquire and preserve, against the laws of change and extinction, authentic representatives of values, whose preservation and use helps to form and strengthen the human and cultural profile of Man.”*<sup>55</sup> Stránský named this specific aspect of reality “museality”.<sup>56</sup> He saw museality as a “special aspect of reality, which can only be conceived through a recognizing and evaluative relationship of man to reality.”<sup>57</sup> *“It is linked to its carriers, to items that just bear those characteristics which determine museality. We usually call these carriers museum objects. I am trying to introduce the concept of musealia, since this term clearly expresses that*

*the objects designated by it bear the quality of museality.”*<sup>58</sup>

Consequently, the appearance of museology does not depend on the museum itself, but on the knowledge of a specific relationship between man and his environment. Museology is intended to acquire knowledge of specific aspects of reality; it should serve *“as a means of acquiring knowledge on certain aspects of reality and it is connected to approaches of storing memories.”*<sup>59</sup>

Waidacher deepened and broadened Stránský’s considerations on “musealia” by stating: *“One can only ever meet the requirement of the phenomenon of museum presentation if one understands that each individual object is polyvalent, that it represents a set of possible statements in itself. It can carry various meanings and can therefore not be recognized in its essence if it is just one component of a larger context. [...] Museum presentation as an artistic event is in diametrical opposition to scientific notation. Presenting in museums means designing freely.”*<sup>60</sup>

Against the background of the previously outlined statements, Stránský proposed the following

58 „Sie ist an ihre Träger gebunden, d.h. an Gegenstände, die eben jene Merkmale tragen, welche ihre Musealität bedingen. Diese Träger bezeichnen wir gewöhnlich mit dem Terminus museale Sammlungsobjekte. Ich bemühe mich, den Begriff Musealien einzuführen, da dieser Terminus klar ausdrückt, dass die von ihm bezeichneten Objekte Merkmale der Musealität tragen“, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Der Begriff der Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, p. 36.

59 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a Science. *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, p. 38.

60 „Dem Phänomen Präsentation kann man überhaupt nur gerecht werden, wenn man versteht, dass jedes einzelne Objekt polyvalent ist, dass es für sich ein Bündel von möglichen Aussagen darstellt. Es kann verschiedenste Bedeutungen tragen und kann daher auch nicht in seinem Wesen erfasst werden, wenn man es einfach nur als Baustein eines größeren Darstellungszusammenhanges betrachten will. [...] Museale Präsentation steht als künstlerisches Ereignis in diametralem Gegensatz zu wissenschaftlicher Darstellung. Museales präsentieren heißt freies Gestalten“, see WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Museum lernen: Lange Geschichte einer Verweigerung. Museologie Online*, 1999, p. 21.

definition of museology as a scientific discipline: *“Museology is a self-differentiating, independent scientific discipline whose object of cognition is a specific attitude of Man to reality expressed objectively in various museum forms throughout the history, which is an expression and a proportionate part of the memory systems. Museology has the nature of social science, pertains to the sphere scientific disciplines of memory documentation, and contributes specifically to the understanding of Man’s society.”*<sup>61</sup>

Waidacher added a metatheoretical definition and classified museology as a humanistic discipline: *“Museology uses philosophical tools to theoretically explain and practically implement a specific cognitive and evaluative relationship between man and his reality.”*<sup>62</sup>

### The system of museology

Stránský continuously developed the system of museology. In his first systematization of 1971, he proposed a division into a genetic, a structural and a practical section of museology. “Genetic museology” thus comprises the history of museography (“Museumswesen”) and “structural museology” the theory of selection (documentation), thesaurization and communication. The third strand, which he viewed as the section of applied museology or “museography”, was the application of theory to practical museum work.<sup>63</sup>

As a consequence, he specified his proposal and focused on the history of acquisition of museality as well

54 DESVALLÈES, Andre and Francois MAIRESSE (eds.). *Key Concepts of Museology* [online]. Paris: Armand Collin, 2010, p. 56 [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/pdf/Key\\_Concepts\\_of\\_Museology/Museologie\\_Anglais\\_BD.pdf](http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/Key_Concepts_of_Museology/Museologie_Anglais_BD.pdf)>.

55 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a Science. *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, p. 36.

56 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a Science. *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, p. 36.

57 Musealität war für ihn eine „bestimmte Seite der Wirklichkeit, welche man nur in der erkennenden und wertenden Beziehung des Menschen zur Realität erfassen kann.“

61 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a Science. *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, p. 39.

62 „Museologie ist die mit Hilfe philosophischer Werkzeuge vorgenommene theoretische Erklärung und praktische Umsetzung eines besonderen erkennenden und wertenden Verhältnisses des Menschen zu seiner Wirklichkeit“, see WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1999, p. 37.

63 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Der Begriff der Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, p. 37.

as on recognizing objects as carriers of museality. In his opinion, both areas determine the field of museology. In the context of recognizing objects as carriers of museality, he foregrounded the theory of selecting, documenting and thesaurization. The theory of museum communication, however, deals with the “broadcast”, i.e. the communication “of museum values”.<sup>64</sup>

These thoughts formed the basis of the discipline’s system. In his text on “museology as a science” first published in English in 1980<sup>65</sup> and later in multiple German writings,<sup>66</sup> Stránský submitted the most consequential systematization of museology: he divided museology into “historical”, “theoretical” and “applied” museology.<sup>67</sup> This classification was further developed and deepened by Waidacher.<sup>68</sup>

The foundations of this division can be found in his early 1971 work titled “Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie”.<sup>69</sup> In his analyses Waidacher refers to texts published in 1971 and 1980. Accordingly, the Waidacher system of museology

correlates to museality: “*Museality is that quality of reality, which is so essential to Man that he saves the carriers of museality from the inevitable decline.*”<sup>70</sup> With regard to Stránský, carriers of museality are seen as “*authentic unmediated evidence*”<sup>71</sup> of reality. The related process is known as the process of musealization.<sup>72</sup>

In several papers<sup>73</sup> Waidacher focussed on the theory of selection and musealisation that defines potential carriers of museality, on the theory of thesaurization and on the theory of documentation. Within the scope of these texts, he explains the process of musealizing and documenting museum objects. He always involves a twofold research process: the first step is concerned with the recognition of the value and the physical characteristics of an object from the perspective of the respective source science. The second step takes into account the museological quality, recognizing and determining the quality of museality for its diachronic and synchronic value for society.

Based on this approach, Waidacher provided the basis for a museological museum documentation system that views the process of musealizing and researching museum objects as a relational database. It also represents the respective contextual relationships of museum objects (IMDAS-pro).<sup>74</sup> Far-reaching consequences of the ideas developed by both museologists are currently shown in the “Conceptual Reference Model” (CIDOC CRM) established by the ICOM “International Committee for Documentation” (CIDOC).<sup>75</sup> This concept uses object’s “entities” and “properties” to index several relationships of objects to people, places and events, and thus connects to the philosophical foundations of museology developed by Stránský and Waidacher.

Stránský even provided a fundamental definition for the theory of museum communication. Accordingly, creating museum presentations is “*a purposeful, creative activity, which arises from the internal communication requirement of museality and conveys by forms of museum exhibitions the vivid communication of scientific knowledge which is the nature of museum reality.*”<sup>76</sup> In doing so, the abstract is presented by the concrete.<sup>77</sup>

64 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, pp. 40–41.

65 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a Science. *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, pp. 33–40.

66 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologie als Wissenschaft. In *Museologie in der Tschechoslowakischen sozialistischen Republik*. Berlin: Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Museumskunde, 1982, pp. 213–232. STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Die theoretischen Grundlagen der Museologie als Wissenschaft. In AUER, Hermann. *Museologie: Neue Wege – Neue Ziele*. München: Saur, 1989, pp. 38–47; STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologie als selbständige Wissenschaft. In FLÜGEL Katharina and Wolfgang ERNST (eds.). *Museologie als Wissenschaft und Beruf in der modernen Welt*. Weimar: Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaft, 1995, pp. 11–29.

67 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a Science. *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, p. 37.

68 WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1999.

69 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, pp. 40–66.

70 Original: „*Musealität ist jene Qualität der Wirklichkeit, die für den Menschen so wesentlich ist, dass er die Träger der Musealität vor dem unvermeidlichen Untergang schützen muss*“, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, p. 41.

71 Original: „*authentisch unvermittelte Belege*“; see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, p. 45.

72 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, p. 45.

73 WAIDACHER, Friedrich. Vom redlichen Umgang mit Dingen. Sammlungsmanagement im System musealer Aufgaben und Ziele. *Mitteilungen und Berichte aus dem Institut für Museumskunde*, 1998, vol. 8 [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://www.smb.museum/fileadmin/website/Institute/Institut\\_fuer\\_Museumsforschung/Publikationen/MIT008.pdf](http://www.smb.museum/fileadmin/website/Institute/Institut_fuer_Museumsforschung/Publikationen/MIT008.pdf)>; WAIDACHER, Friedrich. Museologische Grundlagen der Objektdokumentation. *Berichte und Mitteilungen aus dem Institut für Museumskunde*, 1999, vol. 15 [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://www.smb.museum/fileadmin/website/Institute/Institut\\_fuer\\_Museumsforschung/Publikationen/Mitteilungen/MIT015.pdf](http://www.smb.museum/fileadmin/website/Institute/Institut_fuer_Museumsforschung/Publikationen/Mitteilungen/MIT015.pdf)>.

74 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Thema mit Variationen zu Friedrich Waidacher. *Museum aktuell*, September 2004, p. 10; WAIDACHER, Friedrich. Museumsinformatik. Modell eines multidimensionalen Dokumentationssystems für Museumsobjekte. *Neues Museum*, 1995, no. 3+4, pp. 92–102.

75 Official homepage CIDOC Conceptual Reference Model [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <<http://www.cidoc-crm.org/>>.

76 Original: *Demnach ist museales Präsentieren „eine zielbewusste, schöpferische Tätigkeit, welche dem inneren Kommunikationsfordernis der Musealität entspringt und mittels musealer Ausstellungsformen die anschauliche Mitteilung wissenschaftlicher Erkenntnisse des Wesens der musealen Realität vermittelt“*, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, p. 61.

77 Original: Dabei wird „*das Abstrakte durch das Konkrete*“ dargestellt, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, p. 61.



Waidacher follows on from this with his definition of the creation of museum presentations: “*Museum communication takes place by showing the musealium (museum presentation) and by its interpretative explanation (interpretation).*”<sup>78</sup> “*Museum presentation is communication and evidence through the exhibition of exposita, i.e., musealia, which were selected from the collection for a certain time under consideration of the diachronic and synchronic aspects.*”<sup>79</sup> This definition also includes the way in which creating museum presentations always means making choices with regard to particular values. Accordingly, exhibition directors are called upon to decide which aspects of museum objects should be included in the respective narrative of a museum exhibition.<sup>80</sup>

With the terms “museum exposition”<sup>81</sup> and “museum exhibition”,<sup>82</sup> Stránský further defined the nature of permanent and temporary exhibi-

tions.<sup>83</sup> Waidacher included this provision in his classification of types and genera of museum exhibitions within the theory of museum communication. Waidacher not only developed Stránský’s basic ideas in the context of theoretical museology, but also in applied museology. This is the case in his considerations concerning the presentation of museum objects, designing museum exhibitions as well as the reception of museum communication provisions by visitors.

In his latest treatise on metatheoretical considerations of museology and the outline of the system of museology, Stránský compared the systematization proposals that had been made on the topic of museality by Peter van Mensch<sup>84</sup> and Friedrich Waidacher<sup>85</sup> to his own concept. Here, he partly disagrees with the classifications he had defined by this time. Stránský criticized van Mensch for his lack of terminology and consistent classification. Mensch had divided museology into a “theoretical museology” (including “historiography of museology and methodology of museology”), and a “general”, “historic”, “special” and “applied” museology. Stránský also stated that a meta-theory should not be a part of the system of the theory. In addition, research was only to occur in the section of applied museology; basic research was missing. Above all, he found fault with the fact that this system does not start with a specific cognitive process.<sup>86</sup>

Similarly, Stránský criticized the system that Friedrich Waidacher had developed by deepening his own systematization. In Waidacher’s classification into “metamuseology”, “historical”, “theoretical” and “applied” museology, the knowledge system and the functions are mixed. The difference between basic and applied research is not considered.<sup>87</sup> To determine the character of museology from the position of a general philosophical and metascientific position, Stránský had even coined the term “metamuseology”<sup>88</sup> and stressed that it does not deal with “special museology”, but with a “heuristic system”.<sup>89</sup> Therefore, metamuseology should not be understood as being a part of the museological system. Therefore, Waidacher had given metamuseology a special place in the dynamic overall structure of museology. Nevertheless, this led to criticism by Stránský. The classification of “institutionalization” within “theoretical museology” was beyond merely “*an expression of the effort to incorporate the social scale of the museum phenomenon.*”<sup>90</sup> He continued: “*components of theoretical museology are not functions, but knowledge systems.*”<sup>91</sup>

78 Original: „*Museale Kommunikation erfolgt durch Vorzeigen der Musealien (Präsentation) und durch ihre deutende Erklärung (Interpretation)*“, see WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 3rd ed. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1999, p. 231.

79 Original: „*Museale Präsentation ist Mitteilung und Beweis durch Vorzeigen von Exposita, d.h. von Musealien, die nach diachronischen und synchronischen Gesichtspunkten für bestimmte Zeit aus dem Sammlungsfundus selektiert wurden*“, see WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 3rd ed. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1999, p. 272.

80 MARTINZ-TUREK, Charlotte and Monika SOMMER-SIEGHART. *Storyline. Narrationen im Museum*. Wien: Turia&Kant, 2009; MACDONALDS, Sharon. *Behind the Scenes at the Science Museum*. Oxford: Berg, 2002; GRAMMEL, Soren. *Ausstellungsautorenschaft. Die Konstruktion der auktorialen Position des Kurators bei Harald Szeemann. Eine Mikroanalyse*. Frankfurt am Main: König, 2005; HEESSEN, Anke te. *Dingwelten. Das Museum als Erkenntnisort*. Köln, Weimar, Wien: Böhlau, 2005; HANAK-LETTNER, Werner. *Die Ausstellung als Drama. Wie das Museum aus dem Theater entstand*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2011.

81 Original: „*museale Exposition*“, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie. Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, pp. 62–63.

82 Original: „*Museums-Ausstellung*“, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie. Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, pp. 62–63.

83 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie. Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, pp. 62–63.

84 MENSCH, Peter van. *Museology as a scientific basis for the museum profession*. In MENSCH, Peter van (ed.). *Professionalising the Museums*. Amsterdam: AHA Books – Art History Architecture, 1989.

85 WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 3rd ed. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1999.

86 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Metamuseologie. Teil II. Modelle einer Gliederung der Museologie. Museum aktuell*, Juli 2003, p. 4028.

87 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Metamuseologie. Teil II. Modelle einer Gliederung der Museologie. Museum aktuell*, Juli 2003, p. 4028.

88 See for example STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Museologie als selbständige Wissenschaft*. In FLÜGEL Katharina and Wolfgang ERNST (eds.). *Museologie als Wissenschaft und Beruf in der modernen Welt*. Weimar: Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaft, 1995, pp. 11–29.

89 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Metamuseologie oder: Museologie im Metatext und Kontext. Teil 1. Museum aktuell*, Mai/Juni 2003, p. 3976.

90 Original: Die Einordnung der „*Institutionalisierung*“ unter die Theoretische Museologie bei F. Waidacher sei darüber hinaus lediglich „*Ausdruck der Bemühung, den gesellschaftlichen Umfang des Phänomens Museum einzuarbeiten*“, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Metamuseologie. Teil II. Modelle einer Gliederung der Museologie. Museum aktuell*, Juli 2003, p. 4028.

91 Original: „*Bestandteile der theoretischen Museologie sind jedoch keine Funktionen, sondern Erkenntnisssysteme*“, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Metamuseologie. Teil II. Modelle einer Gliederung der Museologie. Museum aktuell*, Juli 2003, p. 4028.

Consequently, Stránský proposed his third systematization of museology in 2003 as a “meta-theory”.<sup>92</sup> He divided museology into a “diachronic”,<sup>93</sup> a “synchronous”,<sup>94</sup> a “theoretical”<sup>95</sup> and an “applied” level.<sup>96</sup> In his opinion, this system would comprehensively cover the “*theoretical and practical knowledge levels and represent a basis for authentic museological research.*”<sup>97</sup> The individual disciplines would thus form a “dynamic system”.<sup>98</sup>

Unfortunately, he did not explain the significant difference to his proposal from 1980 to which Waidacher had already added the meta-theory for determining meta-scientific positions.<sup>99</sup> Additionally, in the third proposal of “abstract” museology, metamuseology, it is part of the dynamic structure, whereby all parts are concerned with the exploration of the object of knowledge of museology, which is museality.

Furthermore, Waidacher sees “institutionalization” not as an “*effort to incorporate the social scale of the museum phenomenon,*”<sup>100</sup> but as a theory and as practical implementation of museality by the museum

92 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Metamuseologie. Teil II. Modelle einer Gliederung der Museologie. Museum aktuell*, Juli 2003, p. 4030.

93 By meaning “historical museology”.

94 By meaning “abstract museology”.

95 Including selection, “Thesaurierung” and presentation.

96 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Metamuseologie. Teil II. Modelle einer Gliederung der Museologie. Museum aktuell*, Juli 2003, p. 4029.

97 Original: „Dieses System deckte seiner Meinung nach die „*theoretischen und praktischen Erkenntnisebenen komplex ab und stellt eine Basis für authentische museologische Forschung dar*“, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Metamuseologie. Teil II. Modelle einer Gliederung der Museologie. Museum aktuell*, Juli 2003, p. 4029.

98 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Metamuseologie. Teil II. Modelle einer Gliederung der Museologie. Museum aktuell*, Juli 2003, p. 4029.

99 Siehe dazu WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Museologie als Erkenntnisssystem und Handlungsanweisung. Jahresbericht/Landesmuseum Joanneum*, 1991, Graz, 1992, no. 22, pp. 9–27.

100 Original: „*Bemühung, den gesellschaftlichen Umfang des Phänomens Museum*“ einzuarbeiten.

as an institution. The social scale of the phenomenon can, however, be found in several subregions of the system of museology, which are always based on museality. Unfortunately, no further discussions on this subject by museologists can be found. Waidacher had already closed his “scriptorium” at this time and Stránský published nothing on this topic except for a short addendum<sup>101</sup> to the problem of systematizing the discipline.

Nevertheless, the theory of museality is not only incorporated into the current CIDOC-CRM, but also into the consideration of “heritology” as well as “cultural heritage”.<sup>102</sup> Stránský approached both topics critically.<sup>103</sup> Lastly, it was also shown that the quality of museality is not only a phenomenon of the museum interior but also adheres to objects “in situ”.<sup>104</sup>

### Methodologies

To fulfil the tasks of an academic discipline, museology would have to develop appropriate methods.<sup>105</sup> Therefore, Stránský emphasizes the importance of developing museological methods to investigate the object of knowledge. However, these methods are not clearly defined. He

101 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Nachtrag zur „*Metamuseologie*“. *Museum aktuell*, Oktober 2003, p. 4153.

102 ŠOLA, Tomislav. *Essays on Museums and their Theory. Towards the cybernetic museum*. Helsinki: Finnish Museums Association, 1997. Šola created the term “Mnemosophie” for a discipline concerned with theories of memory. See also MENSCH, Peter van. *Museality at breakfast. The concept of museality in contemporary museological discourse. Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 14–19.

103 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Cyberraum und Museumskultur. Museum aktuell*, Februar 2007, pp. 20–24.

104 BIEDERMANN, Bernadette and Nikolaus REISINGER. *Die Stadt als Lebensraum und museale Inszenierung zwischen Erinnerung, Assoziation und Wahrnehmung. Am Beispiel der Grazer Altstadt. Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2012–2013, no. 12–13, pp. 129–148.

105 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Der Begriff der Museologie. Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, p. 37.

merely states that museology is in inter- and transdisciplinary relation to other disciplines.<sup>106</sup>

A whole chapter in Waidacher’s “Handbuch” is dedicated to the methodologies of investing in the object of knowledge.<sup>107</sup> Accordingly, museology should use an “*elastic multilayered approach in the choice of its methods,*”<sup>108</sup> whereby museology usually precedes inductively. In terms of inter-subjectively verifiable results, Waidacher proposes empirical induction, the theory of critical deduction and semiotic “*Abduktion-slogik*”.<sup>109</sup> Moreover, he emphasizes the essence of museology as an interdisciplinary subject that applies methods of the source disciplines as well as neighbour sciences.<sup>110</sup> Therefore, the methods of knowledge have to be borrowed depending on the question and corresponding to the thesis in relation to museality.<sup>111</sup>

In the area of recognizing and evaluating potential carriers of museality, proven traditional methods are those of historical sciences, particularly heuristics and hermeneutics. In the field of museum documentation within the *cross-faculty platform university museums* at the University of Graz, museological methods are, at the moment, extended by tools and methods from the digital humanities. In the field of museum communication, mu-

106 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Nachtrag zur „*Metamuseologie*“. *Museum aktuell*, Oktober 2003, p. 4153.

107 WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 3rd ed. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1999, pp. 61–63.

108 Original: ein „*elastisches vielschichtiges Vorgehen in der Wahl der Erkenntnismethoden*“.

109 WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 3rd ed. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1999, pp. 62–63.

110 WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 3rd ed. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1999, pp. 40, 46, 50, 303.

111 Siehe dazu auch BIEDERMANN, Bernadette. Exploring the meaning of objects and communicating museality as challenge for museological methodology. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2014–2015, no. 14–15, pp. 15–26.

seology uses methods of empirical social research. Unfortunately, only a few epistemological works on the development and expansion of museological methods are published that refer to Stránský and Waidacher.<sup>112</sup>

### Terminology

In terms of the development of museology as an academic discipline, Stránský also sought to develop a museological terminology. He described the publication of a dictionary of museum-related terms, which was published in Moscow in 1974,<sup>113</sup> as a “pioneering” act. He therefore supported the publication of a “Dictionnaire museologicum”, the first edition of which was published in 1978.<sup>114</sup>

Stránský probably thought of a museological lexicon, which was to list all terms used in relation to museality. However, because this terminology had to be developed for the first time, the concept of “Dictionarium museologicum” presents just a collection of those terms which were used in connection with (practical) museum work at that time. The terms were also translated into different languages.

A meeting on the planned publication of “Dictionnaire museologicum” was the reason for the first encounter between Stránský and Waidacher in 1980 where both recognized the complexity of

such a project. A compilation of museological terms with a logical deduction shown by their relation to museality was to be presented for the first time in Friedrich Waidacher’s first edition of the “Handbuch” in 1993 in the form of a “Glossary”. For the quality of museality, he created the German term “museal”, thus communicating the special quality developed by Stránský.<sup>115</sup> He also established the term “Nouophors”, naming musealia as carriers of sense and meaning.<sup>116</sup> With this concept, he additionally wanted to distance the museological approach from general conceptions of defining objects as carriers of signs, which were named “Semiophors”.<sup>117</sup>

The fact that a common terminology for museological research is of international importance is also reflected in the publication by Desvallées and Mairesse with the title “Key Concepts of Museology”.<sup>118</sup> It defines terms used in this context as a current state of research. Several terms are not only provided in English, but are also translated into five other languages (French, German, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese). Unfortunately, this work does not include a time-independent particular object of knowledge, which is why theoretical and practical concepts are mixed together.

To date, the system of knowledge developed by Stránský has not been sufficiently acknowledged or reflected upon in scientific discourse, meaning that it is denied that this system of museology has the quality of an academic discipline: “*However, the likening of museology to a science – even under development – has slowly been abandoned in so far as neither its object of study, nor its methods, truly correspond to the epistemological criteria of a specific scientific approach.*”<sup>119</sup>

Without providing an alternative proposal for a museology system – which Stránský had required – museology is conceded to be a museum philosophy with a metatheoretical approach that has two tasks to fulfil: “(1) it serves as metatheory for the science of intuitive concrete documentation, (2) it provides regulating ethics for all institutions responsible for managing the intuitive concrete documentary function.”<sup>120</sup>

Without the required logical falsification of Stránský’s theories, which would be necessary in recourse to K. Popper, the assumption that the knowledge system developed by Stránský does not meet the requirements of an academic discipline remain an unverified thesis. Furthermore, an alternative knowledge system for exploring the temporal phenomenon of collecting, preserving, investigating and exhibiting objects as witnesses of specific social realities has not yet been submitted.

112 BIEDERMANN, Bernadette. Exploring the meaning of objects and communicating museality as challenge for museological methodology. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2014–2015, no. 14-15, pp. 15–26; BIEDERMANN, Bernadette and Nikolaus REISINGER. Die Stadt als Lebensraum und museale Inszenierung zwischen Erinnerung, Assoziation und Wahrnehmung. Am Beispiel der Grazer Altstadt. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2012–2013, no. 12-13, pp. 129–148.

113 *Kratkij slovar’ muzejnych terminov*. Moskva, 1974.

114 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Museologische Terminologie. Neue Museumskunde*, 1988, no. 1, p. 12.

115 Waidacher, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 3rd ed. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1999, p. 708: “museal refers to the quality of museality” („museal: auf die Qualität der Musealität bezogen“).

116 Waidacher, Friedrich. Sachen und Wörter oder von der Mühe, Erinnerung zu bewahren. In Geldner, Georg (ed.). *Der Milde Knabe oder die Natur eines Berufenen. Ein wissenschaftlicher Ausblick, Oskar Pausch zum Eintritt in den Ruhestand gewidmet*. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, p. 20.

117 Pomian, Krzysztof. *Der Ursprung des Museums. Vom Sammeln*. Berlin: Wagenbach, 1988.

118 Desvallées, Andre and Francois Mairesse (eds.). *Key Concepts of Museology* [online]. Paris: Armand Collin, 2010, p. 55 [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/pdf/Key\\_Concepts\\_of\\_Museology/Museologie\\_Anglais\\_BD.pdf](http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/Key_Concepts_of_Museology/Museologie_Anglais_BD.pdf)>.

119 Desvallées, Andre and Francois Mairesse (eds.). *Key Concepts of Museology* [online]. Paris: Armand Collin, 2010, p. 55 [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/pdf/Key\\_Concepts\\_of\\_Museology/Museologie\\_Anglais\\_BD.pdf](http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/Key_Concepts_of_Museology/Museologie_Anglais_BD.pdf)>.

120 Desvallées, Andre and Francois Mairesse (eds.). *Key Concepts of Museology* [online]. Paris: Armand Collin, 2010, p. 55 [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/pdf/Key\\_Concepts\\_of\\_Museology/Museologie\\_Anglais\\_BD.pdf](http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/Key_Concepts_of_Museology/Museologie_Anglais_BD.pdf)>.

## Training programmes

During his career and his work at the Department of Museology at Masaryk University in Brno, where he habilitated in 1993, Stránský was dedicated to the education of students. In several training opportunities he recognized a specific pragmatism, lacking a theoretical basis and reference to museality as well as a system of knowledge of museology. This naturally led to “unilateral and disorganized training programmes.”<sup>121</sup> This, he noted, despite the wording of the “ICOM Basic Syllabus for Professional Museum Training”. In 2000, the “ICOM Curricula Guidelines for Museum Professional Development”<sup>122</sup> were published, providing guidelines for practical training and neglecting the theoretical study of the object of knowledge of museology.

However, the “UNESCO International Summer School of Museology” at Masaryk University, which has offered courses in museology since 1987, put metamuseology at the centre of the curriculum and integrated historical, theoretical and applied museology as a system.<sup>123</sup> Stránský placed particular importance on the point that “museum staff, therefore, perceive present life, pursue its problems and take their own dedicated position.”<sup>124</sup>

121 Original: „einseitigen und systemlosen Ausbildungsprogrammen“, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museum studies auf der Suche nach sich selbst. *Museum aktuell*, April 2005, p. 34.

122 See homepage ICOM Curricula Guidelines for Museum Professional Development [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/pdf/professions/curricula\\_eng.pdf](http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/professions/curricula_eng.pdf)>.

123 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museum studies auf der Suche nach sich selbst. *Museum aktuell*, April 2005, p. 34; STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Ten Years International Summer School of Museology. In STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Museology for Tomorrow's World*. Munich: Christian Müller-Straten, 1997, pp. 143–151.

124 Original: Besonderen Wert legte er darauf, dass „Museumsmitarbeiter also das gegenwärtige Leben wahrnehmen, seine Problematik verfolgen und eigene engagierte Stellung dazu nehmen“, see STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Musealisierung und Paradigmenwechsel. *Museum aktuell*, Mai/Juni 2001, p. 2804.

In 1994, Friedrich Waidacher established a modular training programme for general museology at the Institute of History at the University of Graz (“Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz”), consisting of historical, theoretical and applied museology. He was eventually appointed Honorary Professor of Museology in 2003. This represents the first award of *venia docendi* at an Austrian university. Today these courses are still held in the context of a combination of subjects called “Cultural Management – Applied Cultural Studies” and in the permanent curriculum of the history department at the University of Graz.<sup>125</sup> After Stránský published his article on training programmes, some more courses were started, taking place at Leipzig University of Applied Sciences<sup>126</sup> and at Julius Maximilian University in Würzburg.<sup>127</sup>

## Personal matters

After meeting for the first time at a conference in 1980, Stránský and Waidacher developed a particularly deep, friendly relationship. They shared their “abhorrence of any ideology, contempt for lazy thinking (“ratio pigra”), a deep connection to music and their delight in humour.”<sup>128</sup>

Their mutual professional and personal appreciation is revealed not only in the way in which they men-

125 See homepage Studienschwerpunkt Kulturmanagement. In *Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <<https://geschichte.uni-graz.at/de/allgemeine-geschichte-der-neuzeit/lehre-studium/studienschwerpunkt-kulturmanagement/>>.

126 See homepage Museologie. In *Hochschule für Technik, Wirtschaft und Kultur Leipzig* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <<http://www.htwk-leipzig.de/de/studieninteressierte/studienangebot/bachelor/museologie/>>.

127 See homepage Museologie und Museumswissenschaft. In *Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://www.museologie.uni-wuerzburg.de/aktuelles\\_und\\_termine/](http://www.museologie.uni-wuerzburg.de/aktuelles_und_termine/)>.

128 Original: So teilten sie miteinander ihre „Abscheu vor jeglicher Ideologie, Verachtung für faules Denken (ratio pigra), eine tiefe Beziehung zur Musik sowie die Freude an Humor“, Friedrich Waidacher, interviewed on 2016-08-29.

tioned each other in relevant publications, but also in their personal correspondence. In the preface of his handbook, Waidacher expresses his special thanks to Stránský: “I express my special thanks and send a respectful greeting to Zbyněk Z. Stránský, the pioneer of contemporary museology. Without his courageous and tireless decades of basic research our knowledge would be as blurred as it was a generation ago. The museum world has him to thank for crucial contributions to serious discussions of the scientific basis of the museum. His concepts and theories have already become part of the vocabulary and instruments of museology. This manual makes extensive use of the results of his work in its theoretical part.”<sup>129</sup>

Stránský received this compliment for his review of “museology as a communist science”<sup>130</sup> in 2001. He saw his theoretical considerations confirmed in publications by Waidacher and Maroević. Moreover, Waidacher further showed his appreciation in a piece he wrote to commemorate Stránský’s birthday in the journal “Museum aktuell”.<sup>131</sup> He discusses the academic career of the recipient and particularly highlights his research and teaching activities at Masaryk University in Brno, where he founded the “International Summer School of Museology” (ISSOM) in 1986.

129 Original: „Mein besonderer Dank und respektvoller Gruß gilt Zbyněk Z. Stránský, dem Pionier der zeitgemäßen Museologie. Ohne seine mutige und unermüdlige jahrzehntelange Grundlagenforschung wäre unser Wissen weiterhin so unscharf wie noch vor einer Generation. Die Museumswelt verdankt ihm entscheidende Impulse für die ernsthafte Auseinandersetzung mit den wissenschaftlichen Grundlagen des Musealwesens. Sie verdankt ihm Begriffe und Theorien, die bereits in den Sprachschatz und das Instrumentarium der Museologie eingegangen sind. Dieses Handbuch macht im theoretischen Teil ausgiebigen Gebrauch von den Ergebnissen seiner Arbeit“, see Waidacher, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 3rd ed. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1999, p. 14.

130 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Ist Museologie eine kommunistische Wissenschaft? *Museum aktuell*, April 2001, pp. 2758–2761.

131 Waidacher, Friedrich. Ein Unermüdlicher. *Museum aktuell*, September 1996, pp. 296–297.

In return, Stránský dedicated a paper consisting of six “variations” to the scientific achievements of Friedrich Waidacher.<sup>132</sup> Stránský particularly highlighted the development of the system of museology, the extension of the definition of museology, the contribution to the formation of a museological terminology, the activity in professional organizations and the permanent defence of museology as a scientific discipline. Waidacher gave lectures at the “UNESCO International Summer School in Brno” as well as at the universities in Vienna, Basel, Zagreb and Karlsruhe. He also established the above-mentioned three-part series of lectures on museology at the Institute of History at the University of Graz.

The mutual esteem that Stránský and Waidacher felt for each other is also evident from their personal correspondence. They sent each other greeting cards and reprints of their works and arranged private meetings. They “*did not have to talk about museology*” because “*in any case they were of the same opinion.*”<sup>133</sup> The obituary in the current issue of “*Museologica Brunensia*”, in which Waidacher describes Stránský as “irreplaceable”, also shows deep appreciation. This too has to be seen as a particular expression of mutual respect because F. Waidacher closed his public “scriptorium” several years ago.

## Conclusion

The publications and the communication between Czech scientist Zbyněk Z. Stránský and Austrian scientist Friedrich Waidacher shows that they were able to create a system by working on the episte-

mological and theoretical issues of museology. This system is argued for consistently and stringently, as shown, for example, by the development of Stránský’s fundamental ideas by F. Waidacher, who extended the system, created appropriate terminology and presented an international state of research, whereby all the sections are always based on the timeless object of knowledge.

Their unconditional and rigorous arguments in favour of the timeless museum appearance are expressed in a special relationship between man and his environment, and make the two museologists so extraordinary. This relationship is shown by collecting, preserving, investigating and exhibiting museum objects. The object of knowledge and the related dynamic structure of museology have not been falsified logically, but are rather reflected upon and further developed at universities in Graz and Brno through conferences and lectures.

Undertaking a further basic study of the methods to explore and deepen museology as a scientific discipline would, however, contribute to further strengthening the system. The now re-established Czech-Austrian museological relations between the University of Graz and Masaryk University Brno could make a contribution to this.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY:

### Primary sources

*Private archive of Prof. Dr. Friedrich Waidacher.*

Interview with Friedrich Waidacher on 29<sup>th</sup> August 2016, Graz.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Cyberraum und Museumskultur. *Museum aktuell*, Februar 2007, pp. 20–24. ISSN 1433-3848.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Der Begriff der Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, pp. 14–39.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Die Museen im Osten im Umbruch – Märkte und Kontexte. *Museum aktuell*, Mai 2005, pp. 6–10. ISSN 1433-3848.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Die theoretischen Grundlagen der Museologie als Wissenschaft. In AUER, Hermann. *Museologie: Neue Wege – Neue Ziele*. München: Saur, 1989, pp. 38–47. ISBN 3-598-10809-5.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Einleitung zur Vitrinologie. *Museum aktuell*, Dezember 1996, pp. 420–425. ISSN 1433-3848.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity, supplementum 1. Einführung in die Museologie*, 1971, pp. 40–66.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Ist Museologie eine kommunistische Wissenschaft? *Museum aktuell*, April 2001, pp. 2758–2761. ISSN 1433-3848.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Metamuseologie oder: Museologie im Metatext und Kontext. Teil 1. *Museum aktuell*, Mai/Juni 2003, pp. 3974–3978. ISSN 1433-3848.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Metamuseologie. Teil II. Modelle einer Gliederung der Museologie. *Museum aktuell*, Juli 2003, pp. 4028–4030. ISSN 1433-3848.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Musealisierung und Paradigmenwechsel. *Museum aktuell*, Mai/Juni 2001, pp. 2802–2806. ISSN 1433-3848.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologie – akademische Disziplin für die Museumspraxis. *Museum aktuell*, März 1998, pp. 1048–1054. ISSN 1433-3848.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologie als selbständige Wissenschaft. In FLÜGEL Katharina and Wolfgang ERNST (eds.). *Museologie als Wissenschaft und Beruf in der modernen Welt*. Weimar: Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaft, 1995, pp. 11–29. ISBN 3-929742-56-X.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologie als Wissenschaft. In *Museologie in der Tschechoslowakischen sozialistischen Republik*. Berlin: Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Museumskunde, 1982, pp. 213–232.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologie: Mode oder tatsächliche Notwendigkeit? In *Jahresbericht/Landesmuseum Joanneum*, 1982, Graz, 1983, no. 12, pp. 161–165. ISSN 0378-6862.

<sup>132</sup> STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Thema mit Variationen zu Friedrich Waidacher. *Museum aktuell*, September 2004, pp. 9–13.

<sup>133</sup> Original: Über Fachliches mussten die beiden „nicht sprechen“, da sie „ohnedies einer Meinung waren“, Friedrich Waidacher, interviewed on 2016-08-29.

- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museologische Terminologie. *Neue Museumskunde*, 1988, no. 1, pp. 12–17. ISSN 0028-3282.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a Science. *Museologia*, 1980, vol. XI, no. 15, pp. 33–40. ISSN 0392-5528.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museum studies auf der Suche nach sich selbst. *Museum aktuell*, April 2005, pp. 33–40. ISSN 1433-3848.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Nachtrag zur „Meta-Museologie“. *Museum aktuell*, Oktober 2003, p. 4153. ISSN 1433-3848.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Ten Years International Summer School of Museology. In STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Museology for Tomorrow's World*. Munich: Christian Müller-Straten, 1997, pp. 143–151. ISBN 3-932704-57-6.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Thema mit Variationen zu Friedrich Waidacher. *Museum aktuell*, September 2004, pp. 9–13. ISSN 1433-3848.
- WAIDACHER, Friedrich. Museologie als Erkenntnisssystem und Handlungsanweisung. *Jahresbericht/Landesmuseum Joanneum*, 1991, Graz, 1992, no. 22, pp. 9–27. ISSN 0378-6862.
- WAIDACHER, Friedrich. Museum lernen: Lange Geschichte einer Verweigerung. *Museologie Online*, 1999. ISSN 1617-285X.
- WAIDACHER, Friedrich. *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1999. ISBN 978-3-205-99130-4.
- WAIDACHER, Friedrich. Museologische Grundlagen der Objektdokumentation. *Berichte und Mitteilungen aus dem Institut für Museumskunde*, 1999, vol. 15 [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://www.smb.museum/fileadmin/website/Institute/Institut\\_fuer\\_Museumsforschung/Publikationen/Mitteilungen/MIT015.pdf](http://www.smb.museum/fileadmin/website/Institute/Institut_fuer_Museumsforschung/Publikationen/Mitteilungen/MIT015.pdf)>. ISSN 1436-4166.
- WAIDACHER, Friedrich. Museumsinformatik. Modell eines multidimensionalen Dokumentationssystems für Museumsobjekte. *Neues Museum*, 1995, no. 3+4, pp. 92–102. ISSN 1015-6720.
- WAIDACHER, Friedrich. Sachen und Wörter oder von der Mühe, Erinnerung zu bewahren. In GELDNER, Georg (ed.). *Der Milde Knabe oder die Natur eines Berufenen. Ein wissenschaftlicher Ausblick, Oskar Pausch zum Eintritt in den Ruhe-*
- stand gewidmet*. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, pp. 19–29. ISBN 3-205-98819-1.
- WAIDACHER, Friedrich. Vom redlichen Umgang mit Dingen. Sammlungsmanagement im System musealer Aufgaben und Ziele. *Mitteilungen und Berichte aus dem Institut für Museumskunde*, 1998, vol. 8 [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://www.smb.museum/fileadmin/website/Institute/Institut\\_fuer\\_Museumsforschung/Publikationen/Mitteilungen/MIT008.pdf](http://www.smb.museum/fileadmin/website/Institute/Institut_fuer_Museumsforschung/Publikationen/Mitteilungen/MIT008.pdf)>.

## Secondary Literature

- BAUR, Joachim (ed.). *Museumsanalyse. Methoden und Konturen eines neuen Forschungsfeldes*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2010. ISBN 978-3-89942-814-8.
- BIEDERMANN, Bernadette. Exploring the meaning of objects and communicating museality as challenge for museological methodology. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2014–2015, no. 14-15, pp. 15–26. ISSN 1615-5254.
- BIEDERMANN Bernadette and Nikolaus REISINGER. Die Stadt als Lebensraum und museale Inszenierung zwischen Erinnerung, Assoziation und Wahrnehmung. Am Beispiel der Grazer Altstadt. *Curiositas. Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2012–2013, no. 12-13, pp. 129–148. ISSN 1615-5254.
- BUCHLI, Victor (ed.). *The Material Culture Reader*. Oxford, New York: Berg, 2002. ISBN 1-85973-554-1.
- CARBONELL, Bettina M. (ed.). *Museum Studies. An Anthology of Contexts*. New York: Wiley, 2012. ISBN 978-1-4051-7381-0.
- DESVALLÈES, Andre and Francois MAIR-ESSE (eds.). *Key Concepts of Museology* [online]. Paris: Armand Collin, 2010, pp. 53–56 [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/pdf/Key\\_Concepts\\_of\\_Museology/Museologie\\_Anglais\\_BD.pdf](http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/Key_Concepts_of_Museology/Museologie_Anglais_BD.pdf)>. ISBN 978-2-200-25398-1.
- DOLÁK, Jan and Jana VAVŘÍKOVÁ. *Museolog Z. Z. Stránský. Život a dílo*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2006. ISBN 80-210-4139-0.
- GLUZIŃSKI, Wojciech. *Problemy współczesnego muzealnictwa*. Warszawa, 1963.
- GRAMMEL, Soren. *Ausstellungsautoren-schaft. Die Konstruktion der auktorialen Position des Kurators bei Harald Szeemann. Eine Mikroanalyse*. Frankfurt am Main: König, 2005.
- HANAK-LETTNER, Werner. *Die Ausstellung als Drama. Wie das Museum aus dem Theater entstand*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2011. ISBN 978-3-8376-1600-2.
- HEESEN, Anke te. *Dingwelten. Das Museum als Erkenntnisort*. Köln, Weimar, Wien: Böhlau, 2005. Schriften des Deutschen Hygiene-Museums Dresden 4. ISBN 3-412-16604-9.
- KIRSCH, Otakar. Vysokoškolská výuka muzeologie v Brně v době normalizace a nástupu demokratického režimu. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 12–20. ISSN 1805-4722.
- KORFF, Gottfried. *Museumsdinge. Deponieren – Exponieren*. Köln, Weimar, Wien: Böhlau, 2007. ISBN 978-3-412-01506-0.
- Kratkij slovar' muzejnych terminov*. Moskva, 1974.
- MACDONALDS, Sharon. *Behind the Scenes at the Science Museum*. Oxford: Berg, 2002. ISBN 1-85973-566-5.
- MAROEVIĆ, Ivo. *Introduction to Museology*. München: Müller-Straten, 1998. ISBN 3-932704-52-5.
- MARSTINE, Janet. Introduction. In MARSTINE, Janet. *New Museum Theory and Practice. An Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006, pp. 1–36. ISBN 1405105585.
- MARTINZ-TUREK, Charlotte and Monika SOMMER-SIEGHART. *Storyline. Narrationen im Museum*. Wien: Turia&Kant, 2009. Schnittpunkt, Ausstellungstheorie und Praxis, Band 2. ISBN 978-3-85132-547-8.
- MENSCH, Peter van. Museology as a scientific basis for the museum profession. In MENSCH, Peter van (ed.). *Professionalising the Muses*. Amsterdam: AHA Books – Art History Architecture, 1989. ISBN 90-5246-013-2.
- MENSCH, Peter van. Museality at breakfast. The concept of museality in contemporary museological discourse. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 14–19. ISSN 1805-4722.
- MRÁZOVÁ, Lenka and Lucie JAGOŠOVÁ. Obsahové proměny kurikula brněnské muzeologie v letech 1964–2014. *Museo-*

- logica Brunensia*, 2014, no. 3, pp. 28–42. ISSN 1805-4722.
- MÜLLER-STRATEN, Christian. The Contribution of Zbynek Z. Stransky to Museology within the Frame of the Brno Museology School. *Museum aktuell*, Januar 2007, pp. 19–22. ISSN 1433-3848.
- NEUSTUPNÝ, Jiří. *Muzeum a věda*. Praha: Národní muzeum, 1968.
- NEUSTUPNÝ, Jiří. Die Museologie als wissenschaftliche Disziplin. In *Museologische Forschung in der ČSSR*. Berlin: Institut für Museumswesen, 1980, pp. 207–212.
- PEARCE, Susan M. Museum Studies in Material Culture. In PEARCE, Susan M. (ed.). *Museum Studies in Material Culture*. London: Leicester University Press, 1989, pp. 1–10. ISBN 0-7185-1288-X.
- PEARCE, Susan M. *Museums, Objects and Collections. A Cultural Study*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992. ISBN 978-0-7185-1442-6.
- POMIAN, Krzysztof. *Der Ursprung des Museums. Vom Sammeln*. Berlin: Wagenbach, 1988. Kleine kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliothek 9. ISBN 3-8031-5109-0.
- POPPER, Karl. *Logik der Forschung*. 9th ed. Tübingen, 1989 [Wien: Julius Springer, 1935]. Die Einheit der Gesellschaftswissenschaften. Studien in den Grenzbereichen der Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften, vol. 4. ISBN 3-16-345485-2.
- REISINGER, Nikolaus. Musealisierung als Theorem der Museologie. Zur Musealisierung von Großobjekten und Landschaften am Beispiel der Eisenbahn und des „Südbahnmuseums Mürzzuschlag“. *Curi- ositas: Jahrbuch für Museologie und museale Quellenkunde*, 2012–2013, no. 12–13, pp. 55–68. ISSN 1615-5254.
- RIVIÈRE, George H. The museum – the intensification of scientific research and the growth of art production. In *International symposium on museums in the contemporary world*. Paris: UNESCO, 1969.
- RUTAR, Václav. Vznik, vývoj a práce externí katedry muzeologie v Brně v letech 1963–1969. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, vol. 3, pp. 4–11. ISSN 1805-4722.
- ŠOLA, Tomislav. *Essays on Museums and their Theory. Towards the cybernetic museum*. Helsinki: Finnish Museums Association, 1997. ISBN 951-9426-18-3. ISSN 1239-9841.
- VIEREGER, Hildegard. *Museumswissenschaften*. Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink, UTB, 2006. ISBN 978-3-8252-2823-1.
- WALZ, Markus (ed.). *Handbuch Museum: Geschichte, Aufgaben, Perspektiven*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2016. ISBN 978-3-476-02375-9.

## Internet

- CIDOC Conceptual Reference Model* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <<http://www.cidoc-crm.org/>>.
- ICOFOM: ICOM International Committee for Museology* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <<http://network.icom.museum/icofom>>.
- ICOM Curricula Guidelines for Museum Professional Development* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/pdf/professions/curricula\\_eng.pdf](http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/professions/curricula_eng.pdf)>.
- Member of H-MUSEUM Advisory Board. Prof. Dr. Friedrich Waidacher. In *H-Museum* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <<https://www.h-net.org/~museum/waidacher.html>>.
- Museologie. In *Hochschule für Technik, Wirtschaft und Kultur Leipzig* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <<http://www.htwk-leipzig.de/de/studieninteressierte/studienangebot/bachelor/museologie/>>.
- Museologie und Museumswissenschaft. In *Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[http://www.museologie.uni-wuerzburg.de/aktuelles\\_und\\_termine/](http://www.museologie.uni-wuerzburg.de/aktuelles_und_termine/)>.
- Studienschwerpunkt Kulturmanagement. In *Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <<https://geschichte.uni-graz.at/de/allgemeine-geschichte-der-neuzeit/lehre-studium/studienschwerpunkt-kulturmanagement/>>.
- Zbynek Zbyslav Stránský. In *Wikipedie: Otevřená encyklopedie* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-06]. Available from www: <[https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zbyn%C4%9Bk\\_Zbyslav\\_Str%C3%A1nsk%C3%BD](https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zbyn%C4%9Bk_Zbyslav_Str%C3%A1nsk%C3%BD)>.

## BERNADETTE BIEDERMANN

Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, Institut für Geschichte, Universitätsmuseen, Graz, Österreich  
 bernadette.biedermann@uni-graz.at

Bernadette Biedermann started to study History of art and Art management (Applied cultural studies) at the University of Graz in 1999. During her studies already she mainly focused on the fields of General museology. She completed her studies in 2004 with a thesis about museum communication forms on the example of exhibition texts.

Afterwards she wrote her doctoral thesis (2004–2007) dealing with collection history of the “Museum of Cultural History and Applied Arts” of the Landesmuseum Joanneum (published in 2009). At the same time she began to work as co-curator at the Joanneum. Among her activities, besides inventorying of collectibles, also was preparing a museological museum collections thesaurus. Since winter term 2010 she is employed as a lecturer at the University of Graz. Within the combined field of study “Cultural management/ Applied cultural studies” she is responsible for lectures in Theoretical museology. Besides this she also participate in various research projects. She coordinates the digitalisation process of the collections of university museums at the University of Graz from a museological perspective. Her research and publication activities are mainly focused on following topics: theoretical museology, forms of museum presentation and communication, museum documentation standards as well as enriching applied museum work by methods of digital humanities.

Bernadette Biedermann studovala od roku 1999 dějiny umění a umělecký management (aplikovaná kulturologie) na Univerzitě ve Štýrském Hradci. Už během studia se zaměřovala hlavně na oblast obecné muzeologie. Svá studia ukončila v roce 2004 diplomovou

prací o formách muzejní komunikace na příkladu textů k výstavám. Poté napsala doktorskou disertaci (2004–2007) pojednávající o historii sbírek Muzea kulturních dějin a užitého umění v rámci Landesmuseum Joanneum (vyšlo v roce 2009). Tou dobou začala v tomto muzeu pracovat jako kurátorka. Věnovala se inventarizaci a tezuraci sbírkových předmětů. Od zimního semestru 2010 přednáší na Univerzitě ve Štýrském Hradci. V rámci kombinovaného studia v oboru kulturního managementu a aplikované kulturologie přednáší teoretickou muzeologii. Kromě toho se také podílí na různých výzkumných projektech. Participuje také na koordinaci digitalizace sbírek univerzitních muzeí na Univerzitě ve Štýrském Hradci. Její výzkumné a publikační aktivity se zaměřují hlavně na teoretickou muzeologii, formy muzejní prezentace a komunikace, standardy pro muzejní dokumentaci anebo rozvoj aplikované muzejní práce digitálními metodami v humanitních vědách.



## STUDIE/ARTICLES

## REMARKS ON THE ROLE OF Z. Z. STRÁNSKÝ IN CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE CURRICULUM OF BRNO MUSEOLOGY

DOI: 10.5817/MuB2016-2-7

LENKA MRÁZOVÁ

## ABSTRACT/ABSTRAKT:

It is beyond doubt that besides Jan Jelínek, Zbyněk Z. Stránský was another key person decisive for the development of Brno museology. His theoretical system still today forms the basic pillar of the curriculum of professional museology studies in Brno. The analysis of gradual forming of museology studies at the Brno university attests not only to Z. Z. Stránský's enthusiasm for the museological field, but mainly to thoroughness with which he approached the creation of curriculum with regard to its functionality, laying the focus on continuous updating of the educational system established. The history of Brno museology is already quite well-documented, so that the primary purpose of this text is not to supplement the factual account but rather turn attention to individual crucial moments in the course of formation of its educational system as anchored in the approach by Z. Z. Stránský.

## Poznámky k roli osobnosti

## Z. Z. Stránského ve vývoji obsahové koncepce brněnské muzeologie

Není pochyb o tom, že Zbyněk Z. Stránský byl, vedle Jana Jelínka, klíčovou a ve vývoji brněnské muzeologie určující osobností. Jeho teoretický systém dodnes tvoří základní pilíř obsahu odborného studia muzeologie v Brně. Analýza postupného formování muzeologických studií na brněnské univerzitě

svědčí nejen o vlastním zápalu Z. Z. Stránského pro obor muzeologie, ale zejména o důkladnosti, s jakou přistupoval k tvorbě kurikula ve vztahu k jeho funkčnosti a s důrazem na neustálou aktualizaci nastaveného vzdělávacího systému. Historie brněnské muzeologie je již poměrně dobře zpracována, záměrem předkládaného textu tak primárně není doplnit faktografickou linii jako spíše upozornit na zásadní dílčí momenty k formování jejího výukového schématu v přístupu Z. Z. Stránského.

## KEYWORDS/KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA:

Z. Z. Stránský – curriculum – museology – museum work

Z. Z. Stránský – kurikulum – muzeologie – muzejnictví

*“Our Chair was established after 1962 and it had to overcome many obstacles of its own crystallisation and programme maturation process. We had no possibility to adopt experiences or follow an already verified organisational and educational model. We were among the first ones in Europe and had therefore to search for our own, original way. This was demanding both from a pedagogical and from a professional point of view, because museology itself was until then a too insufficiently funded and constituted discipline to be able to serve in this condition as an immediate base for teaching. This is why the realisation of the educational programme was only possible on the basis of an intensive scientific, research*

*and documentation work. Thereby we created a system of knowledge, which eventually became the expression of our conception of museology and determined the overall character of our Chair as well.”*

Jan Jelínek<sup>1</sup>

The opening citation foreshadows very well the way, which from the point of view of the authors of the first curriculum of Brno museology had to be passed in the course of formation of the Chair as an original scientific department. Our main aim is to draw attention to this aspect of professional work of both of the founding personalities and remember some moments in the personal and philosophic approach by Zbyněk Z. Stránský, which were decisive for the appearance of the Brno museology studies.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> JELÍNEK, Jan. Předmluva. In STRÁNSKÝ, Z. *Z. Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filosofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1972, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> The Brno museological department started its activity in 1963, initially as an external chair of the then Jan Evangelista Purkyně University (present-day Masaryk University) working at the Moravian Museum. Postgraduate studies were opened in the academic year 1965/1966. This external chair was then affiliated to the Chair of Prehistory in the early 1970s. Subsequently, in 1977, after emergence of the Chair of Archaeology and Museology, predecessor of what is now the Department of Archaeology and Museology, Faculty of Arts, it became an internal university department. Within the scope of the Department of Archaeology and Museology currently works a separate Centre of Museology, whose integral part also became the UNESCO Chair of Museology and World Heritage, which was founded with Stránský's support in 1994. In the 1990s, together with social changes and new legal regulations of university studies, postgraduate studies gradually changed into specialization studies and the museology studies were subsequently extended by full-time and combined modes of study.

### Theory vs. empiricism

In the introduction to the first edition of his 1972 textbook *Introduction to Museology*, Zbyněk Z. Stránský speaks about a wider context of emergence of the Chair and emphasizes that its founding is part of the experienced contemporaneous necessity to pass over from mere practical conception of museum work to consolidation of the discipline on the basis of a scientific theory.<sup>3</sup> Stránský was very sensitive towards this polemic between the theoretical and the purely empirical approach to the discipline and his argumentation supporting the scientific view of the world and museum work thus represented the beginning of formation of the curriculum of Brno museology as well as the origins of Stránský's theoretical system of museology. The founding of the Chair fluently followed previous theoretical activity in the field of museology, but the discipline itself needed to obtain a more stable foundations both in academic and in museum milieu. The discussion about recognition of the discipline accompanied the whole origins of museology tuition in Brno and Z. Z. Stránský and his co-workers strived to cope actively with this situation. So it came that Brno hosted the first museological symposium in 1965, which offered a platform for professional discussion about the concept of museology as an independent discipline versus a set of "service" techniques for individual disciplines, which find employment in museums with regard to content of the collections treated. The aim of the symposium was not only to make the widest possible community of museum workers familiar with the problems of museology and demonstrate the topicality of these problems in association with contacts established abroad, but also to create a community of engaged

museologists and museum professionals for the purpose of further theoretical and creative work in the given field. The symposium was conceived as a meeting targeted at particular goals and it was expected to yield clear strategic knowledge which would help to support further development of the discipline, as it is evidenced by a thorough preparation of source materials submitted to the attendants registered. Among them was "*introductory material, which was intended for basic orientation. It draw attention to relevant literature, foreshadowed the possible solution and, above all, defined the two fundamental questions of the symposium: A) The essence of museology and B) Museology as a field of university studies.*"<sup>4</sup> The openness towards a broader interdisciplinary discussion about the formation of museology as an independent discipline, as well as the effort in mutual inspiration and logical interconnection, are also evidenced by invitation of colleagues from another disciplines – archival research and library science, which are closely linked with museology and which underwent successfully an analogous theoretical development of the discipline as well as constitution of university education. The discussion and the effort to capture the attention of a wider professional museum community were successful and, as expected, very stimulating for further work on the development of museology as an independent discipline. The papers presented reflected the confrontation of contradictory points of view, terminological and methodical ambiguity, and pointed to the lack of specialists who are able to solve the problems in wider gno-seological, methodological, philosophical and other aspects, or to the isolation of Czech museum milieu from current development in the world. Herewith we mainly mean

the isolation in the sense of possible knowledge of topical trends and questions solved in association with development of museological theory abroad.<sup>5</sup> Z. Z. Stránský continued to pay attention to the discussion and defence of scientific character of the discipline, and the need to clarify and explain the relationship between what he termed museology and museography accompanied almost all of the conceptual texts by Stránský dealing with the problems of museology.

### Museology in relation to the other disciplines

The discussion about museology as not only a practical, but rightly also a theoretical field, is also associated with Stránský's patiently held polemic about the relationship of museology to the other disciplines, which are present in the museum work by their employment in museum collections. The fact that museology was until then insufficiently anchored in the field of science and education and that its significance has been underrated among the museum workers was usually explained by an insufficient understanding of the content of the discipline. Stránský in his texts mainly drew attention to erroneous assumptions about competences which are necessary to carry out professional museum work. Museum workers were often top experts in their own disciplines, but as regards the professional museum competences, their knowledge and methodology acquired during university studies did not made them prepared for such a work. Professional museum competences were then acquired gradually, non-systematically and only in the empirical sphere. This obtaining of experience directed towards a truly competent museum worker was usually also determined

3 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. Úvod do muzeologie. Brno: Filosofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1972, p. 4.

4 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálů prvního muzeologického symposia Brno – 1965*. Brno: Moravské muzeum v Brně, 1966, p. 3.

5 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálů prvního muzeologického symposia Brno – 1965*. Brno: Moravské muzeum v Brně, 1966, p. 4.

by personal interest of the one or another individual. Systematic museum work, according to Stránský, was also hindered by a mix of professional scientific systems applied to museum practice without any unifying museological base.<sup>6</sup> This polemic about the relationship of museology to the other disciplines employed in museums, however, is not only related to the defence of necessity of theoretical perception of museum processes, but is also tightly associated with the original form of the curriculum of Brno museology. During elaboration of the curriculum it was necessary to take into account that the museological theory in Czech milieu is rather regarded as museography. Maybe the most distinctive advocate of this approach, the Prague archaeologist and museologist Jiří Neustupný, regarded the museum institution itself as the focal point of interest of museological theory. For him, museology was not a science but theory and technique derived from professional scientific work in museums, that is, from the so-called special museologies of individual disciplines employed in museums. General museology, according to Neustupný, directly emerges from generalisation of the knowledge of these individual disciplines and from finding a sort of common base in this knowledge.<sup>7</sup> Despite an evident controversy between the opinions by Neustupný and Stránský (on the one hand museology as a generalisation of special museologies, and on the other hand museology as a specific, entirely independent approach to perception of reality, which should be the basic foundations on which the systems of individual disciplines are resting as

a superstructure), both museologists cooperated in mutual respect, striving to shift the development in the field of museology forward through the medium of university education. The first curriculum of Brno museology, even though it was an effective compilation of opinions by both of the above personalities, reflects to a considerable extent schematically the original system by Neustupný: the curriculum is divided into general museology, which includes topics like the essence of museums, museology, history of documentation theory, thesaurisation and presentation or international and national museum organisations; and into special museologies, that is, museology of geological sciences, museology of biological sciences, museology of prehistory, museology of history, museology of ethnography, museology of history of art, and museology of literary science and musicology (academic year 1964/1965).<sup>8</sup>

#### Curriculum as a result of scientific organisation of the discipline

A moment which formed in the most significant way the teaching scheme of Brno museology is represented by Stránský's conviction that education in the field of museology must be based on its scientific organisation. His work on the system of Brno museology tuition therefore cannot be separated from the work on his own concept of the system of museology as a science. In this connection we can follow up several another very important formative factors.

**Stránský's original professional orientation and multi-spectral education** (philosophy, history, musicology) shielded the emerging theory from the point of view of the range of knowledge and academic erudition; **deep knowledge of the development of museums, museum work and museological ideas as well as a complex knowledge of available museological literature** enabled Stránský to analyse the situation in the discipline and name the so far unsolved theoretical problems. In his textbooks and other introductory texts, as well as in his inaugural dissertation, Zbyněk Z. Stránský refers very conceptually to selected milestones in the course of history of museums; the connection between philosophical thinking and the knowledge of history of the discipline together with the ability to extract just those critical moments of museological thinking, which shifted the discipline and the needs of museology teaching gradually closer towards scientific conception, formed the background of Stránský's theory. He also explored the **study requirements** in the opinions by J. Graesse or J. Leisching as well as in the orientation of École du Louvre, and continued the analysis further until the present by parallel mentions of international and Czech development.<sup>9</sup> Thereafter he refined his opinion on the form of museology teaching by a **critical comparative analysis of the content of contemporaneous forms of museum educational programmes** in the effort to find the optimal form of university studies.<sup>10</sup> Education in any discipline, according to Stránský, is only meaningful when it brings something own and original

6 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filosofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1972, p. 6, see also STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filosofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1979, pp. 7–8 etc.

7 NEUSTUPNÝ, Jiří. *Otázky dnešního muzejnictví. Příspěvky k obecné a speciální muzeologii*. Praha: Orbis, 1950, p. 9.

8 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálů prvního muzeologického sympozia Brno – 1965*. Brno: Moravské muzeum v Brně, 1966, p. 16, see also MRÁZOVÁ, Lenka and Lucie JAGOŠOVÁ. *Obsahové proměny kurikula brněnské muzeologie v letech 1964–2014*. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, no. 3, p. 32, tab. 1, further e.g. SCHNEIDER, Evžen. *Specifické vzdělávání muzejních pracovníků a jeho usoustavnění v ČR*. *Muzeologické sešity: Supplementum* 3, 1985, pp. 85–126.

9 E. g. STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filosofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1972 or STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *De Museologia. Metateoretická studie k základům muzeologie jako vědy*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, 1992, 300 p. Inaugural dissertation, etc.

10 In detail see e. g. STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filosofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1972 etc.

and enriches our knowledge both practically and theoretically.<sup>11</sup> The effort to find reflection of this belief in contemporaneous educational courses in museology made Stránský define the problematic aspects of museology tuition. Most determining in this regard is according to him again the encounter of two approaches to formation of the educational programme, that is, on the one hand the effort to develop the teaching at the level of theoretical application, on the other hand the learning of methods and techniques of museum work. Stránský referred to the persisting fear that the preference of theory would separate the teaching from practice and diminish therewith its benefits for museum work, and he regarded this fear as misapprehension of the difference between the museological and museographic orientation of the approach to museum reality.<sup>12</sup> He noticed very well that the emergency of teaching “showcaseology” is a frequent argument against museology tuition in universities and he pointed out that the existing state of museology education at that time, which rather worked with practical approach where the content of teaching is as good as identical with the profile of museum activity and is focused on providing a basic orientation in museum activities,<sup>13</sup> is to a certain extent also determined by the present state of the theoretical basis of museology. According to Stránský “*The formation of educational programmes is an equally demanding process as the constitution of museology as a possible discipline.*”

11 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1972, p. 15.

12 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1972, p. 21.

13 The educational programme, which was elaborated in the 1960s by the newly established International Committee for the Training of Personnel (ICTOP) at ICOM, also was blamed by Z. Z. Stránský for its practical orientation and absence of theory, see e.g. STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1972, pp. 13 and 21.

*Both tasks are interconnected and determine one another.*”<sup>14</sup> **The urge to find an own specific range of knowledge as well as adequate forms and methods of museology studies**<sup>15</sup> connected with developmental and methodological level of contemporary science became the focal point of work of the Brno Chair, and Zbyněk Z. Stránský perceived this specific range of knowledge as an indispensable qualitative prerequisite of museum work.<sup>16</sup> Its formulation as well as the build-up of the curriculum of Brno museology were characterised by Stránský’s **meticulous work with terminology**, which gradually resulted in elaboration of professional meta-language.

Gradual integration of Stránský’s theory into the educational system of Brno museology can be followed up in continuous changes of the curriculum.<sup>17</sup> The educational scheme was thoroughly divided into the museological part and the museographic part. In relation to the original system, whose focal point rested in special museologies, these two parts gradually became balanced. Thanks to presence of a unifying theoretical base in many courses of the museographic part we can gradually even notice a slight prevalence of theory. However, in accordance with the above-mentioned opinion by Stránský about the necessity of a mutual

14 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1972, p. 22.

15 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1972, p. 22.

16 STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1972, p. 25.

17 E.g. PERNIČKA, Radko Martin. Proces realizace a zkvalitňování postgraduálního studia muzeologie na filozofické fakultě UJEP v Brně. *Muzeologické sešity: Supplementum* 3, 1985, pp. 71–84 or SCHNEIDER, Evžen. Specifické vzdělávání muzejních pracovníků a jeho usoustavnění v ČSR. *Muzeologické sešity: Supplementum* 3, 1985, pp. 85–126, further also MRÁZOVÁ, Lenka and Lucie JAGOŠOVÁ. Obsahové proměny kurikula brněnské muzeologie v letech 1964–2014. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, no. 3, pp. 28–42.

determination of theory and practice, the practical viability of graduates in the museum milieu was in no way harmed. When we turn back to the content of the then Brno educational system (1970s and 1980s), it reflected the development of theory by changes in the structure and strengthening of the theoretical part. The curriculum was divided into A. *profile courses* (museological part) and B. *professional specialisation courses* (museographic part). Profile courses were subdivided into two blocks – a) *courses in general basics* focused on general context of scientific work and cultural policy and the position of museums in this system, and b) *courses in general museology* which included the introduction to museology, history of museums, introduction to museography, as well as courses like Theory of museum selection, Theory of museum thesaurisation or Theory of museum communication. The professional specialisation courses were then subdivided thematically into three blocks – a) *Special issues of general museology*, b) *Special museology* and c) *Related disciplines*. Within the block of special museology, the learners chose lectures according to their professional orientation in disciplines employed in museums (for example geology, botany, history, etc.) and within the block of courses in related disciplines they paid attention to disciplines which are interacting somehow with museology (for example the above-mentioned archival research and library science, but also informatics, statistics, pedagogical psychology or sociological research, etc.). The courses in special issues of general museology, even though dedicated to particular procedures of museum work (such as, for example, the courses Organisation and management of museums, Basics of museum conservation, Description of collection items...but also Museum as an institution, Visual principles of museum presentation, etc.), exhibited at the same time a certain

degree of generalisation in a specific perception of the world through the medium of Stránský's museological theory.<sup>18</sup>

In the 1990s, when the previously established postgraduate museology studies were supplemented by the newly opened programme of full-time studies in this field at the Masaryk University, the structure of teaching already bears a clear imprint of Stránský's system. When we take into consideration only the main study areas, we can find in the structure of postgraduate studies following categories of courses: *A. Extended basics of sciences, B. Metamuseology, C. Historical museology, D. Social museology* and *E. General museology*, which is subdivided into courses in *a) theoretical museology* and *b) applied museology (museography)*, as well as *F. Particular museologies* and *G. Accessories*. The full-time studies follow more or less this arrangement, only the names of individual study areas are changed, that is *A. General basics, B. Metamuseology, C. Museology* subdivided into the courses in *a) historical museology, b) social museology* and *c) theoretical museology, D. Museography, E. Special museology, F. Related disciplines* and *G. Tutorials*.<sup>19</sup> The concept of studies created in the 1990s represented the last modification of the museological teaching scheme of the Brno museology school, in which Zbyněk Z. Stránský participated before his departure from the Brno university. Despite some partial updates, Strán-

ský's theoretical system of museology and his concept of studies in this field still form the base of museological studies in Brno.

### Evaluation and discussion

The conceptual and systematic approach by Z. Z. Stránský and his colleagues to the profile of curriculum of Brno museology was also reflected in regular evaluation activities and in permanent effort to spark off professional discussion reflecting the study results, opinions by participating pedagogues, the needs of students for practice (until the 1990s the follow-up postgraduate education of museum workers) and, last but not least, the integration of contemporaneous current development in the field of museology, museums and museology teaching. The study itself and the proposals for its partial modifications were reflected continuously and the study, mainly at the beginning, has been modified on the basis of primary evaluation by pedagogues and students.<sup>20</sup> However, this internal university evaluation was not the only activity of the Chair reflecting the Brno studies and the museology education in general. Zbyněk Z. Stránský with his co-workers were very well aware of the necessity to interlink the museology tuition at universities with the widest possible professional discussion among scientific workers, the importance of stimulating their interest, activity and willingness to participate. They were also aware of the necessity to share the knowledge and experience on an international scale, because only a wider professional discussion can help to win general recognition of museology studies as a prereq-

uisite of an active practising of the museum profession.

The primary activity which reflected the current state of the discipline, mainly in the then Czechoslovakia, and at the same time searched for impulses to an optimal setup of the system of museology tuition in the Brno university, was the above-mentioned first museological symposium organised by the Chair in March 1965. The engagement and interest in searching for a wider and conceptual solution were expressed by the all-European meeting of teachers in museology studies in the autumn of 1967, which was organised by the Chair in Brno under the auspices of ICOM. The meeting followed up the effort to solve the problems of museology tuition, which was presented in the 1965 ICOM general conference in New York and gave an impulse to establish the International Committee for the Training of Personnel at ICOM. This Committee was constituted in the next ICOM general conference in 1968 with the aim to support and pursue museology tuition at universities and other forms of education of museum workers as a prerequisite of professional development of the museum work. The Chair impersonated its share in the activities of this Committee through the medium of Jan Jelínek<sup>21</sup> and its active participation declared an evident effort of the Chair members to set the system of museology tuition in Brno into the context of general international development and contribute with own professional activity actively to the conceptualisation of museological education. Besides these international activities of the Chair in forming the profile of the general optimal scope of museological education, it is possible to follow up another continuous internal

<sup>18</sup> Cited after MRÁZOVÁ, Lenka and Lucie JAGOŠOVÁ. *Obsahové proměny kurikula brněnské muzeologie v letech 1964–2014. Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, no. 3, p. 33, tab. 2. See also PERNÍČKA, Radko Martin. *Proces realizace a zkvalitňování postgraduálního studia muzeologie na filozofické fakultě UJEP v Brně. Muzeologické sešity: Supplementum 3*, 1985, pp. 71–72 or SCHNEIDER, Evžen. *Specifické vzdělávání muzejních pracovníků a jeho usoustavnění v ČSR. Muzeologické sešity: Supplementum 3*, 1985, pp. 90–91.

<sup>19</sup> Cited after MRÁZOVÁ, Lenka and Lucie JAGOŠOVÁ. *Obsahové proměny kurikula brněnské muzeologie v letech 1964–2014. Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, no. 3, p. 33, tab. 5, in this text it is possible to find a detailed comparison of educational programmes in individual time periods.

<sup>20</sup> See e.g. MRÁZOVÁ, Lenka and Lucie JAGOŠOVÁ. *Obsahové proměny kurikula brněnské muzeologie v letech 1964–2014. Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, no. 3, p. 32.

<sup>21</sup> E.g. STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1972, pp. 13–14 etc.

evaluation activities of the Chair associated with a wider discussion and subsequent modifications of the system of Brno museology studies. *“The transfer under the auspices of the university is also associated with other reflection of the curriculum, which was discussed in a meeting of all pedagogues in postgraduate museology studies organised on 30 March 1977.”*<sup>22</sup> *The aim of this meeting was the assessment of previous development of museological education, the effort to find possibilities of how to publish study texts, and above all a discussion about possible proposals and recommendations for potential modifications of the curriculum. [...] Another modification of the curriculum of postgraduate museology studies, based on reflection and evaluation of previous experiences in accordance with present general development of museological education, was put into practice after a meeting of external pedagogues and cooperating institutions on 12 February 1981.”*<sup>23</sup> The meeting retrospectively assessed the past three runs of postgraduate museology studies with regard to fluent operation of teaching and study achievements of graduates, and above all reflected in a wide discussion the functionality and contentual concept of the 6th and 7th run based on written comments by participating peda-

<sup>22</sup> Cf. *Archive of DAM, Centre of Museology* (Department of Archaeology and Museology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic) (unsystematized), folder *Studium muzeologie* (obecně) – evaluace, osnovy přednášek, studijní plány, subfolder *Evaluace, vědecká činnost pracovníků katedry muzeologie. Úpravy studijního plánu postgraduálního studia muzeologie* (with an accompanying letter from 7. 7. 1977).

<sup>23</sup> See *Archive of DAM, Centre of Museology* (Department of Archaeology and Museology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic) (unsystematized), folder *Dohody 94/95, výkazy + mix*, subfolder *Organizace a učitelé postgraduálního studia muzeologie, Zasedání učitelů PSM 12. 2. 1981*. Cf. *Archive of DAM, Centre of Museology* (Department of Archaeology and Museology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic) (unsystematized), subfolder *Muzeologický seminář Cikháj 1983. Vývoj výukového programu postgraduálního studia muzeologie (podklad)/ Podkladový materiál pro muzeologický seminář v Cikháji ve dnech 2.–5. V. 1983/*.

gogues.<sup>24</sup> The interest in opinions of the other participants in museology teaching, including students, and the openness towards discussion were successful activators of museologists and museum workers who declared their interest in the discipline and willingness to participate in the development of the discipline and the study itself, which is also attested by the organising of professional museological seminars for graduates and students since the 1980s. These seminars, requested by graduates from the Brno Chair, already were beyond the scope of normal tuition and were targeted at mediation and processing of topical trends and discussions on the development of museological theory and practice.<sup>25</sup> We mention these seminars intentionally among the discussion and evaluation activities, because they reflected the interest of graduates in a continuous supplementing of knowledge, and their openness towards students of Brno museology improved at the same time the quality of museology tuition. All the above-mentioned activities indisputably helped to maintain and enhance the quality of museology studies at the Brno university and they give evidence that the form of studies has been created very thoughtfully, methodically and systematically, not only with regard to own professional scientific results, but under purposeful and active participation of other experts and museum professionals, putting emphasis on international development.

<sup>24</sup> MRÁZOVÁ, Lenka and Lucie JAGOŠOVÁ. *Obsahové proměny kurikula brněnské muzeologie v letech 1964–2014. Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, no. 3, pp. 32–33.

<sup>25</sup> For more details on these seminars, whose tradition continued in the form of cooperation between the Centre of Museology of the Department of Archaeology and Museology at the Masaryk University, Museological Commission of the Czech Association of Museums and Galleries, and the Masaryk Museum in Hodonín, see e.g. MRÁZOVÁ, Lenka and Lucie JAGOŠOVÁ. *Obsahové proměny kurikula brněnské muzeologie v letech 1964–2014. Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, no. 3.

## Conclusion

Zbyněk Z. Stránský, as one of the key personalities in the Brno museology school, left an indelible trace in development of its educational scheme. His professional opinions, interdisciplinary overlap, international contacts as well as the ability to work systematically with topical trends significantly modelled not only the external form of this study, but mainly its content. The initial resolution, which was made by the team preparing the constitution of the Chair, that is, the creation of an own scientific system of knowledge which the curriculum of Brno museology should have followed up and which should have been interconnected with a wider museological and museum community as well as with topical development in the discipline on an international scale, was fulfilled. The path to this own system represented a sequence of very concrete and systematic steps, which gradually profiled the study in a unique way. At the beginning was not only the conviction of founding personalities of the discipline at the Brno university that this study is necessary, but also their vision of formation of a theoretical base of museology and the awareness of wider overlaps of the discipline into the museum work. When we sum up the moments, which appear in the works by Zbyněk Z. Stránský in association with the conception of museology studies in Brno, we will get 1) a patient polemic between theoretical and purely empirical approach to the discipline, and the related 2) delimitation of museology towards the other disciplines engaged in museum institutions, as well as a justified conviction that 3) museological education must be based on scientific organisation of this discipline and, last but not least, a continuous and repeated 4) evaluation of the established system of tuition connected with activation of a wider museum

community and an open discussion on both national and international scale. These conceptually significant steps were supported by other competences and professional overlaps of Stránský, which gave him a wider insight and a detached view of the contentual range of the discipline, and enabled him to accomplish the intent of establishing the scientific system of museology. It mainly involved his a) original professional orientation and multi-spectral education, b) deep knowledge of previous development of the history of museums, museum work and museological thoughts, c) the knowledge of existing museological literature, d) systematic research into study requirements for museum professionals during the whole development, as well as e) critical comparative analysis of current forms of museum educational programmes, f) the urge to define the specific range of knowledge of museology studies, and g) the need to find forms and methods of teaching adequate to this range of knowledge, which are characterised by Stránský's h) meticulous work with specific professional terminology. Zbyněk Z. Stránský in the first edition of his Introduction to museology mentions at the same time that the way chosen by the team who is responsible for the constitution of the Brno Chair of Museology "might only be one of possible ways to the final goal."<sup>26</sup> About the textbook itself, which represents the primary summarisation of Stránský's complete view of the problem treated, he says in the end of the preface "It is the first attempt. I don't know how it will be received. I, however, believe that it fulfils its purpose when it helps to defend the position of museology in the sphere of science and education, and gets another students and professional workers involved in creative work within this discipline."<sup>27</sup> The

accomplishment of this mission is evidenced not only by the number of graduates from Brno museology,<sup>28</sup> but also by constantly extending activities of the Centre of Museology in Brno and the related UNESCO Chair of Museology and World Heritage, which are regarding the currently more than fifty-year-long tradition of museology at the Masaryk University as wealth but also as responsibility and opportunity to develop further the legacy by Zbyněk Z. Stránský and his colleagues, who were present at the birth of the then Chair of Museology.

#### SOURCES:

*Archive of DAM, Centre of Museology* (Department of Archaeology and Museology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic) (unsystematized).

BENEŠ, Josef. Poslání a úkoly regionálních muzeí. In *Muzeologická konference v Turnově 1966: Zpráva o průběhu jednání*. Turnov: Muzeum Českého ráje, 1966, pp. 48–59.

DOLÁK, Jan and Jana VAVŘÍKOVÁ. *Muzeolog Z. Z. Stránský: Život a dílo*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2006. ISBN 80-210-4139-0.

DOUŠA, Pavel. *Organizace českého muzejnictví 1945–1989: Systém řízení muzeí v zajetí politické ideologie*. Opava: Slezská univerzita v Opavě, Filosoficko-přírodovědecká fakulta, Ústav historie a muzeologie, 2005. 230 p. Dissertation. Supervisor Doc. PhDr. Karel Boženek, Ph.D.

DOUŠA, Pavel. Ústřední muzeologický kabinet 1955–1989. *Muzeum: muzejní a vlastivědná práce*, 2011, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 3–14. ISSN 1803-0386.

ENNENBACH, Wilhelm. Aphorismen zur Museologie. *Muzeologické sešity*, 1979, no. VII, pp. 1–8, supplement.

<sup>28</sup> At the time of the fiftieth anniversary of founding of the Brno museological department, the sources elaborated by workers of the Centre of Museology declare more than 250 graduates from postgraduate studies and more than 500 graduates from full-time studies. See e.g. MRÁZOVÁ, Lenka and Lucie JAGOŠOVÁ. Obsahové proměny kurikula brněnské muzeologie v letech 1964–2014. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, no. 3, ISSN 1805-4722, pp. 32–33 etc.

HANSLOK, Andreas. *Museologie und Archivwissenschaft in der DDR: Abgrenzung und Annäherung zweier Nachbarwissenschaften*. Marburg: Tectum, 2008. 208 p. ISBN 978-3-8288-9581-2.

HOLMAN, Pavel. Cesty brněnské muzeologie. In *Muzeologie na začátku třetího tisíciletí/Museology at the Beginning of the Third Milenium: sborník z mezinárodní konference Teorie a praxe 2008*. Brno: Technické muzeum v Brně, 2009, pp. 198–202. ISBN 978-80-86413-61-7.

HOLMAN, Pavel and Naďa URBÁNKOVÁ. Brněnská muzeologie v posledních deseti letech. In *Naše muzejnictví v minulém desetiletí čili Muzejnítkovo soužití s múzami, úředníky i zedníky: sborník přednášek ze semináře 21.–22. června 2001*. Hodonín: Masarykovo muzeum v Hodoníně, 2002, pp. 88–92.

ICOFOM Study Series (1983–2012). In *ICOM International Committee for Museology: Our Publications* [online]. Paris: ICOM, 2010 [cit. 2016-08-15]. Available from www: <<http://network.icom.museum/icofofom/publications/our-publications/>>.

JELÍNEK, Jan. Muzeologie a její výuka na vysokých školách. In *Sborník materiálů prvního muzeologického symposia: Brno – 1965*. Brno: Moravské muzeum, 1966, pp. 5–7.

KIRSCH, Otakar. Vysokoškolská výuka muzeologie v Brně v době normalizace a nástupu demokratického režimu. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 12–20. ISSN 1805-4722.

LEHMANNOVÁ, Martina. ICOM Czechoslovakia and Jan Jelínek. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 81–83. ISSN 1805-4722.

LÜHBE, H. Zeit-Verhältnisse. Über die veränderte Gegenwart von Zukunft und Vergangenheit. In ZACHARIAS, Wolfgang (ed.). *Zeitphänomen Musealisierung. Das Verschwinden der Gegenwart und die Konstruktion der Erinnerung*. Essen: Klartext-Verlagsges, 1990, pp. 40–49. ISBN 978-3-88474-604-2.

MRÁZOVÁ, Lenka and Lucie JAGOŠOVÁ. Obsahové proměny kurikula brněnské muzeologie v letech 1964–2014. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, no. 3, pp. 28–42. ISSN 1805-4722.

MÜLLER-STRATEN, Christian. The contribution of Zbyněk Stránský to museology

<sup>26</sup> STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1972, p. 5.

<sup>27</sup> STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1972, p. 5.

- and contribution of the Brno museology school. In *Muzealizace v soudobé společnosti a poslání muzeologie/Musealization in contemporary society and role of museology: Sborník ze symposia s mezinárodní účastí pořádaného při příležitosti životního jubilea tvůrce brněnské muzeologické školy Zbyňka Z. Stránského/Anthology from symposium with foreign participation in the occasion of anniversary of the founder of the Brno museology school Zbyněk Z. Stránský*. Praha: Asociace muzeí a galerií České republiky, 2008, s. 27–35. ISBN 978-80-86611-28-0.
- NEUSTUPNÝ, Jiří. *Muzeum a věda*. Praha: Kabinet muzejní a vlastivědné práce při Národním muzeu v Praze, 1968. Muzejní práce, no. 13.
- NEUSTUPNÝ, Jiří. *Otázky dnešního muzejnictví: Příspěvky k obecné a speciální muzeologii*. Praha: Orbis, 1950.
- NEUSTUPNÝ, Jiří. *Teorie ne návod k praxi*. In STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálů prvního muzeologického symposia Brno – 1965*. Brno: Moravské muzeum v Brně, 1966, pp. 18–19.
- PERNÍČKA, Radko Martin. *Proces realizace a zkvalitňování postgraduálního studia muzeologie na filozofické fakultě UJEP v Brně*. *Muzeologické sešity: Supplementum 3*, 1985, pp. 71–84.
- PODBORSKÝ, Vladimír. *Výuka muzeologie na Masarykově univerzitě*. In *Muzealizace v soudobé společnosti a poslání muzeologie/Musealization in contemporary society and role of museology: Sborník ze symposia s mezinárodní účastí pořádaného při příležitosti životního jubilea tvůrce brněnské muzeologické školy Zbyňka Z. Stránského/Anthology from symposium with foreign participation in the occasion of anniversary of the founder of the Brno museology school Zbyněk Z. Stránský*. Praha: Asociace muzeí a galerií České republiky, 2008, pp. 14–26. ISBN 978-80-86611-28-0.
- RUTAR, Václav. *Vznik, vývoj a práce externí katedry muzeologie v Brně v letech 1963–1969*. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, vol. 3, pp. 4–11. ISSN 1805-4722.
- SCHNEIDER, Evžen. *Specifické vzdělávání muzejních pracovníků a jeho usoustavnění v ČR*. *Muzeologické sešity: Supplementum 3*, 1985, pp. 85–126.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *De Museologia. Meta-teoretická studie k základům muzeologie jako vědy*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, 1992. 300 p. Inaugural dissertation.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Brno: education in museology: on the 10. anniversary of the foundation of the museological department of the Philos. fac. of the J. E. Purkyně University in Brno*. Brno: J. E. Purkyně University, 1974. 52 p.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Ist Museologie eine kommunistische Wissenschaft? Eine Entgegnung auf deutsche Einstellungen*. *Museum Aktuell*, 2001, no. 68 (April), pp. 2759–2760.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Metodologické otázky současnosti*. In *Muzeologické sešity*, 1974, no. 5, pp. 5–43.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Podstata muzeologie a její zařazení do vysokoškolského studia*. In STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálů prvního muzeologického symposia Brno – 1965*. Brno: Moravské muzeum v Brně, 1966, pp. 10–17.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Předmět muzeologie*. In STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálů prvního muzeologického symposia Brno – 1965*. Brno: Moravské muzeum v Brně, 1966, pp. 30–33.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Rozvoj muzeologické produkce a formování muzeologie jako svébytného oboru*. *Muzeologické sešity: Supplementum 3*, 1985, pp. 57–70.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálů prvního muzeologického symposia Brno – 1965*. Brno: Moravské muzeum v Brně, 1966.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1972. 115 p.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1979. 167 p.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Z. Z. *Úvod do muzeologie*. Brno: Filozofická fakulta University Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Brně, 1984. 167 p.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Úvod do studia muzeologie: Určeno pro posluchače International Summer School of Museology – ISSOM*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 1995. ISBN 80-210-0703-6.
- STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Úvod do studia muzeologie: Určeno pro posluchače International Summer School of Museology –*
- ISSOM. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2000. ISBN 80-210-1272-2.
- STRÁNSKÁ, Edita, STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Základy štúdia muzeológie*. Banská Štiavnica: Univerzita Mateja Bela, Fakulta prírodných vied, Katedra eko-muzeológie, 2000.
- VALÁŠKOVÁ, Lucie. *Brněnská muzeologie po roce 1990*. *Museologica Brunensia*, 2014, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 21–27. ISSN 1805-4722.

## LENKA MRÁZOVÁ

Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav archeologie a muzeologie, Oddělení muzeologie, UNESCO Chair of Museology and World Heritage, Brno, Česká republika  
mrazova.l@phil.muni.cz

Lenka Mrázová is fellow in the Museology Section and coordinator of activities of UNESCO Chair of Museology and World Heritage, Department of Archaeology and Museology Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University. She completed her studies in history, museology, and social pedagogy and counselling at the Faculty of Arts of the Masaryk University and in 2003 and 2004 she has worked as a museum pedagogue in the Museum of Romani Culture in Brno. Since 2004 she has been part-time lecturer and since 2015 she is fellow in the Museology Section of the Department of Archaeology and Museology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University. She is lecturer in further education courses of museum professionals and she co-operates as a methodologist and lecturer in educational projects for primary and secondary schools focused on history, civics or multicultural education. She is concerned with museum pedagogy, museum didactics and issues of museum and didactics interpretation.

Lenka Mrázová je asistentkou oddělení muzeologie a koordinátorkou činnosti Katedry UNESCO pro muzeologii a světové dědictví



Ústavu archeologie a muzeologie Filozofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity.

Absolvovala studium historie, muzeologie a sociální pedagogiky a poradenství na Filozofické fakultě Masarykovy univerzity a v letech 2003 až 2004 pracovala jako muzejní pedagog v Muzeu romské kultury o.p.s. v Brně. Od roku 2004 působila jako externí vyučující oddělení muzeologie Ústavu archeologie a muzeologie Filozofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity, od roku 2015 je interní asistentkou tohoto oddělení. Je lektorkou kurzů dalšího vzdělávání v oblasti muzeologie a muzejní edukace a jako metodik a lektor spolupracuje na vzdělávacích projektech pro základní a střední školy zaměřených na dějepis, výchovu k občanství nebo multikulturní výchovu. Věnuje se muzejní pedagogice, muzejní didaktice a problematice muzejní a didaktické interpretace.

## METODICKÉ A INFORMAČNÍ TEXTY/ METHODICAL AND INFORMATIVE TEXTS

# EIN UNERSETZBARER. ZUM ABLEBEN VON ZBYNĚK Z. STRÁNSKÝ

DOI: 10.5817/MuB2016-2-8

FRIEDRICH WAIDACHER

Es ist schwer, einem Freund wie ihm nachzurufen. Zu tief waren persönliche und fachliche Sympathie, um noch einen abgehobenen objektiven Standpunkt einnehmen zu können. Zwar habe ich vor einem Dezennium mein Skriptorium endgültig geschlossen, will aber den Nachkommenden doch einen Brief schreiben.

„Das muss man analysieren!“ lautete seine Forderung, der er auch selbst stets mit unerbittlicher Strenge nachkam. Da er faules Denken, *ratio pigra*, nicht ertragen konnte, trat er dagegen stets kompromisslos auf und brauchte demnach über einen Mangel an Feinden nicht zu klagen. Als wir einmal gemeinsam an einer Tagung im Norden Europas teilnahmen, beleidigte er in öffentlicher Diskussion gleich mehrere Diskutanten, indem er ihre Denkfehler schonungslos offenlegte. Dann schwieg er trotzig. Ich übernahm seine Verteidigung und erklärte in einfachen Schritten, was er gemeint hatte. Dabei war er der lebenswürdigste Mensch, aufmerksam, höflich, humorvoll; nur als Philosoph kannte er keine Gnade.

Unser erstes Zusammentreffen fand 1980, in der Mitte unseres Lebens, in einem Nachbarland statt. Dort waren wir als Vertreter unserer jeweiligen Muttersprachen zu einem grotesken Projekt geladen, das schließlich nach vielen Jahren zu einem unbrauchbaren Resultat führte. Da schon die Anlage des Unternehmens von Inkompetenz geprägt war, fanden wir uns sofort auf derselben Seite und begründeten

innerhalb weniger Stunden eine tiefe Freundschaft, die auch fachlich zu greifbaren Ergebnissen führen sollte. Schließlich war Zbyněk der erste Forscher überhaupt, der den Erkenntnisgegenstand der Museologie auf philosophischer Grundlage widerspruchsfrei definierte und damit zum Begründer einer Wissenschaft wurde.

Leicht hatte er es nie gehabt. Schon als Student wurde er von der Universität in Prag als Idealist relegiert und musste sich jahrelang mühselig durch das System eines rigiden Kommunismus arbeiten, bis er über mehrere Stationen an der Universität Brno ein Institut für Museologie aufbauen konnte.

Als er einmal ausnahmsweise zu Gastvorlesungen in ein „sozialistisches Bruderland“ reisen durfte, wählte er die Zugverbindungen so, dass er in Graz übernachten musste. Er war bei meiner Frau und mir zu Gast, verbrachte allerdings die ganze Nacht lesend in meiner Bibliothek, da er dort die Literatur fand, die in seinem Land verboten war.

Wir trafen einander immer wieder. Entweder nahm ich an der von ihm begründeten International Summer School of Museology in Brno teil oder ich lud ihn zu Vorträgen ein, etwa zum Österreichischen Museumstag. Da ich ihn dort dazu bewegen hatte können, seine von Natur aus sehr komplizierte und dadurch fast unverständliche Sprache zu vereinfachen, erzielte er einen durchschlagenden Erfolg, der sogar einen kritischen Kollegen zum

Ausspruch verführte, der Stránský sei ja großartig. Das konnte ich nur bestätigen.

Wir hatten immer vieles zu besprechen, schließlich war er auch Musiker und Musikwissenschaftler und hatte beim Organisten des Prager Doms studiert. Sein Konzept einer linear strukturierten Ausstellung über Leoš Janáček, die in einer konkreten Aufführung des Streichquartetts „Intime Briefe“ ihren Höhepunkt hätte finden sollen, wurde nie verwirklicht. Es wäre eine bisher nicht dagewesene neue Form des Ausstellungserlebens gewesen.

Dass er als Böhme mit Wiener Großmutter über subtilen Humor verfügte, war selbstverständlich. Manchmal lieferte er auch skurrile Episoden. Als ich einmal in Brno zum Mittagessen in einer Kantine geladen war, bestand er darauf, mir mein Essen zu servieren und brachte eine Portion Brathuhn. Als ich ihn aufmerksam machte, dass ich Vegetarier sei, meinte er überrascht „Aber das ist doch Huhn.“

Seinen Ruhestand verbrachte er mit seiner Frau in bescheidenen Verhältnissen in der Slowakei. Von dort betrachtete er kritisch die Welt, klagte zuweilen über die Verwechslung von Museologie und „Vitrinologie“ und zog sich mehr und mehr zurück.

Da ihn zu seiner langjährigen Diabetes-Erkrankung in den letzten Jahren auch noch ein Parkinson-Syndrom belastete, beschränkten sich unsere Kontakte schließlich

nur noch auf herzliche, aber spärliche Zuschriften zu Geburtstagen und zum Jahreswechsel.

Es wird wohl noch lange dauern, bis seine epochale Bedeutung erkannt werden wird.

#### FRIEDRICH WAIDACHER

Museologe, Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz (emeritierter Professor)  
Österreich

### THE IRREPLACEABLE ONE. ON THE DEMISE OF ZBYNĚK Z. STRÁNSKÝ

#### FRIEDRICH WAIDACHER

It is difficult to write an obituary for a friend like him. The personal as well as professional sympathies were too deep to be able to take an objective standpoint. It is true that I finished my scriptorium definitely ten years ago, but I will yet write a letter to the successors.

“It must be analysed!” sounded his requirement, with which he himself always complied with relentless stringency. As he was not able to tolerate lazy thinking, *ratio pigra*, he opposed it always very uncompromisingly and had therefore absolutely no reason to complain about a lack of enemies. When we once participated together in a conference in North Europe, he offended in a public discussion several discussants by unveiling mercilessly the errors in their reasoning. Afterwards he remained defiantly silent. I had to advocate him by explaining in simple steps, what he had in mind. But in fact he was the kindest man, attentive, polite, witty; only as a philosopher he showed no mercy. We met for the first time in 1980, in the middle of our life, in a neighbouring country. As representatives of our mother tongues

we were invited there to take part in a grotesque project, which after many years finally led to useless results. Since the organisation of the event already was marked by incompetence, we found ourselves immediately on the same side and started within a few hours a deep friendship, which was predestined to bring tangible results as well in the professional field. Zbyněk namely was the very first researcher who consistently defined the object of knowledge in museology on a philosophical basis and became herewith the founder of a scholarly discipline. The things were never easy for him. In his student years he was relegated from the Prague university for ideological reasons, and had to struggle laboriously through the rigid communist system. He passed through several positions at the Brno university, until he finally established the Department of Museology.

When he once exceptionally was allowed to travel to a “socialist sister country” to give there guest lectures, he chose rail connections which made him stay overnight in Graz. He was a guest of my wife and me, but spent the whole night reading in my library, because he found there literature which was forbidden in his homeland.

We have met each other again and again. I have either participated in the International Summer School of Museology in Brno, which was founded by him, or invited him to give lectures in Austria, for example on the Austrian Museum Day. As I was able to bring him to simplify his language, which was by nature very complicated and therefore almost incomprehensible, he achieved a resounding success, which even made a critical colleague say that Stránský was indeed brilliant. And this was something that I could confirm. We always had many things to discuss, since he was as well a musician and musicologist and

studied with the organist of Prague Cathedral. His concept of a linearly structured exhibition about Leoš Janáček, which may have culminated in a concrete performance of the string quartet “Intimate Letters”, was never realised. It would have been an unprecedented and new form of the exhibition experience.

Being a native Czech with Viennese grandmother, he naturally had a subtle sense of humour. Sometimes he also provided for comical episodes. When I was once invited to have a lunch at a canteen in Brno, he insisted on serving me my meal and brought a portion of roast chicken. When I notified him that I am a vegetarian, he responded surprised “But this is chicken, it’s all right.”

He spent his retirement years with his wife in modest conditions in Slovakia. From there he observed the world with a critical eye, complained sometimes that museology is often mistaken for “cabinetology”, and withdrew more and more into himself.

Because he suffered not only from a long-term diabetes but in the past years also from the Parkinson’s disease, our contacts eventually became limited to cordial but only sporadic birthday greetings and New Year wishes.

It probably will take a long time until his epochal significance will be recognised.

#### FRIEDRICH WAIDACHER

museologist, Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz (Professor Emeritus)  
Austria

METODICKÉ A INFORMAČNÍ TEXTY/  
METHODICAL AND INFORMATIVE TEXTSZBYNĚK ZBYSLAV STRÁNSKÝ, ICOFOM  
AND THE MUSEOLOGY

DOI: 10.5817/MuB2016-2-9

HILDEGARD K. VIEREGG

Zbyněk Stránský was without any doubt a very important expert on the museums – specialized on all of the problems in museology. I met him sometimes on the occasion of ICOFOM Annual Meetings, as for example 1997 in Paris and Grenoble. Particularly I remember the visit to the Ecomusée Pierre de Bresse together with Vinoš Sofka. Vinoš was on the occasion of a reception after the visit to the museum-area playing the piano in a nice room of the small castle, while Stránský was leaning on a windowsill contemplatively. This was a situation that shows also the different opinions of both of them according to Museology. Both of them were companions coming from Brno (former Czechoslovakia) – the Moravian Museum and Masaryk University. Brno and Praha played an extraordinary important role for Museology, cities where it was more or less “created” on a socialistic (Marxist-Leninistic) source.

After the Second World War and the foundation of ICOM Museology as the science became – from my view – a new trend in the Museum landscape. As we can read in another paragraph the theory and the interdisciplinarity were thereby the decisive factor.

Peter van Mensch describes in his PhD thesis from 1992 *Towards a Methodology of Museology* the steps for the development of Museology in ICOFOM (International Committee for Museology in ICOM (International Council of Museums), the “pre-history”, the first period

(1977–1982) and the second period (1983–1989).<sup>1</sup> I would like to add a further period from 1990 until now (2016). My own experience in ICOFOM goes back to the General Conference of ICOM 1983 and the Annual Meeting of ICOFOM in Barbican Centre of London/GB. All what happened before I can only take from talks with friendly colleagues or publications.

Stránský was on the one hand a unique and extraordinary personality in Museology. On the other hand he mentioned himself the importance from colleagues of Masaryk University and the motivations of other museum experts from home and abroad who were interested in ICOFOM and Museology.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, I will try to perform the relationship to some of his colleagues.

The founding period of ICOFOM was characterized by a few personalities, as Jan Jelínek and Vinoš Sofka from Brno and Jiří Neustupný from Praha, and of course, Stránský as a student and follower of Jelínek.

Jan Jelínek (1926–2004) graduated as anthropologist from the Brno University (1949), became

<sup>1</sup> MENSCH, Peter van. Towards a methodology of museology. PhD thesis. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, 1992. In *eMuzeum* [online]. Praha: Centrum pro prezentaci kulturního dědictví, 2007, pp. 25–33 [cit. 2016-09-10]. Available from www: <<http://www.emuzeum.cz/admin/files/Peter-van-Mensch-disertace.pdf>>.

<sup>2</sup> STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk (ed.). *Museology for Tomorrow's World. Proceedings of the international symposium held at Masaryk University, Brno, Oct 9–11, 1996*. Munich: Verlag Dr. Christian Müller-Straten, 1997.

1951 curator and 1958 director of Moravian Museum in Brno/Czechoslovakia (on January 1, 1993 the state was divided into two States: Czech Republic and Slovakia). From 1971–1977 he was President of ICOM, afterwards he served as Chairman of the Advisory Committee. His opinion was characterized by an interdisciplinary approach.<sup>3</sup> Probably van Mensch relates in this view to MuWoP no 2 (Museological Working Papers) with the headline *Interdisciplinarity in Museology*.<sup>4</sup>

Vinoš Sofka (1929–2016) came also from Brno. He had graduated on the laws. Because of political conditions in the socialistic Czechoslovakia he emigrated in the 1960s from Czechoslovakia to Sweden (Stockholm/Uppsala) and worked as Deputy Director at Stockholm Museum of History. In the years after the founding of ICOFOM 1976 both of them became successively the Chairmen and formative personalities of this at that time most important Committee of ICOFOM – Jelínek from 1977–1983, Sofka from 1983–1989.

Sofka became “*appointed Chairperson of the schools Scientific and*

<sup>3</sup> MENSCH, Peter van. Towards a methodology of museology. PhD thesis. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, 1992. In *eMuzeum* [online]. Praha: Centrum pro prezentaci kulturního dědictví, 2007, p. 25 [cit. 2016-09-10]. Available from www: <<http://www.emuzeum.cz/admin/files/Peter-van-Mensch-disertace.pdf>>.

<sup>4</sup> Museological Working Papers – MuWoP no. 2/1981. In *ICOM International Committee for Museology: Our Publications* [online]. Paris: ICOM, 2010 [cit. 2016-09-24]. Available from www: <[http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/MuWoP%202%20\(1981\)%20Eng.pdf](http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/MuWoP%202%20(1981)%20Eng.pdf)>.

*Pedagogical Council in 1990*<sup>5</sup> and 1994 Professor at the UNESCO Chair for Museology and World Heritage in Brno and finally initiated together with Stránský the International Summer School for Museology (ISSOM). From this time on he returned for the periods of Summer- and Winter-Semester at any time from Stockholm to Brno.<sup>6</sup>

Another personality in Czechoslovakia I would like to introduce was Jiří Neustupný (1906–1981), a curator of Prehistory at the National Museum in Praha, the Director of the Center of Education and Museology, and a professor of Prehistory and Museology at the Faculty of Philosophy at the Charles University in Praha. He also particularly dealt with terms as Museography, Museumkunde, Museology and others. Museology for him can be described as “a theory and methodology of museum work” and he speaks in support of German museologists about “Museumswissenschaft” as a “Querwissenschaft” (interdisciplinary science).<sup>7</sup> As far as I see, he never held an official post in ICOFOM. In MuWoP no 2 Neustupný continues the idea of interdisciplinarity and describes “the participation in research activities as well as in the popularization of knowledge” as a most striking fact and as “mul-

ti-various and heterogeneous”, “on several different levels, each of which incommensurable with the other.”<sup>8</sup>

There was another personality who influenced the development of ICOFOM and Museology, Georges Henri Rivière (1897–1985) from France. Rivière at first studied Music (until 1925) and then worked as a pianist in Paris. Because of his contacts to George Gershwin, Josephine Baker and representatives of the performing arts he was getting interested in the Arts of non-European cultures. Already by the end of the 1920s he developed ideas and conceptions for a contemporary type of a museum.<sup>9</sup> Finally Rivière founded 1937 the *Musée National des Arts et Traditions populaires* in Paris, and presented it as a kind of “ideal-village” on the World Fair. Finally the Ecomuseum resulted from the Musée de Bretagne in Rennes, an Environmental Museum dating from the year 1940.<sup>10</sup> Rivière had already discovered the “ethnographic” museology, and after the Second World War he established the *Centre d’Ethnologie Française*. The conception of Ecomusée was described as “civilizations in their Natural Environments.” A very important example in this concern became the Ecomusée Pierre-de-Bresse, situated not far from Grenoble that was already mentioned before.

1948–1965 he had been the first chair and acting director of ICOM, the International Council of Museums (and permanent adviser) since 1968.

For Stránský Rivière was of importance for ICOFOM as he in a great measure felt responsible for the development of the Ecomusées and New Museology, tasks to which Stránský also paid attention.

The term “Ecomusée” that was later characterized as “A center of this idea of a museum lie not things, but people”<sup>11</sup> is more a result of coincidence.

On an international Conference 1971 the former environmental minister Poujade used in attention to Hugues de Varine-Bohan (1891–1967)<sup>12</sup> this term that was combined between musée and écologie. 1972 this was on the occasion of an ICOM Conference in Lourmarin/France described more precisely. The first international workshop about this topic took place in Quebec/Canada (1984). One of the basic principles and aims was the decentralization of the museum-landscape that in previous times as e.g. in France was concentrated to the capital of Paris.<sup>13</sup>

In his role as ICOM’s acting director Rivière visited Jelínek in the Moravian Museum Brno 1964, was very interested in Jelínek’s “multi-disciplinary approach” to Anthropology and Palaeontology and tried to take influence on Museology. In van Mensch’s estimation years later, on the occasion of the Annual Meeting of ICOFOM in Mexico (1980), “Rivière tried to manipulate the meeting, which was chaired by Sofka since Jelínek was unable to attend.”

5 SOFKA, Vnoš. My adventurous life with ICOFOM, museologists and anti-museologists, giving special reference to ICOFOM Study Series. April 1995. In *ICOM International Committee for Museology: Our Publications* [online]. Paris: ICOM, 2010 [cit. 2016-09-30]. Available from www: <[http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/ISS%20HISTORRY%201995%20V.%20SOFKA.pdf](http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/ISS%20HISTORRY%201995%20V.%20SOFKA.pdf)>.

6 Neustupný, Jiří. Museology as an academic discipline. See *Museological Working Papers – MuWoP no. 1/1980*. In *ICOM International Committee for Museology: Our Publications* [online]. Paris: ICOM, 2010, p. 28 [cit. 2016-09-24]. Available from www: <[http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/MuWoP%201%20\(1980\)%20Eng.pdf](http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/MuWoP%201%20(1980)%20Eng.pdf)>.

7 Neustupný, Jiří. Museology as an academic discipline. See *Museological Working Papers – MuWoP no. 1/1980*. In *ICOM International Committee for Museology: Our Publications* [online]. Paris: ICOM, 2010, p. 28 [cit. 2016-09-24]. Available from www: <[http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/MuWoP%201%20\(1980\)%20Eng.pdf](http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/MuWoP%201%20(1980)%20Eng.pdf)>.

8 Neustupný, Jiří. On the homogeneity of museology. See *Museological Working Papers – MuWoP no. 2/1981*. In *ICOM International Committee for Museology: Our Publications* [online]. Paris: ICOM, 2010, p. 46 [cit. 2016-09-24]. Available from www: <[http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/MuWoP%202%20\(1981\)%20Eng.pdf](http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/MuWoP%202%20(1981)%20Eng.pdf)>.

9 Georges-Henri Rivière. In *Wikipedia.de* [online]. [cit. 2016-09-20]. Available from www: <[https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Georges-Henri\\_Rivi%C3%A8re](https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Georges-Henri_Rivi%C3%A8re)>.

10 For more information see VIERGE, Hildegard. *Museumswissenschaften. Eine Einführung*. Paderborn: Utb GmbH, 2006, pp. 110–116.

11 HAUENSCHILD, Andrea. *Claims and Reality of New Museology: Case Studies in Canada, the United States and Mexico* [online]. Washington: Smithsonian Center for Education and Museum Studies, 2000 [cit. 2016-09-10]. Available from www: <<http://museumstudies.si.edu/claims2000.htm>>.

12 ROJAS, Roberto, José Luis CRESPIÁN and Manuel TRALLERO. *Museen der Welt. Vom Museum zum Aktionsraum*. Hamburg: Rowohlt Verlag, 1977.

13 HARTEN, Elke. *Museen und Museumsprojekte der Französischen Revolution. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte einer Institution*. Münster: Lit, 1989, p. 108.

The main problem was the status of ecomuseums and the so-called New Museology within ICOM.<sup>14</sup>

In the Museological Working Papers no 1 (MuWoP) 1980 Stránský published one of his first substantial articles relating museum-issues: about the mission and particularly the terms. In this concern Stránský also attracted attention with his systematization according to questions to Museology: “*science or just practical work?*”, terms containing “-logy”, “science” or “practical work”.<sup>15</sup> He also complains in this concern that the trial to define “Museology” (George Henri Rivière/France, Roberto Aloii/Italy, Jiří Neustupný/Charles University Praha/Czechoslovakia, Avram Moiseevich Razgon/Soviet Union, Ellis Burcaw/University of Idaho/USA, Joachim Aue/Museum für Deutsche Geschichte Berlin/GDR) would be only a “metaphorical approach”.<sup>16</sup> This was a serious critique against competent and experienced colleagues. Above that, this critique reveals that the definitions of museum-terms were not given clearly enough. Stránský apparently liked to express the opinions – from his point complicated and in order to outface others. He liked it to express his view with “synthetic” terms. This also relates to his use of Latin language. Although I also like the humanistic education with languages as Greek and Latin very

14 MENSCH, Peter van. Towards a methodology of museology. PhD thesis. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, 1992. In *eMuseum* [online]. Praha: Centrum pro prezentaci kulturního dědictví, 2007, p. 27 [cit. 2016-09-10]. Available from www: <<http://www.emuseum.cz/admin/files/Peter-van-Mensch-disertace.pdf>>.

15 See Stránský in Museological Working Papers – MuWoP no. 1/1980. In *ICOM International Committee for Museology: Our Publications* [online]. Paris: ICOM, 2010, pp. 42–44 [cit. 2016-09-24]. Available from www: <[http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/minisites/icomof/pdf/MuWoP%201%20\(1980\)%20Eng.pdf](http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/minisites/icomof/pdf/MuWoP%201%20(1980)%20Eng.pdf)>.

16 See Stránský in Museological Working Papers – MuWoP no. 1/1980. In *ICOM International Committee for Museology: Our Publications* [online]. Paris: ICOM, 2010, p. 43 [cit. 2016-09-24]. Available from www: <[http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/minisites/icomof/pdf/MuWoP%201%20\(1980\)%20Eng.pdf](http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/minisites/icomof/pdf/MuWoP%201%20(1980)%20Eng.pdf)>.

much, I never would expect that all of our readers must master these languages.

Nevertheless, usually the museum experts from socialistic countries were in agreement about research areas and political positions – often controlled by the Party of their States.<sup>17</sup>

1980 Stránský asked the same questions as many times before and repeated very often his idea about Museology as a Science or only Practical work.

1981 Stránský published in *Neue Museumskunde*, edited by the “*Rat für Museumswesen beim Ministerium für Kultur der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*” about theory and practice of the museum work, an article about *Die Prinzipien der musealen Ausstellung* (The Principles of museal Exhibitions) in German language. This was related to a speech at an International seminar for Museology 1977 in Veszprem/UVR, and with the agreement of the author revised for the print edition in *Neue Museumskunde*.<sup>18</sup>

1987 the ISSOM Summer School took place in Brno. Zbyněk Stránský was really its founder. In his article *Ten years of the International Summer School of Museology (ISSOM)* 1997 he describes on the one hand the political constraints in Czechoslovakia under the communist regime and the serious intervention of “secret state police”. On the other hand he relates to the important

17 AUE, Joachim. Zur Zusammenarbeit von Museum und Schule in der Volksrepublik Polen unter Berücksichtigung der Geschichtsmuseen. *Neue Museumskunde*, 1981, vol. 24, no. 1, p. 46.

18 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. Die Prinzipien der musealen Ausstellung. *Neue Museumskunde*, 1981, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 33–40. 1965 Neue Museumskunde was initiated after the building up of the Wall between the Federal Republic of Germany (BRD) and the German Democratic Republic (GDR) – after the division of East and West. Neue Museumskunde is like a mirror to the socialistic development of GDR, and at the same time of the Museum landscape that was instrumentalized by the GDR-Government.

Role in the co-operation between the many personalities, the effective support from Moravian Museum and personalities from the Masaryk University (Kateřina Tlachová, Vinoš Sofka, František Gale, Eduard Schmidt, Jiří Šrámek).<sup>19</sup>

### Bodensee-Symposium

In the second phase 1989 the “Bodensee-Symposium” took place to the topic “*Museologie. Neue Wege – Neue Ziele*.”<sup>20</sup> This was organized by Hermann Auer, at that time the President of the German National Committee of ICOM (1968–1992) and former General Director of Deutsches Museum (1959–1971) and Professor at the Munich University for Natural Sciences and the Techniques.

Auer had organized and accompanied a German team of museum-experts to the General Conference of ICOM to Latin American countries (1986) – Argentina and Brazil – and had collected new suggestions for Museology world-wide together with his team. Two years later he invited Stránský to the Bodensee-Symposium (1988), as a highly estimated personality because of his ideas to Museum development and the recent positions of a socialistic Museology.

Stránský, as the responsible curator of the department for Museology

19 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. Ten Years of the International Summer School of Museology (ISSOM). In STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk (ed.). *Museology for Tomorrow's World. Proceedings of the international symposium held at Masaryk University, Brno, Oct 9–11, 1996*. Munich: Verlag Dr. Christian Müller-Straten, 1997, pp. 143–153. Masaryk University was founded 1919 by Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, first President of Czechoslovakia. 1939 it was closed by the National Socialistic Regime. Reopened 1960 it was named according to the Czech biologist Jan Evangelista Purkyně. Since 1990 the original name is used again.

20 AUER, Hermann (ed.). *Museologie. Neue Wege – Neue Ziele. Bericht über ein internationales Symposium veranstaltet von den ICOM-Nationalkomitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Österreichs und der Schweiz vom 11. bis 14. Mai 1988 am Bodensee*. München/London/NewYork/Paris: K. G. Saur Verlag, 1989.

in the Moravian Museum/Brno/Czechoslovakia, participated in. In the context of the symposium was the first part about the development of Museology to an independent science. Stránský referred in his speech to the theoretical principles for museology as a science (“*Die theoretischen Grundlagen der Museologie als Wissenschaft*”).<sup>21</sup>

While he firstly asked if Museology was existing at all, then he confirmed on the one hand the existence of theory, research work and a methodology, and on the other hand a very long history, in the traditional Europe, starting with Samuel Quiccheberg in Munich (1565), Johann D. Major in Kiel (1674), C. F. Neickelius in Leipzig (1727), J. G. T. Graesse in Dresden (1877), *Office international des musées*, the first international organization for museums.<sup>22</sup>

In the Museological Working Papers (MuWoP no 1, 1980)<sup>23</sup> he had additionally mentioned Carl von Linné, Gustav Klemm, Murray, Julius von Schlosser and Coleman.

Quiccheberg’s (1529–1567) very first museological book composed

21 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. Die theoretischen Grundlagen der Museologie als Wissenschaft. In AUER, Hermann (ed.). *Museologie. Neue Wege – Neue Ziele. Bericht über ein internationales Symposium veranstaltet von den ICOM-Nationalkomitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Österreichs und der Schweiz vom 11. bis 14. Mai 1988 am Bodensee*. München/London/NewYork/Paris: K. G. Saur Verlag, 1989, pp. 38–39.

22 ANANIEV, Vitaly. *International Museum Office – first international museums organization*. St. Petersburg, 2016. Unpublished manuscript.

23 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. Die theoretischen Grundlagen der Museologie als Wissenschaft. In AUER, Hermann (ed.). *Museologie. Neue Wege – Neue Ziele. Bericht über ein internationales Symposium veranstaltet von den ICOM-Nationalkomitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Österreichs und der Schweiz vom 11. bis 14. Mai 1988 am Bodensee*. München/London/NewYork/Paris: K. G. Saur Verlag, 1989, pp. 38–39. See Stránský also in Museological Working Papers – MuWoP no. 1/1980. In *ICOM International Committee for Museology: Our Publications* [online]. Paris: ICOM, 2010, p. 43 [cit. 2016-09-24]. Available from www: <[http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/minisites/icofof/pdf/MuWoP%201%20\(1980\)%20Eng.pdf](http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/minisites/icofof/pdf/MuWoP%201%20(1980)%20Eng.pdf)>.

in Latin language *Inscriptiones vel tituli Theatri amplissimi* – shortly “Theatrum Sapientiae” already included the plan for an ideal condition of a museum.

There are other approaches from the early modern times.

Carl von Linné (1707–1778), a natural scientist and professor for anatomy and medicine at the Swedish Uppsala University created the “Systema Naturae” (1735) and “Philosophia Botanica” (1751). This system is until now of great importance for inventarisation and related to systems in connection to museum collections.<sup>24</sup>

August Klemm (1802–1867), art historian and librarian, published already 1837 a book about the history of collections for Science and Art in Germany. The Museum for Ethnology in Leipzig united after its foundation (1869) the collections of Klemm.<sup>25</sup>

Johann Theodor Graesse (1814–1885) characterized 1883 at the first time Museology as a Science in his journal “*Zeitschrift für Museologie und Antiquitätenkunde sowie verwandte Wissenschaften*.”<sup>26</sup>

Furthermore Stránský continues the ideas of his historic predecessors in a more philosophical way. He relates to the development of Museology in the context of the currentness of society. Museology as a science should in this concern find its place in the system of the sciences and also take care about the inter-

24 VIEREGG, Hildegard. *Geschichte des Museums. Eine Einführung*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2008, pp. 46–48, 221.

25 VIEREGG, Hildegard. *Geschichte des Museums. Eine Einführung*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2008, p. 147.

26 VIEREGG, Hildegard. *Geschichte des Museums. Eine Einführung*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2008, 46–48.

disciplinary relationships.<sup>27</sup> This is really an approach to the opinions of other museologists.

Moreover, in his speech at Bodensee-Symposium he focused very clearly on the collecting of objects and the systematization of terminology, museological terms as “Museality”, “Musealia”, the process of musealization and to the term of Museology itself.<sup>28</sup>

Stránský distinguishes between the “*museum object, i.e. the object as such (deposited in store-rooms and displayed in the museums)*” and the musealia which he understood as a concept, an “imaginary object”, perceive and experienced, but not being merely the thing itself.<sup>29</sup>

As a result of his intensive work with Museology since about 1965, he was often dealing with terms in another museological occasion.

Already 1981 he had dealt with the topic of “Museum Language” in his article *Die Prinzipien der musealen Ausstellung*.<sup>30</sup> Some examples: In the case of explaining the term “language” as an approach “to linguistics from semiotics and semiology”<sup>31</sup> he relates to the lack of exhibitions and says that museum professionals

27 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. Die theoretischen Grundlagen der Museologie als Wissenschaft. In AUER, Hermann (ed.). *Museologie. Neue Wege – Neue Ziele. Bericht über ein internationales Symposium veranstaltet von den ICOM-Nationalkomitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Österreichs und der Schweiz vom 11. bis 14. Mai 1988 am Bodensee*. München/London/NewYork/Paris: K. G. Saur Verlag, 1989, p. 40.

28 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. Die theoretischen Grundlagen der Museologie als Wissenschaft. In AUER, Hermann (ed.). *Museologie. Neue Wege – Neue Ziele. Bericht über ein internationales Symposium veranstaltet von den ICOM-Nationalkomitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Österreichs und der Schweiz vom 11. bis 14. Mai 1988 am Bodensee*. München/London/NewYork/Paris: K. G. Saur Verlag, 1989, pp. 40–46.

29 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. *The Language of Exhibition. ICOFOM Study Series*, 1991, vol. 19, p. 131.

30 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. *Die Prinzipien der musealen Ausstellung. Neue Museumskunde*, 1981, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 33–40.

31 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. *The Language of Exhibition. ICOFOM Study Series*, 1991, vol. 19, p. 129.

sometimes don't distinguish between an exhibition and the composition of an exhibition.<sup>32</sup>

He relates to visual language and non-verbal languages. Stránský describes in his *Language of Exhibitions* the language as a "system of signs." With good reason he severely criticizes that many exhibitions-concepts are overwhelmed with long texts "because they (the curators) do not know how to work with other than textual systems of signs."<sup>33</sup> Instead of he focuses on a system of signs, used for mutual understanding – as the language of sounds, writing, pictures, agreed signals. This follows the result that the language of exhibitions is a language of signs in a metaphorical sense.

Stránský in this concern relates to Charles W. Morris (1901–1979), an American philosopher and semiotician, and his work *Fundamentals of the Theory of Signs*.<sup>34</sup> "The first is the carrier of the sign, the second is what the sign is related to, and the third is the user of the sign."<sup>35</sup>

These were followed by *Signs, Language and Behaviour* (1946). According to Morris language is a system of signs<sup>36</sup> united in a "Semiotisches Dreieck" (semiotical triangle): Begriff (term), Symbol (symbol), Ding (thing).

Surprisingly, neither in this article nor in the ISS 16 *Forecasting a Museological Tool* (1989) Stránský himself used scientific notes or ref-

erences, although he often emphasizes on Museology as a Science.<sup>37</sup>

From my view the publication from 1989 (Auer) is much more forward looking than the following to the title *Museology for Tomorrow's World*, edited by Stránský himself.<sup>38</sup> Nevertheless, the symposium and the publication are very meritoriously, because Stránský included foreign experience in the Czechoslovakian system.

This also applies to his own article about *Ten years of the International Summer School of Museology (ISSOM)* at Masaryk University/Brno.

In the publication *Museology for Tomorrow's World* well-known and prestigious personalities from the home country, other European countries and Canada who were invited to ISSOM 1996 gave speeches and wrote articles exactly on the announced topics: Belgium (1) Canada (1), Croatia (1 author, 3 articles), Czech Republic (5), England (1), Federal Republic of Germany (1), France (1), German Democratic Republic (1), Romania (1), Russia (1), Switzerland (1), Yugoslavia (1).<sup>39</sup>

Nevertheless, it is surprising that from the 18 authors only 6 used the scientific kind of quotations, notes or a bibliography – and the others didn't although Museology was already appreciated as a Science, and Stránský demanded scientificity from his colleagues.

Stránský himself didn't give an article to the main-topic, rather he described the history of *Ten years of the International Summer School of Museology (ISSOM)*.

In order to fulfil scientific issues in an international symposium at a University readers would expect more adequate information and a clear way of citation. But there is on my view also a lack of a clear general conception about the Summer School.

Quite apart from the fact that he related to an alignment of ISSOM on "a very broad orientation in the fields of philosophy, science and culture"<sup>40</sup> he didn't say anything about these interesting fields on main topic *Museology for Tomorrow's World*. In the last paragraph he only mentioned "pedagogical approaches, didactic methods and techniques, and creative conditions for the improvement of museology."<sup>41</sup>

## Conclusion

Stránský was as he is characterized by many experts a "Museum Philosopher". But I never could experience – from all of the articles I read – which other philosophers at least from European or foreign countries of the past or present were ideals for him (maybe Morris, Schopenhauer). When I would know this I had the chance to talk about the contents of his capability more adequately.

Shortly to say: He was a little bit proud on his knowledge in Museology, and also in the Latin language, he used often without thinking about whether this language except

32 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. The Language of Exhibition. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1991, vol. 19, pp. 129–133.

33 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. The Language of Exhibition. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1991, vol. 19, p. 129.

34 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. The Language of Exhibition. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1991, vol. 19, p. 130.

35 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. The Language of Exhibition. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1991, vol. 19, p. 130.

36 MORRIS, Charles W. *Philosophy of Language. Writings on a General theory of Signs*. The Hague Mouton, 1971, p. 103; MORRIS, Charles W. *Foundations of the Theory of Signs* (German Language). Frankfurt, 1988.

37 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. [without title]. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1989, vol. 16, pp. 297–301.

38 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. Ten years of the International Summer School of Museology (ISSOM). In STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk (ed.). *Museology for Tomorrow's World. Proceedings of the international symposium held at Masaryk University, Brno, Oct 9–11, 1996*. Munich: Verlag Dr. Christian Müller-Straten, 1997, pp. 143–151.

39 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk (ed.). *Museology for Tomorrow's World. Proceedings of the international symposium held at Masaryk University, Brno, Oct 9–11, 1996*. Munich: Verlag Dr. Christian Müller-Straten, 1997.

40 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk (ed.). *Museology for Tomorrow's World. Proceedings of the international symposium held at Masaryk University, Brno, Oct 9–11, 1996*. Munich: Verlag Dr. Christian Müller-Straten, 1997, p. 150.

41 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk (ed.). *Museology for Tomorrow's World. Proceedings of the international symposium held at Masaryk University, Brno, Oct 9–11, 1996*. Munich: Verlag Dr. Christian Müller-Straten, 1997, p. 151.



in Czechoslovakia is understandable in other European countries and countries abroad.

There are without any doubt famous European museum experts, colleagues or even scholars whom I was not able to honor because of the enlargement of this article: The famous André Desvallées (France) and Ivo Maroević (Croatia), Wojciech Gluziński (Poland), Klaus Schreiner (GDR), Martin Schaerer (Switzerland) and, a scholar of Stránský, Jan Dolák (teaching until now at the Chair of Ethnology and Museology of Comenius University Bratislava).

Nevertheless, concerning Stránský it is amazing that he was able to develop museology with colleagues in socialistic countries and to participate in the international discussion on Museology, although he was for a long time widely separated from the world outside.

**HILDEGARD K. VIEREGG**

Munich School of Philosophy, Munich  
Germany

METODICKÉ A INFORMAČNÍ TEXTY/  
METHODICAL AND INFORMATIVE TEXTSTHE INFLUENCE OF Z. Z. STRÁNSKÝ'S IDEAS  
ON THE FORMATION OF THE SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL  
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MUSEOLOGY AND  
CULTURAL HERITAGE OF SAINT PETERSBURG STATE  
INSTITUTE OF CULTURE

DOI: 10.5817/MuB2016-2-10

MARIA J. GUBARENKO

Currently, in different countries there exist a variety of diverging views on museology, starting from its official recognition as a science at the national and professional levels and ending with the use of this term rather as a definition of the theory and methodology of museum work. The creation of International Committee for Museology (ICO-FOM) in 1977 is considered to be a milestone in the recognition of museology as a scientific and academic discipline by the global community, developing an international platform for theoretical investigations in this field. Nowadays in the XXI century the common official position of ICOM is the non-acceptance of museology as an independent scientific discipline with its definition as a “field of activity”.<sup>1</sup> Researchers of ICOM state that “*the similarities of museology with a science – even with a developing one – are slowly fading, as neither its object nor its methods really correspond epistemological criteria of a specific scientific approach.*”<sup>2</sup>

In the 1960s–1980s Czechoslovak played an important role in the international activity of ICOM, but

1 Klyuchevye ponyatiya muzeologii [online]. ICOM Russia, 2012 [cit. 2016-09-02]. Available from www: <<http://www.icom-russia.com/upload/iblock/532/5323743f731b222714f20ba0205ec238.pdf>>.

2 Idem, p. 56.

with time its participation has significantly decreased.<sup>3</sup> The position of Russia, Eastern European countries, and probably some other countries, concerning the definition of museology hasn't significantly changed since the first theoretical investigations in the field of museology scientific development. Conversely, such theoretical developments in these countries continue and they are reflected in numerous research works of museologists. It is important to point out that in 1960s the acceleration of museological theory development was provoked by the fact that this discipline was for the first time being taught at the universities.<sup>4</sup> An outstanding museologist Z. Stránský (1926–2016) noted that the necessity of the educational programs' development has deepened the theoretical background of museology.<sup>5</sup>

In St. Petersburg the department of museology was founded in 1988 at the initiative of N. I. Sergeeva (1920–2011). V. P. Gritskevitch (1922–2013) and L. M. Shlyahtina were also the initiators of the

3 MENSCH, Peter van. K metodologii muzeologii. *Voprosy muzeologii*, 2014, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 15–291 [online]. [cit. 2016-09-02]. Available from www: <<http://cyberleninka.ru/journal/n/voprosy-muzeologii>>.

4 BENEŠ, Josef. Mezinárodní anketa. *Muzeologické sešity*, 1983, no. 9, p. 18.

5 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. *Archeologie a muzeologie*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2005, p. 197.

creation of the museology department.<sup>6</sup> L. M. Shlyahtina notes that the understanding of museology, introduced by Z. Stránský, lays at the foundation of educational strategies and museum workers' preparation concepts<sup>7</sup> and moreover it was an impetus to further development of thought and research in the field of theoretical museology. L. M. Shlyahtina has created a course “Theoretical problems of museology”, which has been taught at the department of museology since its creation.

The Department of Museology and Cultural Heritage of Saint Petersburg State Institute of Culture continues to develop and to refer to some statements of Czech museologists, probably the most significant of which is the “father of museology” Z. Stránský, also J. Neustupný, J. Beneš. This fact is reflected in scientific works of professors, graduate and undergraduate students of the department.

Among them we can name the scientific investigations of

6 MASTENICE, Elena. Podgotovka muzeologov v usloviyakh perekhoda na mnogourovnevnyu sistemu obrazovaniya. In *Trudy Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta kul'tury i iskusstv*, 2013, vol. 200, p. 250.

7 SHLYAKHTINA, Lyudmila. Strategii muzeovedcheskogo obrazovaniya v kontekste razvitiya muzeologicheskikh idey. In *Trudy Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta kul'tury i iskusstv*, 2013, vol. 200, p. 335.

L. M. Shlyahina, E. H. Mastenitsa and their followers such as J. V. Zinovieva,<sup>8</sup> S. V. Pshenichnaya,<sup>9</sup> A. J. Volkovitch,<sup>10</sup> O. S. Sapanzha<sup>11</sup> and others. O. S. Sapanzha is the research advisor of students that are currently exploring the scientific works of Stránský.

L. M. Shlyahina states that “*the Saint Petersburg State Institute of Culture is exactly a place where a proper museological scientific school is currently being formed*”<sup>12</sup> (although there are other opin-

ions on this matter<sup>13</sup>). It is crucial to point out that Russian authors use a limited amount of sources of Czech museologists, basically they include the works of Z. Stránský (in German and also translated into Russian). It is related to the fact that the number of Czech museologists’ publications in Russia is considerably low. There are some articles, but yet there aren’t any monographs translated into Russian.

The understanding of museology, its subject, object, structure, terminology and methodology by Stránský has been changing during the process of his scientific researches. This article covers the content and essence of museology, presented in his last monography “Archeology and Museology” (2005). On the ground of continuous museum work and the studies of philosophy, noetics, methodology of science, Stránský formulated a system of museology as a scientific discipline, related to the term of “museality”, created by Stránský and accepted on the international level.

Stránský formulated that “*museology is a scientific discipline that studies the musealisation of reality*.”<sup>14</sup> Musealisation is the endowment of reality with specific characteristics with respect to cultural and memorial value of their authentic representatives, i. e. museal mastering of reality.<sup>15</sup> What is more, Stránský introduced the concept of “cultural metareality”, which meant a form of reality appearing after the process of musealisation. In addition to that, Stránský introduced a new professional museological term “musealita” (cultural-memorial value) for the identification

of the object’s cultural value after its transformation in the process of musealisation. “*Museum is one of the historically developed forms for the embodiment of the specific, museal attitude of man to reality, which is not a constant thing, but a changing one, moreover, it should change in historical and social constellations*,”<sup>16</sup> noted Stránský. His concept of musealisation as a subject of scientific knowledge of museology became fundamental for the science.

This theory was accepted by many museologists in Russia. However, it is crucial to point out that the understanding and interpretation of the term “musealisation” and its derivatives, has undergone significant changes in Russian literature and it could be said that this term wasn’t clearly understood and interpreted – it became “russianized”. Stránský highlighted the difference between the following specific terms: “museal” and “museum”, “musealia”, “museality” and “musealisation”, “thesaurus”, that are accepted and used in Czech professional community of museologists, not only in theory but also in practice. Stránský himself noted that although many specialists and scientists have inherited these new terms, which Stránský was forced to introduce in order to formulate the system of museology, they were not used in properly understood content meaning.<sup>17</sup> In many modern Russian dictionaries and museology textbooks many of the mentioned museological terms are not thoroughly disclosed and sometimes they are even absent.

L. M. Shlyahina and E. N. Mastenitsa define the subject of museology as a “*cognition of museum nature*

8 ZINOV'YEVA, Yuliya. *Vzaimodeystvie muzeya i obshchestva kak sotsiokul'turnaya problema*. Avtoref. dis. [online]. Spb., 2000 [cit. 2016-09-02]. Available from www: <http://www.dissertat.com/content/vzaimodeystvie-muzeya-i-obshchestva-kak-sotsiokulturnaya-problema>.

9 PSHENICHNAYA, Svetlana. *Muzej kak informatsionno-kommunikativnaya sistema*. Avtoref. dis. [online]. Spb., 2000 [cit. 2016-09-02]. Available from www: <http://www.dissertat.com/content/muzei-kak-informatsionno-kommunikativnaya-sistema>; PSHENICHNAYA, S. V. *Muzejnyy yazyk i fenomen muzeya*. [online]. Spb., 2001, p. 233 [cit. 2016-09-02]. Available from www: <http://anthropology.ru/ru/text/pshenichnaya-sv/muzejnyy-yazyk-i-fenomen-muzeya>; PSHENICHNAYA, S. V. *Kontseptual'naya model' muzeya v sovremennoy otechestvennoy muzeologii. Muzei Rossii: poiski, issledovaniya, opyt raboty*. Sb. nauch. tr. Spb, 2007, no. 9, pp. 3–6.

10 VOL'KOVICH, Anna. *Model' muzejnoy kommunikatsii v kontseptsii zarubezhnykh muzevedov. Muzei v sovremennoy kul'ture: sb. nauch. tr. T. 147*. Spb., 1997, pp. 69–73; VOL'KOVICH, Anna. *Muzejnaya ekspozitsiya kak semioticheskaya sistema*. Avtoref. Spb., 1999.

11 SAPANZHA, Ol'ga. *Metodologiya teoreticheskogo muzevedeniya*. SPb., 2008. 115 p.; SAPANZHA, Ol'ga. *Tekhnologiya i metodologiya v sovremennoy muzevedeni: k voprosu o metode nauki. Izvestiya Rossiyskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta im. A. I. Gertsena*, 2009, no. 117, pp. 335–340; SAPANZHA, Ol'ga. *Sovremennoe teoreticheskoe muzevedenie: k voprosu metodologii nauki. Nauchnye problemy gumanitarnykh issledovaniy*, 2010, no. 1; SAPANZHA, Ol'ga. *Istoriografiya muzeologii, muzevedeniya, muzeografii: k voprosu razdeleniya ponyatiy. Voprosy muzeologii*, 2013, no. 2(8), pp. 197–205.

12 SHLYAKHTINA, Lyudmila. *Strategii muzevedcheskogo obrazovaniya v kontekste razvitiya muzeologicheskikh idey*. In *Trudy Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta kul'tury i iskusstva*, 2013, vol. 200, p. 337. More about museological scientific school in the Saint Petersburg State Institute of Culture: SHLYAKHTINA, Lyudmila and Elena MASTENITSA. *Stannovlenie nauchnoy shkoly kafedry muzeologii i kul'turnogo naslediya Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo instituta. Vestnik SpbGUKI*, sentyabrya 2016, no. 3(28), p. 116.

13 ASTAF'YEV, Vladimir and Lidiya SYCHENKOVA. *O predmete Istoriya muzeologii: postanovka problemy. Voprosy muzeologii*, 2013, no. 2(8), p. 181.

14 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. *Archeologie a muzeologie*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2005, p. 256.

15 Idem, p. 120.

16 Idem, p. 165.

17 Idem, p. 114.

of material evidence,<sup>18</sup> which is very close to Stránský's definition. Stránský distinguishes the main structure of the system of museology as follows:

Diachronic<sup>19</sup> (the levels of museological study)/Historical museology  
Synchronous/Modern museology  
Theoretical/Theoretical museology  
Applied/Museography  
Metamuseology.

The structure of museology according to L. M. Shlyahina consists of history, theory, museum chronology, applied museology. In its turn O. S. Sapanzha highlights 3 levels of research which are:

Conceptual level (museology),  
Synthetic level (museology and museography),  
Technological level (museum activity).<sup>20</sup>

Theoretical museology, according to Stránský, is the centre of this system, explaining the museal process by theoretical "subsystems"<sup>21</sup> sub theory of selection, thesaurus compilation, presentation. These three sub theories, based on Stránský's structure, are described in the work of L. M. Shlyahina as a theoretical basis of museum activity.

S. V. Pshenichnaya in her researches creates her own conceptual model of a museum as a specific information and communication system. From the point of view of S. V. Pshenichnaya the use of sys-

18 SHLYAKHTINA, Lyudmila and Elena MASTENITSA. Muzeologiya i ee metody v sisteme sotsial'no-gumanitarnykh nauk. *Fakty i versii: Istoriko-kul'turologicheskiiy al'manakh Issledovaniya i materialy. Kn.4. Metodologiya. Simvolika. Semantika.* SPb.: IMISP, 2005, p. 29.

19 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. *Archeologie a muzeologie.* Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2005, p. 116.

20 SAPANZHA, Ol'ga. Istoriofafiya muzeologii, muzevedeniya, muzeografii: k voprosu razdeleniya ponyatiy. *Voprosy muzeologii*, 2013, no. 2(8), p. 201.

21 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. *Archeologie a muzeologie.* Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2005, p. 122.

tematic and informative-semiotic approaches in the museum investigation allows to shape a holistic view of the museum as a "complex dynamic socio-cultural information and communication system."<sup>22</sup>

Stránský highlights the necessity to combine "museological thinking" with the modern philosophical and scientific thinking. Museology is merging with onthology, noethics and axiology.<sup>23</sup> E. H. Mastenitsa also addresses this issue, pointing out that at the turn of XX–XXI centuries museology was facing an introduction of "philosophical paradigm, oriented on human study in the diversity of all its interconnections with civilization, society, family... The past century was marked by the graduate retreat from the positivistic fragmentation of humanities to the affirmation of a more scientifically universal cultural and historical picture of human and social development..."<sup>24</sup>

The works of E. H. Mastenitsa<sup>25</sup> and L. M. Shlyahina<sup>26</sup> examine the interdisciplinarity and multidisciplinary of museology, described by Stránský. Investigations in the field of museology methodology were held by O. S. Sapanzha and have many parallels and similarities with

theoretical thinking of Stránský on this issue.<sup>27</sup>

In can be concluded that the continuity Z. Z. Stránský's concepts and ideas can be found in theoretical works of professors and students of The Department of Museology and Cultural Heritage of Saint Petersburg State Institute of Culture with their significant influence on scientific development.

**MARIA J. GUBARENKO**

Saint-Petersburg State University of Culture  
Russian Federation

22 PSHENICHNAYA, Svetlana. *Muзей kak informatsionno-kommunikativnaya sistema. Avtoref. dis.* Spb., 2000.

23 STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk. *Archeologie a muzeologie.* Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2005, p. 108.

24 MASTENITSA, Elena and Lyudmila SHLYAKHTINA. Muzei i muzevedenie v universitetskom obrazovanii. *Filosofskiy vek. Al'manakh. Vyp. 30. Istoriya universitetskogo obrazovaniya i mezhdunarodnye traditsii prosveshcheniya.* T. 3. Spb., 2005, pp. 307–314.

25 MASTENITSA, Elena. Muzeologiya v prostranstve mezhdistsiplinarnogo vzaimodeystviya. *Vestn. Len. gos. univ. im. A. S. Pushkina. Nauch. zhurnal. No. 3. Tom 2. Filosoftiya*, 2013, pp. 155–164.

26 SHLYAKHTINA, Lyudmila and Elena MASTENITSA. Muzevedenie kak faktor optimizatsii razvitiya muzeynogo dela. *Kul'turologicheskie issledovaniya v Sibiri.* Omsk: Izd. Dom Nauka, 2009, no. 3(29), p. 71.

27 SAPANZHA, Ol'ga. Tekhnologiya i metodologiya v sovremennom muzevedenii: k voprosu o metode nauki. *Izvestiya Rossiyskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta im. A. I. Gertsena*, 2009, no. 117, pp. 337–340; SAPANZHA, Ol'ga. Razvitie predstavleniy o muzeynoy kommunikatsii. *Izvestiya Rossiyskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta im. A. I. Gertsena*, 2009, no. 103, p. 249.

METODICKÉ A INFORMAČNÍ TEXTY/  
 METHODOICAL AND INFORMATIVE TEXTS

MOJE VZPOMÍNKY NA DOCENTA PHDR. ZBYŇKA  
 Z. STRÁNSKÉHO (26. 10. 1926–21. 1. 2016)

DOI: 10.5817/MuB2016-2-11

VLADIMÍR PODBORSKÝ

Při přípravě materiálů na tyto vzpomínky jsem si s opravdovou chutí „zalistoval“ v paměti. Rozpomínal jsem se, kdy jsem vlastně poprvé Stránského, kterého osud vzhledem k jeho „buržoaznímu původu“ nijak nešetřil, tuto naši i světovou muzeografickou a muzeologickou veličinu, a vlastně nejen muzeologickou, nýbrž obecně kulturní veličinu osobně poznal; z odborné literatury jsem samozřejmě již o něm leccos věděl.

Bylo to v roce 1962, kdy byl Stránský s pomocí muzejního architekta Viléma Hanka přijat do Moravského muzea. Již od ledna 1963 tam začal budovat muzeologické oddělení jako středisko metodiky muzejní práce a současně inicioval zřízení externí katedry muzeologie na tehdejší UJEP v Brně. Realizaci tohoto projektu zaštitil svým jménem tehdejší ředitel Moravského muzea profesor Jan Jelínek. Externí katedra muzeologie byla na UJEP zřízena uzavřením dohody mezi tehdejším rektorem UJEP profesorem Theodorem Martincem a generálním ředitelem UNESCO Frederico Mayorem v listopadu 1964; od roku 1966 začala skutečně pracovat. Jejím vedením byl pověřen tehdy již ve světě renomovaný muzeologický činitel, původně ekonomický náměstek ředitele Archeologického ústavu ČSAV v Brně JUDr. Vinoš Sofka.

Tehdy však vstoupila do hry ještě další instituce: Katedra UNESCO pro muzeologii a světové dědictví – UNESCO Chair of Museology and World Heritage. Podnět k založení tohoto zvláštního pracoviště pod záštitou UNESCO dal právě představi-

tel Komise pro muzeologii ICOFOM JUDr. Vinoš Sofka spolu s docentem Zbyňkem Z. Stránským.

Jen stručně chci uvést početné zásluhy Stránského o rozvoj naší i světové muzeologie: zřízení celostátních kurzů muzejních konzervátorů (které Stránský sám vedl přes 20 let), realizace prvního muzeologického symposia roku 1965, na němž zdůvodnil potřebu vysokoškolské muzeologické výuky a vymezil metateoretický přístup k muzeologii jako vědního oboru, založení sborníku Muzeologické sešity roku 1968, realizace mezinárodní konference o muzeologii roku 1969 (na níž prezentoval svůj systém muzeologie jako vědního oboru) atd. Zvláště pak musím zmínit projekt tzv. postgraduálního studia muzeologie, schválený českým Ministerstvem školství, jehož první běh proběhl roku 1965. Toto studium absolvovalo do počátku 90. let více než 380 posluchačů z Československa.

Po realizaci výstavy „Cesta muzeí“, která prezentovala v 70. letech 20. století historickou úlohu muzeologie, byl Stránský označen za „kosmopolitu“ a bylo navrženo jeho okamžité propuštění. Nakonec byl „připuštěn k práci“, ale externí katedra muzeologie byla roku 1978 začleněna do rámce katedry prehistorie/archeologie tehdejší FF UJEP, vedené tenkrát docentem Radko M. Perničkou; katedra prehistorie/archeologie a muzeologie existovala v letech 1978–1986 (navázal na ni Ústav archeologie a muzeologie FF MU – ÚAM FF MU, zřízený na pod-

nět profesora Vladimíra Podborského roku 1994).

Stránského koncepcí muzeologie byla pozitivně přijímána v řadě zemí (NDR, Jugoslávie, Rakousko, Holandsko, Skandinávie). To vyvolalo pozornost nejen v rámci ICOM, ale přímo v UNESCO, na jehož podnět Stránský vypracoval v roce 1983 projekt Mezinárodní letní školy muzeologie, která zahájila činnost v roce 1986.

Po roce 1989 byl Stránský rehabilitován a pověřen vedením samostatné katedry muzeologie na FF MU a rovněž vedením a profesurou International Summer School of Museology, která byla situována na Rektorátě MU v Brně. Stal se členem ICOM, místopředsedou ICOFOM, předsedou Muzeologické společnosti, předsedou Zvazu múzeí na Slovensku a čestným členem Union of Museologists.

V roce 1993 se mi podařilo PhDr. Zbyňka Z. Stránského habilitovat (se souhlasem Vědecké rady FF MU bez vědecké hodnosti CSc.) a jmenovat ho docentem muzeologie. V rámci tehdy ještě ne zcela konsolidovaných poměrů to kupodivu prošlo. Tak se stalo, že Stránský je do dneška jediným u nás habilitovaným docentem muzeologie, a nechybělo mnoho, aby se stal i jejím profesorem.

Při habilitaci PhDr. Zbyňka Z. Stránského jsem vycházel z pevného přesvědčení, kterého se přidržuji dosud, že muzeologie má být považována na samostatný

vědní obor, jak je tomu ve většině zemí světa. Podávali jsme spolu se Stránským v tomto smyslu několik návrhů, doplněných četnými faktografickými doklady, českému Ministerstvu školství, ale vždycky se našel někdo, nebo někteří, kteří tyto návrhy odmítali; snad z nevědomosti, snad z mylné představy o muzeích jako odkladišti starého nepotřebného harampádí...

Tak se stalo, že Česká republika je jednou z velmi mála zemí, kde muzeologie není stále uznávána za samostatný vědní obor. Přitom je známo, že na světě jsou tisíce muzeí, samozřejmě různého druhu a různé kvality: od seriózních ústavů až po „panoptikální“ zařízení jako je např. „Muzeum voskových figurín Madame Tussaud“ se sídlem v Londýně a s mnoha pobočkami od Hongkongu přes Las Vegas, New York až po Vídeň, nebo muzea jednotlivých osobností (samozřejmě opět různé kvality), jako např. „Muzeum Princzny Diany Spencer“ v Londýně, nebo „Muzeum Waldemara Matušky“ v Jaroměři-Josefově apod.

A při té spoustě muzeí, tentokrát mám na mysli jen seriózní ústavy, je naprosto nezbytné, aby se muzea řídila jednotnými zásadami a principy, zejména pokud pracují s elektronickou evidencí, dokumentací a hodnocením sbírek.

Seriózní muzejní ústavy mají funkce vnitřní a vnější.

Vnitřní funkce spočívají ve výběru muzejních předmětů (funkce heuristická), neboť ne každý předmět je „hoden“ zachování pro budoucnost; dále jde o způsob uložení, evidence a dokumentace předmětů, jejich laboratorní ošetření, případnou restauraci apod.

Vnější funkce spočívá především v jejich lidovýchovném působení, v jejich takřčené „extramurární“ funkci.

Nyní se vrátím k osobnosti docenta Stránského.

Stránský byl nepochybně svým filozofickým a politickým založením antikomunista. Ale v dobách komunistického režimu se snažil s tímto režimem nějak vycházet, aby mohl pracovat. Také věděl, že komunistická politika vybraných a tudíž podporovaných oborů (včetně muzeologie) má i oproti „svobodným“, především západním zemím, kde se jednotlivé vědní obory musejí nejdříve tvrdě prosazovat, své výhody. V tomto smyslu se dal několikrát dost hlasitě slyšet i na fóru Filozofické fakulty. Nebylo tudíž divu, že ho mnozí členové Vědecké rady FF považovali div ne za komunistu, a dali mu to také pocítit při hlasování o jeho jmenování profesorem, které jsem vyvolal, tentokrát ne muzeologie – to by vůbec neprošlo – nýbrž na návrh Mons. Prof. PhDr. Petra Piňhy, CSc., Dr.h.c. – kulturologie. Když jsem za to na Vědecké radě FF loboval, Vědecká rada to jednomyslně odmítla. I můj nejlepší přítel, profesor Rudolf Pečman, který mi nikdy nic neodmítl, prohlásil, že Stránskému musí stačit docentura...

Stránského se však zastal profesor Piňha, v letech 1992–1994 ministr školství ve vládě ČR Václava Klause, který si byl vědomý Stránského hlubokého humanitního vzdělání a založení, a návrh na jmenování Stránského profesorem doporučil Vědecké radě MU přece jen předložit.

A tak jsem měl povinnost v roce 1992 Stránského Vědecké radě MU představit a doporučit pozornosti členů rady jeho inaugurační přednášku. Nenapadlo mne upozornit předem Stránského, aby hovořil lidsky srozumitelnou řečí, a nepoužil svůj oblíbený „metajazyk“. A to se stalo Stránskému osudným!

V domnění, že členy rady oslní, spustil kandidát zostra a sebevědo-

mě přednášku právě v „metajazyce“. To ovšem na členy rady, jmenovitě na lékaře, přírodovědce, a konečně ani na filozofy nezapůsobilo, naopak. Sebevědomé chování Stránského je naopak spíše popudilo. Hlasování vyznělo pro kandidáta jednoznačně negativně.

Tehdejší rektor MU profesor Eduard Schmidt mně potom ostře vytknul, že jsem neměl o Stránského profesuře vůbec uvažovat, že jsem ho neměl před Vědeckou radu MU pustit, že jsem zavinil poškození dobré pověsti nejen Vědecké rady FF, nýbrž celé univerzity atd. Já jsem se samozřejmě bránil: ukázal jsem panu rektorovi šest jednoznačně doporučujících dopisů jmenování Stránského profesorem od předních zahraničních profesorů a další výsoce pochvalné dokumenty o jeho mezinárodní muzeologické a obecně kulturologické proslulosti. Otázal jsem se pana rektora, zda jsem měl tyto dokumenty ignorovat? Na to pan rektor jen nerozhodně pokrčil rameny.

Buď jak buď, Stránský se profesorem nestal. Velmi se ho to dotklo; myslím si, že to až do konce života „neskousnul“.

Dnes je tedy pan docent Stránský již „na pravdě boží“ („jak říkají ateisté“...). Prošel cestou, kterou jednou projdeme všichni.

Jak je tomu vlastně s posmrtným životem v pojetí věřících a v pojetí ateistů?

Z živých lidí to nikdo neví, z mrtvých se nikdo na svět nevrátil, ani se neozval.

Nábožní lidé věří v posmrtný ráj Ježíše Krista, ateisté nevěří v nic, ale ti i oni ve skutečnosti nemají o tom, co je po smrti, ani tušení.

Ale i ateista se vzpírá uvěřit, že zemřelí se ztrácejí kdesi v bezedné „černé díře“ Vesmíru, že po smrti nastává pro člověka nekonečné, ne-

vědomé nic. Já sám si to uvědomuji téměř denně, když v rámci připravovaných „Dějin moravské archeologie“ vzpomínám na plejádu svých mrtvých přátel, kolegů, ba i svých žáků! Jako bych si s nimi při těchto vzpomínkách povídal, zdráhám se uvěřit, že se s nimi již nikdy nese- tkám...

A jak bych měl zakončit tyto moje vzpomínky na pana docenta Stránského?

Nejspíš asi tak, že bych mu popřál, aby tam někde v nadpozemské sféře mohl do nekonečna svobodně a v klidu a pohodě sprádat a rozvíjet své, třebaš i ty „metamuzeologické“ teorie...

#### VLADIMÍR PODBORSKÝ

Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav archeologie a muzeologie (emeritní profesor), Brno  
Česká republika

MY MEMORIES  
OF DOCENT PHDR. ZBYNĚK  
Z. STRÁNSKÝ  
(26. 10. 1926–21. 1. 2016)

#### VLADIMÍR PODBORSKÝ

During preparation of materials for this article I “browsed” through my memories with real zest. I tried to recall when it was that I met Stránský, whose fate was quite harsh because of his bourgeois descent, but who in our country and worldwide ranked among top figures in museography and museology, and in fact not only in museology but in culture at all; of course, I already knew a lot about him from professional literature.

It was in 1962 that Stránský was admitted to the Moravian Museum with the help of the museum architect Vilém Hank. Since January 1963 he already began to build up

there a museological department as a methodical centre of museum work, and incited at the same time the establishment of an external Chair of Museology at the then University of Jan Evangelista Purkyně (UJEP) in Brno. This project was realised under the auspices of the then Director of the Moravian Museum, Professor Jan Jelínek. The external Chair of Museology was established at UJEP by an agreement between the then Rector UJEP, Professor Theodor Martinec, and Director-General of UNESCO, Federico Mayor, in November 1994; since 1996 it actually began to operate. The Chair Holder became JUDr. Vinoš Sofka, at that time already a world-recognised museological authority, originally the Economic Assistant Manager at the Institute of Archaeology, Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in Brno.

At that time, however, another institution also appeared on the scene: the UNESCO Chair of Museology and World Heritage. This specialised department under the auspices of UNESCO was founded at the instigation of JUDr. Vinoš Sofka, representative of the International Committee for Museology (ICOFOM), and Docent Zbyněk Z. Stránský.

I would like to mention only in brief the numerous contributions by Stránský to the development of museology in our country and worldwide: establishment of nationwide courses for museum conservators (which Stránský himself taught more than 20 years), realisation of the first museological symposium in 1965, where he accentuated the need for museological education at universities and defined the meta-theoretical approach to museology as a scholarly discipline, founding of the almanac *Muzeologické sešity* in 1968, organisation of an international conference on museology in 1969 (where he presented his system of museology as a scholarly

discipline), etc. Particularly important was the project of so-called postgraduate museology studies, approved by the Czech Ministry of Education. The first run of studies has taken place in 1965. Until the beginning of the 1990s, these studies were completed by more than 380 learners from Czechoslovakia.

After realisation of an exhibition titled “The Way of Museums”, which in the 1970s presented the historical role of museology, Stránský was labelled a “cosmopolitan” and the proposal for his dismissal came immediately thereafter. At the end he was “allowed to work”, but the external Chair of Museology was embodied in 1978 into the Chair of Prehistory/Archaeology at the then Faculty of Arts UJEP, at that time headed by Docent Radko M. Pernička; the Chair of Prehistory/Archaeology and Museology existed in the years 1978–1986 (it was followed up by the Department of Archaeology and Museology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University – ÚAM FF MU, established at the instigation of Professor Vladimír Podborský in 1994). Stránský’s concept of museology was received positively in many countries (GDR, Yugoslavia, Austria, Netherlands, Scandinavia). These events awakened attention not only within ICOM, but directly in UNESCO, at the instigation of which Stránský elaborated in 1983 a project of the International Summer School of Museology, which started in 1986.

After 1989, Stránský was rehabilitated and appointed the head of an independent Chair of Museology at the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, as well as the head and professor in the International Summer School of Museology, which was located in the Rector’s Office of the Masaryk University in Brno. He became member of ICOM, Vice-chairman of ICOFOM, Chairman of the Museological Society, Chairman of the Union of Slovak Museums, and

honorary member of the Union of Museologists. In 1993 I managed to habilitate PhDr. Zbyněk Z. Stránský (by the approval of the Scientific Board of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, without the academic degree CSc.) and appoint him a Docent (Senior Lecturer) in Museology. The situation at that time was not yet entirely consolidated so that this action surprisingly did not encounter any obstacles. So it happened that Stránský is until today the only habilitated docent in museology in the Czech Republic and he was even close to become a professor.

In habilitation of PhDr. Zbyněk Z. Stránský I based myself on the strong confidence, which I still have today, that museology should be considered an independent scholarly discipline, as it is in the most countries of the world. We submitted with Stránský in this regard several proposals, supplemented with abundant factual evidence, to the Czech Ministry of Education, but there was always somebody who rejected these proposals; maybe for ignorance, maybe for the misapprehension that museums are only dumps of old useless junk...

So it happened that the Czech Republic is one of the very few countries where museology is not yet recognised as an independent scholarly discipline. We know that in the world there are thousands of museums, of course of various types and different quality: from respectable institutions to “panoptical” amenities, such as, for example, the “Madam Tussaud’s Wax Museum” based in London, with many branches from Hong Kong over Las Vegas, New York to as far as Vienna, or museums dedicated to individual personalities (of course of varied quality again), such as, for example, the “Princess Diana Museum” in London or the “Waldemar Matuška Museum” in Jaroměř-Josefov, etc.

And with these numbers of museums, this time I mean the respectable institutions, it is absolutely inevitable that the museums abide by unified rules and principles, mainly if they work with electronic records, documentation and evaluation of collections.

Respectable museum institutions have internal and external functions.

Internal functions comprise the selection of museum items (heuristic function), because not every object is “worth” to be kept for the future, then the way of storage, recording and documentation of objects, their laboratory treatment, possible restoration, etc.

External function of museums mainly consists in their educational activities, in their so-called “extramural” impact.

Now I will return to the personality of Docent Stránský.

Stránský with his philosophical and political orientation was undoubtedly anticommunist. But at the time of communism he tried to get on somehow with this regime in order to avoid any problems at work. He also knew that the communist policy of selected and supported disciplines (including museology) has its advantages, even in comparison with “free”, above all western countries, where individual scientific disciplines often have to struggle hard for their existence. In this sense he also made himself heard several times quite loud in the forum of the Faculty of Arts. Therefore it was in no way surprising that many members of the Scientific Board of the Faculty of Arts considered him almost communist and let him feel it in the vote of appointing him professor, which I called out; this time it was not museology – it would certainly not come off – but culturology, on the proposal of

Mons. Prof. PhDr. Petr Piřha, CSc., Dr. h. c. When I lobbied for it in the Scientific Board of the Faculty of Arts, the Scientific Board rejected it unanimously. Even my best friend, Professor Rudolf Peřman, who never refused to do something for me, declared that Stránský must be satisfied with senior lectureship...

Stránský, however, was advocated by Professor Piřha, Minister of Education in the Czech government of Václav Klaus, who was aware of Stránský’s profound humanist education and disposition, and recommended to submit the proposal for appointing Stránský a professor to the Scientific Board of the Masaryk University. So I was obliged to introduce Stránský to the Scientific Board MU in 1992 and recommend his inaugural lecture to the attention of board members. It did not occur to me to tell Stránský in advance that he should better speak a human-friendly language instead of his favourite “meta-language”. And this proved fatal to Stránský!

Assuming that he will dazzle the board members, the candidate began to speak resolutely and self-confidently just in the “meta-language”. However, the board members, namely doctors of medicine, natural scientists and philosophers, were not impressed by the speech. On the contrary. The self-confident behaviour of Stránský rather irritated them. The vote turned out definitely negatively for the candidate.

The then Rector of the Masaryk University, Professor Eduard Schmidt, reproached me then sharply that I should not have even considered the professorship of Stránský, that I should not have allowed him to appear before the Scientific Board of the Masaryk University, that I caused damage to the good reputation of not only the Scientific Board of the Faculty of Arts but of the whole university, etc. I naturally



defended myself: I showed to the Rector six clearly positive recommendation letters from prominent foreign professors who recommended to appoint Stránský a professor, and another highly laudatory documents on his international museological and general culturological renown. I asked the Rector whether I should have ignored these documents. The Rector in response only indecisively shrugged his shoulders.

Be that as it may, Stránský did not become professor. He was quite aggrieved; I think that he did not reconcile himself to it until the very end of his life.

So, Docent Stránský has already “gone West” (“as atheists say...”). He went a way which all of us will go one day.

How actually is the concept of after-life in believers and in atheists?

The living people do not know and the dead did neither return to this world nor let us know.

Religious people believe in Paradise of Jesus Christ, atheists believe in nothing, but both of them have in fact no idea of what happens after the dead.

However, atheists also refuse to believe that the deceased would disappear somewhere in a bottomless “black hole” of the Universe, that after the death comes only an endless and unconscious nothing. I myself become conscious of it almost every day when I am working on the “History of Moravian Archaeology” and I remember the numbers of my friends, colleagues or even pupils! who already passed away. As if I would talk with them in these memories, I am loath to believe that I will never meet them again...

And how should I finish these memories of Docent Stránský?

Most probably I would wish him freedom and piece somewhere out there in the superterrestrial sphere, so that he can for ever and ever think up and develop his theories, maybe also those of “meta-museology”...

**VLADIMÍR PODBORSKÝ**

Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts,  
Department of Archaeology and Museology (Professor Emeritus), Brno  
Czech Republic

METODICKÉ A INFORMAČNÍ TEXTY/  
METHODICAL AND INFORMATIVE TEXTSFENOMÉN „STRÁNSKÝ“ V MÚZEJNÍCTVE  
NA SLOVENSKU

DOI: 10.5817/MuB2016-2-12

MARCEL LALKOVIČ †

V kontexte trendov, ktoré dnes dominujú v našom múzejníctve, si mnohí v dostatočnej miere nevedomujú, čo v druhej polovici 20. storočia znamenala činnosť, ktorej priekopníkom a výrazným predstaviteľom bol Z. Z. Stránský. Nemáme tým na mysli glorifikáciu jeho osoby. Ide skôr o zamyslenie sa nad charakterom jeho činnosti, prostredníctvom ktorej sa formovalo naše múzejníctvo a i jeho zásluhou sa dotváralo do podoby, ako ho poznáme dnes.

Činnosť, ktorej sa Z. Z. Stránský z hľadiska múzejníctva venoval prakticky celú druhú polovicu 20. storočia, predstavuje ako celok jednu vývojovú etapu. Možno ju charakterizovať ako obdobie, pod ktoré sa významným spôsobom podpísal nielen svojim konaním, ale aj myšlienkami či názormi, ktoré potom niekoľko desaťročí formovali muzeologické myslenie u nás.

V povojnovom období múzejníctvo u nás prešlo zásadnou premenou. Podstatným spôsobom sa zmenili formy múzejnej práce a jej kvalita. Postavené bolo na profesionálnu základňu a múzeá sa ako inštitúcie zaradili medzi politicko-výchovné a kultúrne zariadenia, čím sa opäť dostali do zorného uhla spoločenského záujmu. Tento vcelku úspešný rozvoj sa však uskutočňoval najmä v rovine praxe, a tá vychádzala z dobových podmienok a potrieb. To viedlo k tomu, že sa už v podstatne menšej miere venovala pozornosť teoretickej interpretácii a zovšeobecňovaniu niektorých, z múzejného hľadiska metodicky významných skutočností. A to i na-



Zbyněk Z. Stránský v roce 2000 na konferenci Úlohy přírodních věd v muzealizácii životného prostredia v Liptovskom Mikuláši (Slovenské múzeum ochrany prírody a jaskyniarstva)

priek poznatku, že už v tom čase pôsobilo v múzeách nemálo kvalifikovaných pracovníkov. A sme u ko-reňa veci, pretože práve tejto kategórii zamestnancov problematika muzeologického prístupu v kontexte ich práce nehovorila vôbec nič.

V tomto smere to bol najmä Z. Z. Stránský, ktorý si veľmi dobre uvedomoval, že pracovníci, ktorí sa rozhodli pre prácu v múzeách, neboli ani ako ľudia s vysokoškolskou kvalifikáciou vyškolení pre charakter takto zameranej činnosti. S určitou nadsázkou možno povedať, že zo spoločenského hľadiska išlo o akúsi formu luxusu, keď vyso-

koškolsky vzdelaní pracovníci neodvážali v intenciách múzea prácu, ktorá mala byť charakteristickou alebo dominantnou v podmienkach tohto typu inštitúcie, ale prispôbovali si ju svojim ambíciám a potrebám, ktoré vyplynuli z ich odborového zamerania. Tu niekde potom tkvie podstata toho, prečo sa Z. Z. Stránský počas svojho dlhoročného pôsobenia neúnavne usiloval o profesionalizáciu múzejnej práce. Uvedomoval si, že jednostranné odborné zameranie múzejníkov stávalo do pozície, že ako profesionáli vo vlastnom odbore boli z muzeologického hľadiska úplnými amatérmi. Pre zvládnutie takto zameranej činnosti nemali potrebné vedomosti a preto ani nepoznali metodiku a techniku takejto práce.

V intenciách súdobých poznatkov sa preto logicky usiloval o zlepšenie daného stavu. Za východisko považoval uplatnenie takých foriem, ktoré by v konečnom dôsledku smerovali k rozvoju muzeológie, disciplíny ktorá disponovala poznatkami o predmete, problémoch a o technike muzeologickej práce. Domnieval sa, že treba zaistiť jej odborové uplatnenie v rámci vysokoškolského štúdia, pretože jedine touto formou mohli pracovníci múzeí získať potrebné odborné vzdelanie. Až to vytváralo priestor k tomu, aby sa zainteresovali na muzeologickom prístupe v kontexte jednotlivých vedných disciplín angažovaných v múzeách a získali i potrebné teoretické predpoklady k vlastnej múzejnej činnosti.

Takto zamerané úsilie Z. Z. Stránského našlo napokon svoj výraz vo vytvorení externej katedry muzeológie ako súčasť Filozofickej fakulty Univerzity J. E. Purkyně v Brne v roku 1963. Katedra muzeológie vedená J. Jelínkom, riaditeľom Moravského múzea v Brne sa po svojom založení začala venovať koncepčným a obsahovým otázkam štúdia a pripravovať projekt postgraduálneho štúdia muzeológie pre pracovníkov múzeí. Projekt z väčšej časti pripravil Z. Z. Stránský. Postgraduálne štúdium sa podľa neho považovalo za hlavnú formu ďalšieho vzdelávania vysokoškolských odborníkov, ktorí pôsobili v múzeách za predpokladu, že potrebovali nadobudnúť vedomosti v problematike, na riešení ktorej sa podieľali svojim pracovným zaradením v múzeu.

#### Postgraduálne štúdium muzeológie a slovenské múzeá

Za dobu svojej existencie katedra prešla rôznymi zmenami, avšak jej zriadením vznikla báza, kde sa v jednotlivých študijných behoch zabezpečovala muzeologická výučba pre pracovníkov múzeí. Kľúčovou postavou katedry, ktorá spočiatku existovala ako súčasť Muzeologického oddelenia Moravského múzea, sa stal Z. Z. Stránský. Už v druhom študijnom behu záujem o túto formu štúdia prejavili aj pracovníci múzeí zo Slovenska. Týmto krokom sa reálne začala naplňovať požiadavka Š. Mruškoviča, ktorý sa v roku 1965 vyslovil za to, aby práca katedry mala dosah aj na Slovensko, *pretože v českých i slovenských krajoch v súčasnom období rozvoja muzeálnej práce riešime spoločné teoretické problémy.*

Nasledujúce obdobie jednoznačne ukázalo, že sa existencia tejto formy muzeologického štúdia už od samotného začiatku vnímala na Slovensku pozitívne. Záujem o štúdium nachádzal v slovenských múzeách primeranú odozvu, čo na jednej

Študijný beh		Počet absolventov		
Číslo	Doba trvania	Celkom	Zo Slovenska	
			Počet	%
I.	1965–1968	10	-	-
II.	1967–1970	11	4	36
III.	1969–1972	12	6	50
IV.	1971–1974	10	1	10
V.	1973–1976	13	6	46
VI.	1978–1981	24	8	33
VII.	1980–1983	24	9	37
VIII.	1981–1984	23	5	22
IX.	1984–1987	24	2	8
X.	1986–1989	22	7	32
XI.	1988–1991	23	4	17
XII.	1990–1993	19	9	47
XIII.	1992–1995	10	2	20
Celkom		225	63	28

strane dokumentuje poznatok, že počas 13 študijných behov v rokoch 1965–1995 postgraduálnu formu brnianskeho štúdia absolvovalo aj 65 pracovníkov slovenských múzeí a ďalších inštitúcií. Neostalo však len pri tom. Do procesu výučby sa zásluhou Z. Z. Stránského zapojili aj niektorí poprední slovenskí múzejníci. V začiatkoch participovali najmä na prednáškach v kontexte dejín slovenského múzejníctva. Neskôr ich rady rozšírili aj niekoľkí absolventi štúdia zo Slovenska. V takomto duchu prebiehal tento proces kontinuálne a prakticky po celú dobu existencie postgraduálnej formy brnianskeho muzeologického štúdia.

Po zriadení katedry sa predovšetkým zásluhou Z. Z. Stránského etablovalo v Brne niečo, čo dovtedajšia múzejná prax nepoznala. I keď výučba muzeológie pre tých, čo prejavovali záujem o rozšírenie svojho obzoru nad rámec ich pra-

covného zaradenie, predstavovala základný prvok činnosti tohto pracoviska, bolo tu ešte niečo, čo celkom prirodzene vyplynulo z jeho existencie. Po vzniku katedry za ďalší dôsledok jej činnosti treba považovať i postupné kreovanie muzeologického myslenia. Dnes by sme to mohli charakterizovať ako významný názorový prúd v kontexte muzeologickej problematiky, ktorý sa tu začal udomáčňovať v intenciách nových poznatkov. Nesvedčí o tom len charakter muzeologickej výučby, ale i mnohé záverečné práce, či tendencie, ktoré smerovali k jej teoretickému postihnutiu. V takýchto dimenziách sa existencia katedry vnímala aj v podmienkach slovenského múzejníctva, čo bol tiež jeden z dôvodov, prečo takmer jednu tretinu absolventov postgraduálneho štúdia predstavujú pracovníci zo slovenských inštitúcií.

Ďalší rozmer, ktorý vyplynul z existencie brnianskeho muzeologického

pracoviska, znamenal v podmienkach slovenského múzejníctva aj rozšírenie dovtedajších pracovných kontaktov. Prejavovalo sa to najmä tým, že zvyčajne tam, kde v slovenských múzeách pracovali absolventi postgraduálneho štúdia, začal sa vytvárať reálny priestor pre vzájomnú spoluprácu. A nešlo len o otázky, ktoré by v širšom kontexte súviseli s prezentačnou činnosťou múzeí. Neraz sa k tomu pridružili i rôzne konzultácie odborného charakteru. Vyplynuli zvyčajne z potrieb toho ktorého múzea, problémov, aké sa tu riešili, či postihovali iné otázky reálneho múzejného života.

V podobných intenciách možno vnímať aj spoluprácu, ktorá sa s brnianskym muzeologickým pracoviskom rozvíjala na prelome 70. a 80. rokov minulého storočia prostredníctvom Kabinetu literárnej komunikácie Pedagogickej fakulty v Nitre. Nemožno opomenúť ani vzájomné kontakty s vtedajším slovenským ministerstvom kultúry, či po zriadení Ústrednej správy múzeí a galérií v Bratislave v roku 1979 i s ňou.

### Obdobie po roku 1989

Ďalšia oblasť aktivít Z. Z. Stránskeho sa v kontexte múzejníctva na Slovensku vzťahuje na obdobie po roku 1989. V tomto smere s tým do určitej miery súvisí aj vznik Československej muzeologickej spoločnosti v roku 1990. Jej prostredníctvom sa totiž do praxe uviedla myšlienka Z. Z. Stránskeho, ktorá usilovala o využitie odborného potenciálu, aký predstavovali absolventi postgraduálneho muzeologického štúdia. Išlo mu o to, aby sa prostredníctvom spoločnosti aj oni spolupodieľali na ďalšom rozvoji muzeológie i nášho múzejníctva v intenciách, ktoré vyplynuli zo spoločenskej situácie po roku 1989. Z tohto hľadiska sa spoločnosť, ktorá sa v júni 1990 ustanovila v Slavkove, etablovala ako dobrovoľná, odborná, vedecká a nepolitická

organizácia, nezávislá na štátnych a politických štruktúrach. Spoločnosť mala v kontexte vtedajšieho štátu federálnu pôsobnosť. V jej deväťčlennom výbore, ktorého predsedom sa stal Z. Z. Stránský, mali slovenskí múzejníci paritné zastúpenie. Zúčastňovali sa jeho zasadnutí a spolupodieľali sa aj na podujatiach, ktoré v rokoch 1990–1992 charakterizovali činnosť spoločnosti.

Ďalší charakter aktivít Z. Z. Stránskeho, ktoré sa po roku 1989 orientovali na problematiku múzejníctva na Slovensku, musíme dnes vnímať prostredníctvom dvoch okruhov. Tým prvým je jeho prínos v činnostiach, ktoré súviseli so založením a činnosťou Zväzu múzeí na Slovensku. Oveľa významnejšiu oblasť však predstavuje jeho úsilie o presadenie návrhu na zriadenie katedry ekomuzeológie na pôde Univerzity Mateja Bela v Banskej Bystrici v roku 1998.

### Zväz múzeí na Slovensku

V prípade Zväzu múzeí zohral Z. Z. Stránský významnú úlohu už v prvom období jeho existencie. Patril totiž k iniciátorom obnovenia bývalého Zväzu slovenských múzeí, ktorý pod vplyvom vtedajších pomerov ukončil v roku 1960 svoju činnosť.

Preto je úplne prirodzené, že sa už v samotných začiatkoch zapojil do všetkých, s tým súvisiacich aktivít. Stal sa členom Koordinačného výboru, ktorý do založenia Zväzu zastupoval záujmy slovenského múzejníctva ako celku. V jeho rámci sa veľmi aktívne podieľal na príprave programových dokumentov a iných koncepčných materiálov, ktoré súviseli so vznikom Zväzu múzeí na Slovensku. Na ustanovujúcom valnom zhromaždení 31. mája 1990, ktoré sa uskutočnilo na pôde Múzea SNP v Banskej Bystrici, Z. Z. Stránskeho zvolili za člena Výkonného výboru. Nakoľko sa podľa schvále-

ných stanov Zväzu členom výboru mohol stať len zamestnanec niektorého z členských múzeí, muselo sa najprv doriešiť jeho postavenie. Zásluhou predsedu Zväzu L. Olexu sa Z. Z. Stránský stal zamestnancom Východoslovenského múzea v Košiciach a následne ho výkonný výbor Zväzu zvolil za svojho podpredsedu.

V tejto pozícii sa ako člen príslušnej zväzovej komisie v roku 1991 aktívne podieľal na vypracovaní návrhu Zásad zákona SNR o múzejníctve, ktorý Zväz následne predložil Ministerstvu kultúry SR. Návrh vychádzal zo súčasného stavu poznania múzejnej teórie a praxe a z tohto zorného uhla riešil potrebu ďalšieho rozvoja múzejníctva, a to s ohľadom na význam kultúrneho dedičstva obsiahnutého v zbierkach múzeí a galérií. Zaoberal sa tiež postavením múzejníctva v spoločnosti a riešil z toho plynúce vzťahy. S odstupom času možno túto aktivitu, ktorej hlavným činiteľom bol práve Z. Z. Stránský, považovať za hlas, ktorý z rôznych dôvodov ostal nevypočutý. Vývoj sa na škodu veci začal uberať iným smerom. Avšak je dobré pripomenúť si, že toto jeho úsilie malo za daného stavu svoje opodstatnenie. Za predpokladu, že by boli vtedy kompetentní ochotní načúvať, mohlo byť aj dnes v našom múzejníctve mnohé ináč.

S osobou Z. Z. Stránskeho do značnej miery súvisí aj ďalšia aktivita Zväzu múzeí na Slovensku – medzinárodná muzeologická konferencia *Európske múzeá na ceste k 21. storočiu*, ktorá sa uskutočnila v septembri 1992 v Košiciach. Okrem toho, že sa do nej aktívne zapojil niekoľkými obsahovo zaujímavými referátmi, bol to on, ktorý v spolupráci s Východoslovenským múzeom v Košiciach riešil všetky organizačné či iné otázky pripravovanej medzinárodnej konferencie.

## Katedra ekomuzeológie

Myšlienka ekomuzeológie vyplynula z presvedčenia Z. Z. Stránskeho, že je pre múzejnú kultúru a jej budúcnosť existenčne nevyhnutné, aby prostredníctvom muzeológie filozofické a vedecké myslenie prenikalo do múzejnej praxe, ktorá by tak reagovala na ekologickú a kultúrnu krízu. To si vyžadovalo, aby sa muzeológia prepojila so súčasným eko-filozofickým a eko-vedeckým myslením a bola nimi takto usmerňovaná. V žiadnom prípade teda nešlo o akúsi novú muzeológiu, ako si to vtedy niektorí mylne vysvetľovali, ale len o muzeológiu, ktorá reagovala na požiadavky v intenciách eko-paradigmy. Tá v stále širšom meradle prenikala nielen do filozofie, vedy a kultúry, ale i do celej štruktúry spoločnosti.

Aby však takto orientovaná muzeológia dokázala riešiť z toho vyplývajúce aktuálne úlohy, potrebovala profesionálnu bázu. Túto bázu nemohli zabezpečovať múzeá, nakoľko nešlo len o rozpracovanie teoretických otázok, ale o to, aby sa nové poznatky dostali postupne i do múzejnej praxe. Toto bol primárny dôvod pre vytvorenie zodpovedajúcej inštitucionálnej a profesionálnej platformy, v intenciách ktorej jednoznačne prevládla potreba katedry orientovanej týmto smerom.

Na tomto základe Z. Z. Stránský, v kontexte požiadavky Univerzity M. Bela v Banskej Bystrici, vypracoval v rokoch 1997–1998 príslušný návrh. Vedenie univerzity ho následne začlenilo do projektu pomoci mestu Banská Štiavnica formou zriadenia vysokoškolských pracovísk. Dňom 1. 7. 1998 v kontexte rozvíjania programu ekológie a environmentálnej výchovy došlo k zriadeniu Katedry ekomuzeológie v Banskej Štiavnici ako detašovaného pracoviska Fakulty prírodných vied Univerzity M. Bela. Jej vybudovaním bol poverený Z. Z. Stránský.

Začalo sa tak trochu na zelenej lúke, ale už počínajúc školským rokom 1998/1999 sa prostredníctvom katedry začali zabezpečovať tieto formy muzeologického štúdia:

- Denné magisterské štúdium ekológie so špecializáciou na ekomuzeológiu. Táto forma bola určená pre absolventov stredných škôl, ktorí sa zaujímali o prácu v múzeu i príbuzných zariadeniach.
- Bakalárske odborné dištančné trojročné štúdium ekomuzeológie so špecializáciou na múzejnú konzerváciu. Predstavovalo platformu pre pracovníkov múzeí, galérií, ochranných a pamiatkarských zariadení, ktorí mali ukončené stredoškolské vzdelanie a chýbalo im špeciálne vzdelanie pre výkon konzervátorskej praxe.

• Rozširovacie trojročné odborné dištančné štúdium ekomuzeológie. Táto forma sa týkala pracovníkov múzeí, galérií a príbuzných inštitúcií, ktorí mali vysokoškolské vzdelanie, ale chýbala im muzeologická špecializácia.

Uvedené formy štúdia boli akreditované v odbore environmentálnej ekológie a v roku 1999 Z. Z. Stránský úspešne obhájil ekomuzeologickú špecializáciu pred akreditačnou komisiou Slovenskej republiky.

Neboli to ľahké roky, ale treba povedať, že i napriek rôznym prekážkam vyplývajúcich zo sťahovania katedry či iných okolností, sa toto počiatočné obdobie zásluhou Z. Z. Stránskeho zvládlo na úrovni.

Katedra sa dobudovala i personálne a jej chod sa stabilizoval. Začala sa rozbiehať aj vedeckovýskumná činnosť katedry, ktorá vychádzala zo špecifickej situácie, keďže išlo o nové pracovisko a súčasne i o pracovisko nového odboru. V rámci grantového projektu VEGA v rokoch 1999–2000 riešila katedra problematiku pojmu prírodného

a kultúrneho dedičstva. Výsledky výskumu sa v apríli 2001 prezentovali v Banskej Štiavnici formou celoslovenského odborného seminára a publikovali v zborníku *Museologica* II/2001.

S výskumom súvisela aj činnosť, ktorá sa týkala vypracovania učebných textov – skript, keďže poväčšine išlo o novú problematiku, pre ktorú chýbala potrebná literatúra. V roku 2000 katedra vydala *Základy štúdia muzeológie*. Po obsahovej stránke boli určené pre poslucháčov muzeológie a príbuzných odborov a záujemcov o múzejnú kultúru, ochranu prírody a pamiatkovú starostlivosť. O rok neskôr k nej pribudli študijné texty *Muzeológia*, ktoré sa orientovali na pochopenie zamerania tohto odboru i systému, z ktorého pozostával.

Do rangu vedeckovýskumnej činnosti katedry spadalo aj vydávanie zborníka *Museologica*. Jeho dve čísla (*Museologica* I/200 a *Museologica* II/2001) vydala katedra ešte počas účinkovania Z. Z. Stránskeho na poste jej vedúceho. Zborník v nasledujúcom období, ale s pozmeneným názvom *Acta museologica* vychádzal i v nasledujúcom období. Na katedre sa začala budovať hodnotná muzeologická knižnica, ktorej súčasťou boli aj zahraničné periodiká, napríklad nemecký časopis *Museum Aktuell*. V tom čase Z. Z. Stránský spolupracoval s mnohými zahraničnými pracoviskami a prostredníctvom neho sa do širšieho európskeho povedomia dostalo aj slovenské múzejníctvo a výsledky práce slovenských muzeológov.

## Záver

Ťažko posúdiť, do akej miery by sme v celom kontexte muzeológie mali dnes vnímať úsilie Z. Z. Stránskeho pretavené do činností, prostredníctvom ktorých sa neformovalo len naše múzejníctvo, ale i názory na jeho jestvovanie a charakter. Objektívnu či skôr vy-

čerpávajúcu odpoveď snáď na to dá až budúca doba. V každom prípade však nesmieme nikdy zabúdať na jednu dosť podstatnú vec. Bol to on, ktorý rozhybal dovtedajšie stojaté vody a napriek nie vždy priaznivým okolnostiam prekonával nástrahy osudu, aby sa napokon dostavil i primeraný výsledok.

Problematika muzeologického štúdia, i keď zatiaľ nám neprislúcha hodnotiť jeho terajšiu úroveň, sa dnes stala realitou a ako sa ukazuje, zatiaľ má aj na Slovensku svojich stúpcov. Forma, ktorá sa práve zásluhou Z. Z. Stránskeho ujala v Brne, sa zaslúžila o to, že sa do reálnej praxe dostali ľudia, ktorí v nejednom prípade dokázali vidieť oveľa ďalej ako je bežný obzor človeka. Ich zásluhou o. i. vzniklo aj nemalé množstvo rozličných a podnetných prác. Je to solídny základ pre to, aby aj dnes mohli dochádzať k ďalšiemu obohacovaniu muzeológie ako samostatného odboru a zároveň i k jej formovaniu v intenciách doby a problémov, ktorými žije. V takomto duchu by sme to mali vnímať aj v slovenských podmienkach a usilovať sa o to, aby sa renomé, ktoré sa u nás vybudovalo i zásluhou Z. Z. Stránskeho, našlo svojich pokračovateľov, ktorí by kontinuálne dokázali pokračovať v jeho započatom diele.

## LITERATÚRA A PRAMENE

- Archiv Ústavu archeologie a muzeologie FF MU v Brne, fond *Katedra a Oddělení muzeologie* (nezprac.), kart. 14. běh PSM + Seznam absolventů PGS, Seznam absolventů postgraduálního studia muzeologie na FF UJEP v Brně.
- DOLÁK, Jan a Jana VAVŘÍKOVÁ. *Muzeolog Z. Z. Stránský. Život a dílo*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2006.
- JANOŠTINOVÁ, Marianna (ed.). *Pamětnice k 25. výročí založení Związ muzeí na Slovensku*. Banská Bystrica: Związ muzeí na Slovensku, 2015.
- LALKOVIČ, Marcel. Kam smeruje múzejníctvo na Slovensku? *Európske múzeá na ces-*

*te k 21. storočiu, zborník referátov*. Košice: Východoslovenské múzeum v Košiciach, 1992, s. 27–34.

Návrh zásad zákona SNR o múzejníctve. *Múzejník, orgán Związ muzeí na Slovensku*, marec 1992.

OKÁLI, Ivan. Niekoľko úvah nad jedným oznamom. *Múzeum*, 1998, č. 4, s. 22–23.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálu prvního muzeologického symposia Brno – 1965*. Brno: Moravské muzeum v Brně, 1966.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Potrebujeme eko-muzeológiu? *Múzeum*, 1999, č. 2, s. 18–20.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Nová katedra: katedra ekomuzeologie FPV UMB. *Museologica 1/2000*, Banská Štiavnica, s. 131–134.

STRÁNSKÁ, Edita. Celoslovenský odborný seminár k problematike prírodného a kultúrneho dedičstva. *Múzeum*, 2001, č. 2, s. 35–36.

ŠÁŠKOVÁ, Marianna. Výučba muzeologie na slovenských vysokých školách. *Múzeum*, 2000, č. 1, s. 32–33.

Štúdium muzeologie v školskom roku 1998/99. *Múzeum*, 1998, č. 2, s. 32.

**MARCEL LALKOVIČ**  
muzeolog, Ružomberok  
Slovenská republika

## THE „STRÁNSKÝ“ PHENOMENON AND SLOVAK MUSEUMS

**MARCEL LALKOVIČ †**

In the context of trends which dominate the present-day museums, many people do not sufficiently realize how significant has been in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the activity, in which Z. Z. Stránský was a pioneer and important representative. Herewith we do not want to glorify somehow his person. It rather is a reflection about the character of his activity, through the medium of which our museums have developed to their present form.

The activity associated with museums, in which Z. Z. Stránský was engaged the whole second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century long, represents in its complexity one period of development. It can be characterised as a period, which was significantly influenced by not only his activities, but also ideas or opinions which then formed the museological thinking in our country for some decades.

Museums in our country underwent a significant change in the after-war period. The forms of museum work and its quality have changed in a substantial way. Museums began to be professionalised and classed institutionally among the political-educational and cultural amenities. Herewith they landed in the focal point of social interest again. This quite successful development, however, has mainly taken place at a practical level which was determined by conditions and needs of that time. The result thereof was that theoretical interpretation and generalisation of some methodically important facts concerning museums have been paid much less attention. And this happened despite the fact that museums of that time already employed many qualified workers. And here we are at the root of the problem because the problems of museological approach did not mean anything to this category of employees in the context of their work.

In this regard, it mainly was Z. Z. Stránský who was very well aware that people who decided to work in museums, even though with university qualification, were not trained in such a specifically focused activity. With some exaggeration it can be said that from the social point of view it was a sort of luxury, when university-educated workers in museums did not do the work which should have been characteristic or dominant in this type of institution, but adapted the work

to their ambitions and needs which resulted from their professional specialisation. Here within is the reason why Z. Z. Stránský during his long-time activity strived untiringly for professionalisation of museum work. He was aware that the one-sided professional specialisation of museum workers, who were professionals in their own disciplines, made them absolute amateurs from a museological point of view. They had not the necessary knowledge to master such a specialised activity, and for this reason they did not know the methods and techniques of this work.

Stránský therefore logically endeavoured to improve this state of affairs. He saw the way out in application of forms, which in the end would lead to development of museology – a discipline which had the knowledge of the subject, problems and techniques of museological work. He supposed that it is inevitable to teach museology in universities, because this is the only way how the museum workers can get the necessary professional education. This condition made them involved in museological approach in the context of individual disciplines engaged in museums and in this way they acquired the theoretical knowledge which is necessary for museum activities.

This effort by Z. Z. Stránský eventually found reflection in constitution of an external Chair of Museology belonging to the Faculty of Arts of the Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Brno 1963. After being founded, the Chair of Museology led by J. Jelínek, Director of the Moravian Museum in Brno, began to pay attention to conceptual and contentual problems of the studies and prepared a project of postgraduate museology studies for museum workers. The project was prepared for the most part by Z. Z. Stránský. Postgraduate studies were considered by him the main form of fur-



Zbyněk Z. Stránský in a 2000 conference “The role of natural sciences in musealization of environment” in Liptovský Mikuláš (Slovak Museum of Nature Protection and Speleology)

ther education of university experts who were active in museums, in case that they needed to acquire knowledge of a problem in which they were engaged through the medium of their work in a museum.

### **Postgraduate museology studies and Slovak museums**

The Chair underwent various changes during its existence, but it represented a base where the individual runs of studies provided museology education for museum workers. The key person in the Chair, which initially existed as a part of the Museological Department of the Moravian Museum, became Z. Z. Stránský. Museum workers from Slovakia showed interest in this form of studies in the second run of museology studies already. By this act began to be fulfilled the requirement by Š. Mruškovič, who in 1965 strived to extend the scope of activity of the Chair to Slovakia, *because in Czech and Slovak lands we*

*currently solve the same theoretical problems associated with the development of museum work.*

The subsequent period has clearly shown that from the very beginning already, the existence of such a form of museology studies was received positively in Slovakia. The interest in studies found adequate response in Slovak museums, which is also documented by the fact that during 13 runs of studies in 1965–1995, 65 workers from Slovak museums and other institutions completed the postgraduate studies in Brno. But this was not the end. Thanks to Z. Z. Stránský, several prominent Slovak museum specialists also were involved in the educational process. In the beginnings they mainly participated in lectures concerning the history of Slovak museums. Later also some graduates from Slovakia joined the staff. This process took place continuously during almost the whole period of existence of the postgraduate museology studies in Brno.

After constitution of the Brno Chair of Museology, Z. Z. Stránský helped to establish something that was not yet known in previous museum practice. Even though the basic element of activities of this institution was museological education of those who wanted to enhance their knowledge to beyond the scope of their job, there was something else which fully naturally emerged from its existence. The activity of the Chair also gradually helped to form the museological thinking. Today we could characterize this as a significant ideological stream in the context of museological problems, which began to take roots here in the light of new knowledge. This is evidenced by not only the character of museological education, but also many final theses or tendencies trying to capture its theoretical aspects. The existence of the Chair in these dimensions was also perceived in Slovak museums, which

Run of studies		Number of graduates		
Number	Duration	Total	From Slovakia	
			Number	%
I.	1965–1968	10	-	-
II.	1967–1970	11	4	36
III.	1969–1972	12	6	50
IV.	1971–1974	10	1	10
V.	1973–1976	13	6	46
VI.	1978–1981	24	8	33
VII.	1980–1983	24	9	37
VIII.	1981–1984	23	5	22
IX.	1984–1987	24	2	8
X.	1986–1989	22	7	32
XI.	1988–1991	23	4	17
XII.	1990–1993	19	9	47
XIII.	1992–1995	10	2	20
Total		225	63	28

was one of the reasons why almost one third of graduates were workers from Slovak institutions.

Another aspect, which emerged from the existence of the museological department in Brno, was the extension of existing professional contacts in the milieu of Slovak museums. This was mainly evident in those Slovak museums which employed specialists who completed the postgraduate studies, because these museums began to create real space for mutual cooperation. This concerned not only questions which in a wider context would be associated with presentational activity of museums. It also frequently involved various consultations on professional issues. They usually followed the needs of the one or another museum, the problems treated, or other questions of the real museum life.

In a similar way we can also perceive the cooperation with the museological department in Brno, which developed at the turn between the 1970s and 1980s through the medium of the Cabinet of Literary Communication of the Pedagogical Faculty in Nitra. We must also mention the mutual contacts with the then Slovak Ministry of Culture, or the Central Administration of Museums and Galleries in Bratislava after its founding in 1979.

#### The period after 1989

Another field of activities by Z. Z. Stránský in the context of Slovak museums is connected with the period after 1989. This is to a certain extent also associated with the emergence of the Czechoslovak Museological Society in 1990. It has put into practice the idea by Z. Z. Stránský, which endeavoured to use the professional potential

represented by graduates from the postgraduate museology studies. His idea was that the graduates through the medium of this society also should participate in further development of museology and our museums in the social situation after 1989. In this regard the society, which was constituted in Slavkov in June 1990, was established as a voluntary, professional, scientific and non-political organisation independent from state and political structures. The scope of activity of the society in the context of the then state was federal. In its committee including nine members, whose chairman became Z. Z. Stránský, Slovak museum specialists had an equal representation. They took part in its sessions and cooperated in events, which in the years 1990–1992 characterised the activity of the society.

Another character of activities by Z. Z. Stránský, which after 1989 laid focus on the problem of museums in Slovakia, must be perceived today through the medium of two spheres. The first one is his contribution in activities, which were associated with constitution and activity of the Union of Museums in Slovakia. A much more important area, however, is represented by his effort to carry the proposal for establishment of the Chair of Eco-museology at the Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica in 1998.

#### Union of Museums in Slovakia

Z. Z. Stránský already played an important role during the first period of existence of the Union of Museums. He counted among the initiators of renewal of former Union of Slovak Museums, which was dissolved in 1960 due to overall situation at that time.

It is therefore entirely natural that from the very beginning he was already engaged in all related ac-



tivities. He became member of the Coordination Committee, which until the constitution of the Union represented the interests of Slovak museums as a whole. Within the Committee he took a very active part in preparation of programme documents and other conceptual materials, which were related to the emergence of the Union of Museums in Slovakia. In the general constitutional meeting on 31 May 1990, which has taken place in the Museum of the Slovak National Uprising in Banská Bystrica, Z. Z. Stránský was elected a member of the Executive Committee. Because according to the approved statutes of the Union, only an employee of one of the member museums could become a Committee member, it was necessary to handle the problem of his position. Thanks to the Union Chairman L. Olexa, Z. Z. Stránský became employee of the East Slovak Museum in Košice and the Executive Committee elected him subsequently the vice-Chairman.

In this position, as a member of the relevant union commission, in 1991 he took an active part in elaboration of a proposal of Principles of the Museum Law by the Slovak National Council, which was subsequently submitted by the Union to the Slovak Ministry of Culture. The proposal was based on the then state of knowledge of museum theory and practice and from this point of view it solved the necessity of further development of museums with regard to the significance of cultural heritage contained in museum and gallery collections. It also paid attention to the position of museums in society and solved the relevant relationships. With the passage of time, this activity, which was mainly pursued by Z. Z. Stránský, can be regarded as a voice which remained unheard for various reasons. The development unfortunately began to proceed in another direction. Nevertheless, it is well to remember that his effort

had a good reason under given conditions. If the competent authorities would have been willing to listen at that time, many things in our museums could be different today. The person of Z. Z. Stránský is to a great extent also associated with another activity by the Union of Museums in Slovakia – the international museological conference *European Museums on the Way to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, which was held in Košice in September 1992. He participated in this event actively not only with several interesting papers, but in cooperation with the East Slovak Museum in Košice he also solved all organisational or other questions of the prepared international conference.

#### Chair of Eco-museology

The idea of eco-museology proceeded from the conviction by Z. Z. Stránský that the existence of museum culture inevitably demands that philosophical and scientific thinking penetrate through the medium of museology into the museum practice, which would thus react to ecological and cultural crisis. This requires that museology is interlinked with present-day eco-philosophical and eco-scientific thinking and is directed by them. It was certainly not any new museology, as it was sometimes erroneously interpreted, but only museology which responded to demands following the eco-paradigm. This paradigm penetrated with increasing intensity not only into philosophy, science and culture, but also into the whole structure of society.

Nevertheless, in order to be able to solve topical questions, museology oriented in this manner demanded a professional base. This base could not be provided by museums, because the aim was not only the elaboration of theoretical questions, but the effort to implement new knowledge into the museum practice as well. This was the primary

reason for establishment of a relevant institutional and professional platform, which was clearly focused on the constitution of a chair oriented in this direction.

Z. Z. Stránský, in the context of a demand by the Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, elaborated on this basis a relevant proposal in 1997–1998. The university authorities incorporated it subsequently into a project of help for the town of Banská Štiavnica by establishing two university departments. On 1 July 1998, in the context of development of the ecological and environmental educational programme, the Chair of Eco-museology in Banská Štiavnica was founded as a branch department of Faculty of Science, Matej Bel University. The build-up of this Chair was entrusted to Z. Z. Stránský.

It started as if on a greenfield site, but since the school year 1998/1999 already, the Chair began to offer the following forms of museology studies:

- Full-time master's studies in ecology with specialisation in eco-museology. This form was intended for graduates from secondary schools, who were interested in the work in museums and related amenities.
- Bachelor's professional three-year distance studies in eco-museology with specialisation in museum conservation. They represented a platform for workers in museums, galleries or protection and preservation institutions, who completed their university studies but missed the museological specialisation.
- The above forms of study were accredited in the field of environmental ecology and in 1999, Z. Z. Stránský successfully defended the eco-museological specialisation before the Slovak Accreditation Committee.

That years were not easy, but it must be said that despite various obstacles springing from relocation of the Chair or from other circumstances, this initial period was handled at an appropriate level.

The Chair's staff also was built up and the operation of the department became stabilised. The scientific and research activity of the Chair began to develop, being based on a specific situation because it was a new department and at the same time a new discipline. Within the grant project VEGA in 1999–2000, the Chair was concerned with the problem of natural and cultural heritage. The research results were presented in a nation-wide professional seminar held in Banská Štiavnica in 2001 and published in the proceedings volume *Museologica II/2001*.

Research was also related to an activity concerning the elaboration of teaching textbooks, since most of the content represented new topics and the necessary literature was still missing. In 2000, the Chair published the *Basics of museology studies*. Their content was intended for students of museology and related disciplines and those interested in museum culture, preservation of nature and monument care. One year later the textbook *Museology* was published, which was focused on understanding the specialisation of this discipline and the system on which it was built.

The scientific and research activity of the Chair also included publishing of the periodical volumes *Museologica*. Two numbers (*Museologica I/2001* and *Museologica II/2001*) were still issued by the Chair when Z. Z. Stránský was the Chair Holder. The periodical has also been published in the subsequent period, but with modified title *Acta museologica*. The Chair began to build up a valuable mu-

seological library, which also comprised foreign periodicals, for example the German journal *Museum Aktuell*. Z. Z. Stránský cooperated at that time with many foreign departments and he also disseminated the knowledge of Slovak museums and the outputs of Slovak museologists in a wider European community.

### Conclusion

It is difficult to assess, to what extent we should presently perceive the effort by Z. Z. Stránský as remelted into activities, which formed not only our museums, but also the opinions on their existence and character. An objective or rather exhausting answer might be found in the future. Anyway, we must never forget a quite important fact. It was him who put the stagnant waters in motion and despite not very favourable conditions overcame the pitfalls of destiny to achieve eventually an appropriate result.

The problem of museology studies, even though we are not yet in a position to evaluate their present level, became reality today and, as it becomes obvious, they have supporters in Slovakia as well. The form, which thanks to Z. Z. Stránský became established in Brno, has resulted in practical employment of people who in many cases were able to see much further ahead than the ordinary human horizon allows. They also produced many varied and stimulating works. It is a solid base on which museology as an independent discipline can be further enriched and formed in accordance with the overall situation and the problems with which it deals. In such a spirit we should perceive it as well in Slovak conditions and we should strive that the reputation, which Z. Z. Stránský helped to build up in our country, finds its followers, who would continue his work.

### Literature and sources:

Archive of Department of Archaeology and Museology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic, collection *Katedra a Oddělení muzeologie* (unsystemised), file 14. běh PSM + Seznam absolventů PGS, Seznam absolventů postgraduálního studia muzeologie na FF UJEP v Brně.

DOLÁK, Jan and Jana VAVŘÍKOVÁ. *Muzeolog Z. Z. Stránský. Život a dílo*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2006.

JANOŠTINOVÁ, Marianna (ed.). *Památka k 25. výročiu založenia Zväzu múzeí na Slovensku*. Banská Bystrica: Zväz múzeí na Slovensku, 2015.

LALKOVIČ, Marcel. Kam smeruje múzejníctvo na Slovensku? *Európske múzeá na ceste k 21. storočiu, zborník referátov*. Košice: Východoslovenské múzeum v Košiciach, 1992, pp. 27–34.

Návrh zásad zákona SNR o múzejníctve. *Múzejník, orgán Zväzu múzeí na Slovensku*, marec 1992.

OKÁLI, Ivan. Niekoľko úvah nad jedným oznamom. *Múzeum*, 1998, č. 4, pp. 22–23.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálov prvého muzeologického symposia Brno – 1965*. Brno: Moravské muzeum v Brně, 1966.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Potrebujeme eko-muzeológiu? *Múzeum*, 1999, č. 2, pp. 18–20.

STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Nová katedra: katedra ekomuzeológie FPV UMB. *Museologica I/2000*, Banská Štiavnica, pp. 131–134.

STRÁNSKÁ, Edita. Celoslovenský odborný seminár k problematike prírodného a kultúrneho dedičstva. *Múzeum*, 2001, č. 2, pp. 35–36.

ŠÁŠKYOVÁ, Marianna. Výučba muzeológie na slovenských vysokých školách. *Múzeum*, 2000, č. 1, pp. 32–33.

Štúdium muzeológie v školskom roku 1998/99. *Múzeum*, 1998, č. 2, p. 32.

### MARCEL LALKOVIČ

museologist, Ružomberok  
Slovak Republic

METODICKÉ A INFORMAČNÍ TEXTY/  
 METHODICAL AND INFORMATIVE TEXTS

## ZBYNĚK ZBYSLAV STRÁNSKÝ: ŽIVOT A DÍLO

DOI: 10.5817/MuB2016-2-13

PAVEL HOLMAN

Když se řekne československá muzeologie 2. poloviny 20. století, známým se vybaví zejména tři osobnosti, které zde zakládaly a rozvíjely muzeologii jako vědní obor, ale také výukový obor na vysokých školách – Jiří Neustupný, Josef Beneš a Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský. K nim bychom mohli přiřadit ještě Jiřího Špěta jako předního odborníka na dějiny českého muzejnictví. Bohužel čas je neúprosný a tyto osobnosti nás postupně opouštěly, zanechavše zde svoje dílo a také žáky a následovníky. Bohužel 21. ledna 2016 odešla i poslední z těchto osobností Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský, zakladatel brněnské muzeologické školy, spoluzakladatel postgraduálního muzeologického studia a externí katedry na brněnské univerzitě a zakladatel katedry muzeologie a denního studia muzeologie na téže škole. S ním odešla poslední z osobností, které můžeme nazvat zakladateli české muzeologie a jejího mezinárodního věhlasu. Z. Z. Stránský byl osobou, která formovala teoretické základy muzeologie a podílela se také na tvorbě řady výstav a expozic v československých muzeích a památkových objektech a koncepcích mnoha muzeí. Své stopy zanechal také jako univerzitní pedagog a to prostřednictvím svých žáků, které učil kritickému muzeologickému myšlení.

Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský se narodil v Kutné Hoře dne 26. října 1926. Ale rodiče se brzy přestěhovali do Pardubic a později do Bratislavy. Na jeho zájmy a pozdější profesní směřování měly vliv povolání a zájmy jeho rodičů – matka byla profesorkou jazyků se zájmem



o hudbu, otec, profesí chemik, se zajímal o dějiny techniky a technické muzejnictví. Muzejnictví, resp. muzeologie se staly pro Zbynka Z. Stránského nejen povoláním, ale i posláním. Hudba pak celoživotním koníčkem.

V Bratislavě započal i středoškolská studia. Město ale musel s rodiči opustit na začátku 2. světové války, kdy se přestěhovali do Prahy. Zde také dokončil střední školu. Po skončení války, v roce 1946, nastoupil na Filozofickou fakultu Karlovy univerzity, obor filozofie a historie. Studia ukončil v roce 1950. Kromě toho také vystudoval externě muzikologii na Masarykově univerzitě v Brně. Po skončení studia nastoupil do muzea v České Brodě a poté do Muzea Antonína Dvořáka (součást Národního muzea). Zároveň pracoval i ve Společnosti Antonína Dvořáka. V roce 1952 nastoupil do Hellichova muzea v Poděbradech, kde se stal také ředitelem. Jeho zásluhou se muzeum stalo Krajským muzeem Pražského kraje. Za jeho působení začalo muzeum vydávat odborné periodikum *Muzejní zprávy Pražského kraje*, ve kterém hojně publikoval, včetně muzeologicky zaměřených článků. V roce 1958 z poděbradského muzea odešel do Muzea Vysočiny v Jihlavě.

Zásadní zlom v životě Z. Z. Stránského přišel v roce 1962. Tehdejší ředitel Moravského muzea v Brně, světově uznávaný antropolog, a můžeme také říci muzeolog, Jan Jelínek v rámci organizačních změn v muzeu zřídil také muzeologické oddělení. To mělo plnit funkci metodického, teoretického a dokumentačního centra a Zbyněk Z. Stránský se stal jeho pracovníkem. Zde mohl plně uplatnit a rozvíjet muzeologii jako vědu.

Hned po příchodu na muzeologické oddělení se zapojil do aktivit na poli muzeologie, které rozvíjel Jan Jelínek. Předně to bylo znovuobno-

vení vysokoškolské výuky muzeologie v Brně na filozofické fakultě. V roce 1921 zde Jaroslav Helfert zřídil lektorát muzejnictví, který ale zanikl s jeho odchodem z Brna do východních Čech na počátku 50. let 20. století. Jan Jelínek a s ním i Zbyněk Z. Stránský si uvědomovali nutnost speciální přípravy budoucích a stávajících muzejních pracovníků na práci v muzeích, na což je speciální studium jednotlivých vědních oborů zastoupených v muzeích nepřipraví. Proto usilovali o otevření takového studia v Brně. Po jednáních s vedením Univerzity Jana Evangelisty Purkyně a vedením Filozofické fakulty UJEP schválily vědecké rady těchto institucí otevření postgraduálního studia muzeologie a zřízení externí katedry muzeologie. Dalšími jednáními a přípravou studia byl pověřen Jan Jelínek. Postupně se podařilo připravit studijní plán, získat akreditaci a na podzim 1964 byl otevřen první běh postgraduálního studia muzeologie. Na všech přípravách se podílel i Zbyněk Z. Stránský, který se také aktivně zapojil jako jeden z vyučujících. Výuka v této formě studia probíhal až do poloviny 90. let 20. století. Celkem bylo realizováno 15 běhů a studium ukončilo cca 300 absolventů. S otevřením denního studia muzeologie zájem o tuto formu studia klesal, a proto byla ukončena.

Důležitým počinem muzeologického oddělení Moravského muzea a externí katedry muzeologie Filozofické fakulty UJEP bylo uspořádání muzeologického symposia v roce 1965. Účastnila se ho řada osobností české a slovenské muzeologie a muzejnictví, včetně nestora oboru Jiřího Neustupného. Zásadní příspěvky přednesl Jan Jelínek, který hovořil o potřebě muzeologie pro muzejnictví a její výuce na vysokých školách, a zejména Zbyněk Z. Stránský. Ten ve svých příspěvcích hovořil ve dvou rovinách – jednak o muzeologii jako vysokoškolském studijním oboru a jeho

studijním programu, jednak o muzeologii jako vědním oboru, jeho předmětu, systému a terminologii. Poprvé zde Zbyněk Z. Stránský představil svoje pojetí muzeologie, jeho předmět a systém. Upozornil na dílo svých předchůdců, počínaje Klimentem Čermákem a konče Jiřím Neustupným a Stránského současníkem Josefem Benešem. Prezentoval rovněž názory zahraničních muzeologů, jako byl Georges Henri Riviére, Alma S. Wittlin, H. A. Konnr aj. Na základě srovnání přístupů konstatuje, že předmětem zájmu muzeologie nemohou být jen muzea, ale i další formy sběratelství a speciálního přístupu lidí ke skutečnosti.

Svoje pojetí muzeologie Stránský pak prezentoval v několika vydáních Úvodu do studia muzeologie, z nichž první vyšlo v roce 1972 (další v letech 1979 a 1984, v roce 1993 vyšla speciální verze pro posluchače Mezinárodní letní školy muzeologie a to v české, anglické a francouzské verzi, česká upravená verze vyšla ještě v roce 2000) a také v řadě dílčích článků publikovaných u nás i v zahraničí.

Zbyněk Z. Stránský stál rovněž u zrodu významného muzeologického časopisu nazvaného *Muzeologické sešity*. Tento časopis vydávala Univerzita Jana Evangelisty Purkyně, Moravské muzeum a Moravská galerie počínaje rokem 1969. Tento časopis vycházel až do roku 1986. Vyšlo celkem 10 řádných čísel a 3 supplementa, v nichž svoje články publikovala řada předních našich i zahraničních muzeologů. Z pohledu výuky muzeologie v Brně je zajímavé II. Supplementum z roku 1974, celé věnované historii výuky od roku 1963, včetně studijních plánů. Toto číslo vyšlo i v angličtině a ruštině. Muzeologické sešity ve své době sehrály důležitou roli muzeologického teoretického časopisu, který doposud u nás nevycházel. Bohužel, pokusy o jeho

restart v první polovině 90. let skončily neúspěchem.

Díky publikační činnosti Stránského muzeologie vešla do širšího povědomí odborné veřejnosti u nás i v zahraničí a umožnila mu se zapojit do řady mezinárodních aktivit. Ať již na půdě ICOMu nebo v roce 1977 založeného ICOFOMu, tedy výboru pro muzeologii (zakladatelskými osobnostmi byli např. Jan Jelínek, Peter van Mensch, Vиноš Sofka aj.). Z pověření Ministerstva kultury se od roku 1978 podílel na práci mezinárodního týmu připravujícího slovník *Dictionarium museologicum*, který pak vyšel v roce 1983. Práce trvala několik let a přípravný tým vydával průběžně zpravodaje, kde byly prezentovány aktuální problémy a výsledky. Výsledný slovník byl nakonec koncipován jako překladový. Vedoucím jazykem byla angličtina. K anglickému termínu pak byl přiřazen ekvivalent v dalších 19 jazycích. Na české části pracoval právě Zbyněk Z. Stránský a Oskar Brůža. Na konci knihy pak byl zkušební výkladový slovník některých termínů. Předpokládalo se, že právě na výkladovém muzeologickém slovníku bude mezinárodní tým dále pracovat. Bohužel se členové nedokázali shodnout na tom, jak pokračovat a činnost týmu byla ukončena. Muzeologický terminologický výkladový slovník je dodnes restem, který teoretická muzeologie má. Ve svých publikacích se o základní terminologii pokoušel i Z. Z. Stránský, ale samostatný slovník nevydal. Ten publikoval nakonec Josef Beneš pod názvem *Muzeologický slovník*, ale ten zapadl a širšího ohlasu se nedočkal. Pokusy o slovník najdeme v zahraničí, kde v některých zemích takovéto slovníky vyšly. Od počátku 90. let 20. století na takovémto slovníku pracuje francouzský muzeolog Andrée Desvallées a jeho tým. Výsledek byl nedávno publikován.

Mezinárodní renomé Z. Z. Stránského a brněnské muzeologické školy bylo značné. Z. Z. Stránskému

to umožnilo vytvořit mezinárodní projekt školy, která by zahraničním účastníkům prezentovala výsledky brněnské muzeologie a také sem přivedla zahraniční muzeology, kteří by prezentovali svoje názory a svoje pojetí oboru. Projekt byl připravován pod záštitou UNESCO od roku 1983. V roce 1986 pak byla zřízena *Mezinárodní letní škola muzeologie – International Summer School of Museology (ISSOM)* a byl otevřen první běh základního kurzu, který měl posluchačům formou přednášek, cvičení a exkurzí prezentovat celý systém muzeologie. Zpočátku vytvářel pro účastníky jisté překážky tehdejší režim, ale škola fungovala a brzy si v zahraničí získala značné renomé. Obsahovou náplň školy a výběr zahraničních přednášejících připravoval Zbyněk Z. Stránský (po roce 1989 se na tom v některých případech podílel i Vиноš Sofka), organizační stránku měla na starosti pracovnice Sekretariátu ISSOM, kterých se na tomto místě vystřídal několik. Od roku 1986 se každý rok uskutečnil jeden běh základního kurzu. Od roku 1994 navrhl Z. Z. Stránský, na základě ohlasů od posluchačů, pořádat i kurzy speciální, zaměřené např. na muzejní management, muzejní výstavnictví a sbírkotvornou činnost. Od tohoto roku se každoročně pořádal buď základní kurz a jeden specializační, nebo dva specializační. Někteří posluchači absolvovali i více kurzů. Byli i tací, kteří ukončili všechny vypisované kurzy. ISSOM byla úspěšná škola, které se zúčastnili posluchači a vyučující ze všech kontinentů, vyjma Austrálie, a jak jsem uvedl výše, někteří přijeli několikrát jako studenti, ale také nejprve jako studenti a následně i vyučující. Po odchodu Z. Z. Stránského na Slovensko, na Univerzitu Mateja Bela, se ve vedení školy vystřídali Krasimir Damjanov, Vиноš Sofka a Jan Dolák. Poslední kurs se pak uskutečnil v roce 2000.

Z. Z. Stránský nezapomínal ani na výuku muzeologie na brněnské

univerzitě, ani na práci v muzeologickém oddělení Moravského muzea. V Moravském muzeu postupně budoval odbornou muzeologickou knihovnu, do které získával jak české publikace a časopisy, tak i zahraniční tituly. V těch případech, kdy nebylo možné získat knihu samotnou, byly pořizovány fotokopie. Týkalo se to zejména starší a staré muzeologické literatury, počínaje Samuelem Quicchenbergem, Johannem Danielem Majorem, Casparem Friedrichem Neickeliem atd. Vznikla tak cenná sbírka muzeologické literatury od nejstarší známé (Quicchenbergovo *Inscriptiones vel tituli theatri amplissimi* z roku 1565) až po 20. století. Další cennou sbírku, kterou Z. Z. Stránský budoval, tvoří soubor diapositivů, zachycující dobovou podobu československých a zahraničních muzeí, nebo soubor diapositivů zachycující podobu historických sbírek, doprovázejících přednášky z dějin sběratelství a muzejnictví. Muzeologické oddělení bylo také teoretickým a metodickým pracovištěm, na kteréžto činnosti se Stránský také podílel. Po jeho odchodu na Masarykovu univerzitu muzeologické oddělení postupně zaniklo, vytvořené fondy byly ale převedeny do Knihovny Moravského zemského muzea.

Z. Z. Stránský se také snažil rozvíjet výuku *postgraduálního studia muzeologie*. Zejména v sedmdesátých letech prošel výukový program některými reformami a byla posílána zejména teoretická výuka. Snahy akreditovat také denní výuku muzeologie zatím vycházely naprázdno. To se Zbyňku Z. Stránskému podařilo až po roce 1989. V roce 1992 bylo akreditováno denní studium muzeologie a založena Katedra muzeologie. Studium bylo již tehdy koncipováno jako dvoustupňové, bakalářské a na to navazující magisterské, což bylo tehdy na českých

vysokých školách neobvyklé, ale brzy se tento systém stal standardem. V roce 1993 pak byl otevřen první ročník bakalářského studia a první ročník magisterského studia (do něj nastoupili absolventi muzeologie ze Slezské univerzity, kde bylo tehdy pouze bakalářské studium). Od té doby se výuka muzeologie stále rozvíjí. Již Z. Z. Stránský začal budovat nezbytnou základnu každého vysokoškolského oboru, jako je odborná knihovna a i nezbytné technické vybavení. S tím mu pomáhal i Pavel Holman, který na katedru nastoupil jako odborný asistent v roce 1993. V roce 1994 se podařilo získat také část knihovny zrušeného Ústředního muzeologického kabinetu (v té době přejmenované na Muzejní informační a studijní službu) Národního muzea. Tím byla knihovna posílena o řadu cenné literatury vydávané českými a později i slovenskými muzei od 19. století a také literaturou zahraniční. Pomocí grantů bylo získáno potřebné technické vybavení, které obohatilo výuku a usnadnilo pracovníkům práci.

Otevření hranic v roce 1989 umožnilo Z. Z. Stránskému širší zapojení do mezinárodních aktivit, kterých se mohl zúčastnit i osobně. Účastnil se tak různých zasedání ICOMU i ICOFOMu a dalších muzejních a muzeologických institucí a univerzit.

V roce 1996 odchází Z. Z. Stránský do důchodu, ale ještě do roku 1998 působí jako ředitel ISSOM a také přednáší na Katedře muzeologie, která byla ale mezitím spojena s archeologií do Ústavu archeologie a muzeologie. V roce 1998 zakládá na Univerzitě Mateja Bela v Banské Bystrici Katedru ekomuzeologie, kterážto působila na odloučeném pracovišti v Banské Štiavnici. Katedru vedl až ro roku 2002, kdy odchází do důchodu.

I poté je zván na různé přednášky a akce, jak na Slovensku ale i dal-

ších evropských zemích. K osmdesátinám Z. Z. Stránského je uspořádána v Technickém muzeu v Brně mezinárodní konference, která má připomenout jeho dílo, ale také prezentovat nové směry v muzeologii. Referáty zde přednesla řada jeho spolupracovníků a žáků.

Postupně se ale Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský stahoval z veřejného života, i díky vážné chorobě, kterou onemocněl. Jeho srdce dotlouklo v ranních hodinách dne 21. ledna 2016. Jeho muzeologické dílo bude dále žít nejen v jeho publikacích, ale i v odkazu, který předal svým žákům v bohaté pedagogické kariéře, a kteří jeho myšlenky uplatňují v každodenní praxi. Ať je to používání termínů, které zavedl, jako muzeálie, muzealizace aj., nebo v přístupu k jednotlivým činnostem v muzeích. Jeho odkaz je také dále rozvíjen i na Oddělení muzeologie Ústavu archeologie a muzeologie Filozofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity v Brně, kterou zakládal.

**PAVEL HOLMAN**  
muzeolog, Brno  
Česká republika

#### ZBYNĚK ZBYSLAV STRÁNSKÝ: LIFE AND WORK

**PAVEL HOLMAN**

When somebody mentions Czechoslovak museology of the 2nd half of the 20th century, those who are in the know will mainly imagine three figures who founded and developed here museology as a scholarly discipline, but also as a field of university studies – Jiří Neustupný, Josef Beneš and Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský. Among them we could also count Jiří Špět as a top expert in the history of Czech museums. Time is unfortunately merciless and these personalities gradually passed

away, leaving here their work as well as disciples and followers. It is sad enough that on 21 January 2016 passed away the last of these personalities, Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský, founder of the Brno museological school, co-founder of postgraduate museology studies and external Chair at the Brno university, and founder of the Chair of Museology and full-time museology studies in the same school. With him left the last of figures whom we can call the founders of Czech museology and originators of its international renown. Z. Z. Stránský was a person who formed the theoretical foundations of museology and participated in creation of many temporary and permanent exhibitions in Czechoslovak museums and listed monuments, and development of conceptions of many museums. He also left his legacy as a university pedagogue through the medium of his disciples, whom he taught critical museological thinking.

Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský was born in Kutná Hora on 26 October 1926. But his parents soon moved to Pardubice and later to Bratislava. His interests and later professional career were influenced by occupations and interests of his parents – mother was professor of languages, interested in music, father was chemist, interested in the history of technology and technical museums. Museums, or museology, became to Zbyněk Z. Stránský not only an occupation but also mission. Music was his lifelong hobby.

In Bratislava he began to study in a secondary school. But he and his parents had to leave the town at the beginning of World War II, when they moved to Prague. Here he completed his secondary school education. After the end of the war, in 1946, he began to study at the Faculty of Arts, Charles University, in the fields of philosophy and history. He completed his studies in 1950. Besides this he also at-

tended part-time musicological studies at the Masaryk University in Brno. After completion of studies he started to work in the Museum of Český Brod and afterwards in the Antonín Dvořák Museum (part of the National Museum). At the same time he also worked in the Antonín Dvořák Society. Since 1952 he worked in the Hellich Museum in Poděbrady where he also became Director. It was his merit that the museum became Regional Museum of the Prague Region. Under him the museum began to issue a specialized periodical *Muzejní zprávy Pražského kraje* (Museum Reports of the Prague Region) in which he published many papers, inclusive of museologically focused articles. In 1958 he left the Poděbrady Museum and came to the Museum of Vysočina Region in Jihlava.

An important milestone in the life of Z. Z. Stránský came in 1962. The then Director of the Moravian Museum in Brno, world-recognised anthropologist, and we can also say museologist, Jan Jelínek within the scope of organisational changes in the museum also established a museological department. It was intended to play the role of a methodical, theoretical and documentation centre, and Zbyněk Z. Stránský was employed in this department. Here he could apply museology to the fullest extent and develop it as a science.

Immediately after being employed in the museological department, he became involved in activities in the field of museology, which have been pursued by Jan Jelínek. Among them was above all the re-opening of museology studies at the Faculty of Arts in Brno. In 1921, Jaroslav Helfert established here the Lectorate in Museum Studies which, however, was dissolved after his departure from Brno to South Bohemia in the early 1950s. Jan Jelínek and Zbyněk Z. Stránský were aware of the fact that any future or pre-

sent museum workers need a special professional training which is not included in specialized studies of individual disciplines involved in museums. That is why they made efforts to open such study programme in Brno. After negotiations with management of the University of Jan Evangelista Purkyně and its Faculty of Arts, the scientific boards of these institutions approved the opening of postgraduate museology studies and establishment of an external Chair of Museology. Another negotiations and preparation of studies were entrusted to Jan Jelínek. The curriculum was gradually set up, accreditation was gained, and the first run of postgraduate museology studies was opened in the autumn of 1964. Zbyněk Z. Stránský participated in all these preparatory works and he also took an active part as one of the teachers. Teaching in this form of study has taken place until the mid-1990s. A total of 15 runs of studies were realised, and about 300 graduates have completed their studies. After implementation of full-time museology studies, the interest in this form of study experienced a decrease and the postgraduate studies were therefore terminated.

An important action of the museological department of the Moravian Museum and the external Chair of Museology of the Faculty of Arts UJEP was the organisation of a museological symposium in 1965. It was attended by many personalities of Czech and Slovak museology and museums, including a doyen of the discipline, Jiří Neustupný. Crucial papers were presented by Jan Jelínek, who spoke about the necessity of museology for museums and about museology tuition in universities, and mainly by Zbyněk Z. Stránský. The latter spoke in his presentation about two levels – about museology as a field of university studies and its curriculum, and about museology as a scholarly discipline with its subject, system

and terminology. Zbyněk Z. Stránský introduced here for the first time his concept of museology, its subject and system. He turned attention to the work of his predecessors, beginning with Kliment Čermák and ending with Jiří Neustupný and Stránský's contemporary Josef Beneš. He also presented the opinions of foreign museologists, such as Georges Henri Riviére, Alma S. Wittlin, H. A. Konnr a. o. On the basis of a comparison between approaches he claims that the matter of museological interest need not to be only museums but also another forms of collecting activity and special approach of humans to reality.

Stránský presented his special concept of museology in several editions of the *Introduction to Museology Studies*, the first of which appeared in 1972 (the next ones in 1979 and 1984, in 1993 appeared a special version for the students of International Summer School of Museology in Czech, English and French language, and another modified Czech edition was published in 2000) and in many partial articles published in our country and abroad.

Zbyněk Z. Stránský also participated in foundation of an important museological journal titled *Muzeologické sešity*. This periodical was published by the University of Jan Evangelista Purkyně, Moravian Museum and Moravian Gallery from 1969 to 1986. The total of 10 regular issues and 3 supplements published contained articles by top Czech and foreign museologists. Interesting with regard to museology studies in Brno is the II Supplement from 1974, which is dedicated to the history of museology tuition since 1963, including the curricula. This issue was also published in English and Russian language. *Muzeologické sešity* played an important role of a museological theoretical journal, which has not yet

been published in our country until that time. The attempt to revive the journal in the first half of the 1990s unfortunately failed.

Thanks to Stránský's publishing activity, museology became widely known among the professional public in our country and abroad and enabled him to take part in international activities within ICOM or, since 1977, within ICOFOM, that is International Committee for Museology (among the founders were, for example, Jan Jelínek, Peter van Mensch, Vinoš Sofka a. o.). On the authority of the Ministry of Culture he participated since 1978 in the work of an international team preparing the *Dictionarium museologicum*, which was then published in 1983. The work lasted several years and the preparatory team continuously issued newsletters which featured topical problems and results. The final book was conceived as a translation dictionary. The main language was English and each English term was associated with equivalents in another 19 languages. The Czech part was elaborated by Zbyněk Z. Stránský and Oskar Brůža. At the end of the book there was a trial explanatory dictionary of several terms. It was supposed that the explanatory museological dictionary will be the next task on which the international team will cooperate. The members unfortunately could not reach an agreement on how to proceed, so that the activity of the team was terminated. The museological terminological explanatory dictionary remained an unfinished issue in theoretical museology. Z. Z. Stránský in his publications also attempted a basic terminology but he did not publish a separate dictionary. Such a work was finally published by Josef Beneš and titled *Muzeologický slovník* (Museological dictionary), but it sunk into oblivion without finding any wider recognition. Dictionaries were published in several foreign countries. French

museologist Andrée Desvallées and his team have been working on such a dictionary since the 1990s. The result was published recently.

The international renown of Z. Z. Stránský and the Brno museological school was considerably high. It enabled Z. Z. Stránský to work out an international school project which would present to foreign learners the results of the Brno museological school and attract foreign museologists who would present their opinions and conception of the discipline. The project has been prepared under the auspices of UNESCO since 1983. The *International Summer School of Museology* (ISSOM) was then established in 1986, beginning with the first run of the basic course which should have made the attendants familiar with the whole system of museology through lectures, tutorials and excursions. Some obstacles for the participants were initially generated by the then political regime, but the school functioned and soon it won a quite good reputation abroad. The content of the teaching and the selection of foreign lecturers were prepared by Zbyněk Z. Stránský (after 1989 also in co-operation with Vinoš Sofka), the organisational matters were in the competence of the ISSOM Secretariat where several workers have gradually replaced each other at the same post. One run of the basic course has taken place each year since 1986. Z. Z. Stránský, based on the response from learners, proposed to organise since 1994 as well specialized courses which would be focused on, for example, museum management, museum exhibitions and collecting activity. From that year either a basic course and a specialized course, or two specialized courses were opened each year. Some of the learners completed more than one course. There even were attendants who completed all the courses opened. ISSOM was a successful school, in which stu-

dents and teachers from all continents except Australia have taken part and, as I already mentioned above, some of the participants came several times as students, but also first as students and later as teachers as well. After departure of Z. Z. Stránský to the Matej Bel University in Slovakia, the school was led by Krasimir Damjanov, Vinoš Sofka and Jan Dolák who gradually replaced each other. The last course has taken place in 2000.

Z. Z. Stránský also taught museology at the Brno university and worked in the museological department of the Moravian Museum. In the Moravian Museum he gradually built up a specialized museological library, for which he acquired both Czech and foreign books and journals. If a book could not be acquired for some reason, a copy was made. This mainly concerned older museological literature, beginning with Samuel Quicchenberg, Johann Daniel Major, Caspar Friedrich Neickel, and others. This way arose a valuable collection of museological literature from the oldest known works (Quicchenberg's *Inscriptiones vel tituli theatri amplissimi* from 1565) to the 20th century. Another valuable collection built up by Z. Z. Stránský comprises an assemblage of projection slides capturing the historical appearance of Czechoslovak and foreign museums, or an assemblage of projection slides featuring the historical collections, which accompanied the lectures in history of collecting activities and museums. The museological department also was a theoretical and methodical workplace, in the activities of which Stránský has taken part. The museological department has gradually declined after his departure to the Masaryk University, but the established collections were transferred to the Library of the Moravian Museum.

Z. Z. Stránský also tried to develop the *postgraduate museology studies*.



The educational programme has mainly been changed and redesigned in the 1970s and focus was laid particularly on theoretical aspects. The efforts to accredit as well the full-time studies were not yet successful at that time. Zbyněk Z. Stránský succeeded with this effort as late as after 1989. In 1992, full-time museology studies were accredited and the Chair of Museology was founded. The education in museology was already at that time conceived as a two-degree study, namely the bachelor's programme and the follow-up master's programme, which was unusual at Czech universities of that time, but this system soon became a standard. The first year of bachelor's studies and the first year of master's studies (attended by museology graduates from the Silesian University where at that time only the bachelor's programme could be studied) were opened in 1993. Since then, the museology tuition has been constantly developed. It was already Z. Z. Stránský who began to build up the inevitable basis of each field of university studies, namely a specialized library and the necessary technical equipment. In this, he was helped by Pavel Holman, who started to work in the Chair as a fellow in 1993. In 1994, they managed to obtain a part of the library of the dissolved Central Museological Cabinet (at that time renamed to Museum Information and Study Service) of the National Museum. The library was thereby enriched with a lot of valuable literature published by Czech and later also Slovak museums since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and with foreign literature as well. Grants helped to obtain the necessary technical equipment, which enriched the teaching and made the educational work easier.

The opening of frontiers in 1989 enabled Z. Z. Stránský a wider participation in activities, in which he also could be personally involved.

He took part in various meetings of ICOM and ICOFOM and other museums and museological institutions and universities.

Z. Z. Stránský was retired in 1996, but until 1998 he still acted as Director of ISSOM and held lectures in the Chair of Museology, which was in the meantime connected with archaeology and gave rise to the Department of Archaeology and Museology. In 1998 he founded the Chair of Ecomuseology at the Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, which operated as a detached department in Banská Štiavnica. He has been the Chair Holder until 2002 when he went into retirement.

Even after being retired, he has been invited to various lectures and events, both in Slovakia and in other European countries. On the occasion of the 80<sup>th</sup> birthday of Z. Z. Stránský, an international conference was organised in the Technical Museum in Brno. The conference should have remembered his work but also presented new trends in museology. Papers were presented by many of his co-workers and disciples.

However, Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský gradually withdraw from public life, also due to serious illness from which he suffered. His heart went silent in the morning hours on 21 January 2016. His museological work will live on not only in his publications, but also in the legacy which he left to his disciples during a rich pedagogical career and who put his ideas into everyday practice. Be it the use of terms which he implemented, such as musealia, musealisation, etc., or the approach to individual activities in museums. His legacy has also been further developed in the Department of Archaeology and Museology at the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University in Brno, which he founded.

**PAVEL HOLMAN**  
museologist, Brno  
Czech Republic

## PRAVIDLA PRO PŘÍSPĚVATELE

*Museologica Brunensia* je mezinárodní vědecký recenzovaný časopis publikující původní vědecké práce, metodické a informační texty, recenze a zprávy z oblasti muzeologie a muzejnictví. Cílem je prezentovat muzeologii jako moderní vědeckou disciplínu ovlivňující muzejní praxi a seznámit čtenáře s aktuálními trendy v oboru.

Periodikum svým zaměřením navazuje na mezinárodně uznávané periodikum *Muzeologické sešity*, které vycházelo v letech 1969–1986 pod patronací brněnské univerzity a Moravského muzea v Brně.

## PRAVIDLA PRO PŘIJETÍ ČLÁNKU K UVEŘEJNĚNÍ

Přijímáme příspěvky do všech rubrik (studie, metodické a informační texty, medailon, recenze literatury, muzejní kritika, zprávy z oboru) v českém, slovenském nebo anglickém jazyce. Recenzním řízením procházejí příspěvky v rubrice Studie.

Nedílnou součástí studie (max. 45000 znaků) je abstrakt (max. 800 znaků včetně mezer), medailon autora (max. 200 znaků – působíště, profesní profílace, elektronický kontakt) a 5 klíčových slov v jazyce článku.

Redakční rada si vyhrazuje právo výběru příspěvku, který bude publikován.

## Uzávěrka jarního čísla je vždy

31. ledna, uzávěrka podzimního čísla je vždy 31. srpna.

## POŽADAVKY PRO AUTORY:

Rukopisy předkládejte ve formátu MS DOS, nebo MAC Pages. Písmo – Times New Roman 12 pt., řádkování 1,5. Grafy ukládejte zvlášť ve formátu DOC/XLS, přiložte náhled v PDF.

Tabulky ukládejte zvlášť ve formátu XLS, přiložte náhled v PDF. Grafy ve formátu XLS nebo DOC, přiložte také náhled v PDF. Obrázky v rozlišení nejméně 300 dpi v maximálním

počtu 5 fotografií na článek (formát tiff, eps) ukládejte vždy separátně. Tabulky značte jako obrázky. Popisky obrázků přikládáte ve zvláštním souboru s označením obrázků Obr. 1: (česky psaný příspěvek) anebo Fig. 1: (in English).

## Korespondenční adresa:

museologica.brunensia@phil.muni.cz (do předmětu zprávy uvádějte MB – příspěvek + jméno autora).

## CITAČNÍ PRAVIDLA:

Veškeré poznámky uvádějte pod čarou. Citace se řídí citační normou ČSN ISO 690. Názvy titulů uvádějte v původním jazyce. Používejte obraty: Ibidem Idem

## Příklady:

**1. Monografie** (u více než 3 autorů citujte publikaci pod názvem) EDSON, Gary. *International Directory of Museum Training*. London, New York: Routledge, 1995. ISBN 0-415-12257-0. FALK, John H. a Lynn D. DIERKING. *Learning from Museums: Visitor Experiences and the Making of Meaning*. Oxford: AltaMira Press, 2000. ISBN 0-7425-0295-3.

BRODESSER, Slavomír, Jan BŘEČKA a Jiří MIKULKA. *K poznání a slávě země. Dějiny Moravského zemského muzea*. Brno: Moravské zemské muzeum, 2002. ISBN 80-7028-193-9.

**2. Článek v periodiku**

SCHNEIDER, Evžen. Specifické vzdělávání muzejních pracovníků a jeho usoustavění v ČSR. *Muzeologické sešity: Supplementum* 3, 1985, s. 85–126.

DOUŠA, Pavel. Ústřední muzeologický kabinet 1955–1989. *Muzeum: muzejní a vlastivědná práce*, 2011, roč. 49, č. 1, s. 3–14. ISSN 1803-0386.

**3. Článek ve sborníku, příspěvek v monografii**

NEUSTUPNÝ, Jiří. Teorie ne návod k praxi. In STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálů prvního muzeologického symposia Brno – 1965*. Brno: Moravské muzeum v Brně, 1966, s. 18–19.

INGLE, Marilyn. Pupils' perceptions of museum education sessions. In HOOPEER-GREENHILL, Eilean. *The Educational Role of the Museum*. London, New

York: Routledge, 1994, s. 316–323. ISBN 0-415-11287-7.

**4. Archivní materiál**

Plná citace (v článku): Národní archiv v Praze. Fond 1005 – Úřad říšského protektora, kart. 534, sign. I – 10 V – 3 – 1 – Musea v Protektorátě – všeobecně a jednotlivě 1939 – 1944. Zpráva vrchnímu vládnímu radovi von Bothovi s názvem Der Jude Iltis als Begründer der Gregor Mendel – Museum in Brünn.

Zkrácená citace (v soupisu zdrojů): Národní archiv v Praze. Fond 1005 – Úřad říšského protektora, kart. 534.

**5. Elektronický zdroj**

Webové stránky: Ústav archeologie a muzeologie, oddělení muzeologie [online]. Brno: Filozofická fakulta Masarykovy univerzity, 2009 [cit. 2014-09-22]. Dostupný z www: <<http://www.phil.muni.cz/waom>>.

Článek na webu: STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Muzeologie hledá sebe sama. In *Katedra UNESCO pro muzeologii a světové dědictví* [online]. Brno: Filozofická fakulta Masarykovy univerzity, 2009 [cit. 2014-09-22]. Dostupný z www: <[http://www.phil.muni.cz/unesco/Cesky/clanek\\_8.html](http://www.phil.muni.cz/unesco/Cesky/clanek_8.html)>.

Publikace na webu: DODD, Jocelyn a Ceri JONES. *Mind, body, spirit: How museums impact health and wellbeing* [online]. Leicester: University of Leicester, School of Museum Studies, Research Centre for Museums and Galleries, June 2014 [cit. 2015-11-19]. Dostupný z www: <<https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/museumstudies/rcmg/publications/mind-body-spirit-report>>. ISBN 978-1-898489-49-8.

## RULES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

*Museologica Brunensia* is a reviewed scientific journal publishing original scientific works, methodical and informative texts, books and exhibitions reviews and news in the field of museology and museum environment. The aim is to present museology as a modern scientific discipline with application into museum practice and to inform about new trends.

Journal by its specialization is a follower of internationally respected journal *Muzeologické sešity*, published during years 1969–1986 in cooperation of Brno university and Moravian Museum in Brno.

### RULES FOR ARTICLE ACCEPTANCE

We accept contributions to all sections (Articles, Medallion, Book Review, Museum Review, News) in Czech, Slovak or English language. All contributions in the Articles section undergo a peer review process.

Abstract (max. 800 characters), medallion of the author (max. 200 characters) and 5 keywords in the language of the article are the integral parts of the main article (max. 45000 characters). The Editorial Board reserves the right to choose the article that will be published.

**Deadline for spring issue is always 31<sup>st</sup> January, deadline for autumn issue is always 31<sup>st</sup> August.**

### REQUIREMENTS FOR AUTHORS:

Manuscripts should be presented in MS DOS or MAC Pages. Font – Times New Roman 12 pt., line spacing 1.5. The resolution of images should be at least 300 dpi, a maximum of 5 photos per article (TIFF, EPS), each stored separately. Tables or charts should be indicated as images. Image description should be placed in a separate file with marking Obr. 1: (contribution written in Czech or Slovak) or Fig. 1: (in English).

**Mailing address:**  
museologica.brunensia@phil.muni.cz  
(Subject: MB – articles + name of author).

### CITATION RULES

All remarks and notes should be written as footnotes. Standard citation ČSN ISO 690 is used. Names of titles should be mentioned in the original language. Use phrases: *Ibidem* *Idem*

#### Examples:

**1. Monograph (book)** (in case of more than 3 authors, the book is to be cited by its title)

EDSON, Gary. *International Directory of Museum Training*. London, New York: Routledge, 1995. ISBN 0-415-12257-0.  
FALK, John H. and Lynn D. DIERKING. *Learning from Museums: Visitor Experiences and the Making of Meaning*. Oxford: AltaMira Press, 2000. ISBN 0-7425-0295-3.

BRODESSER, Slavomír, Jan BŘEČKA and Jiří MIKULKA. *K poznání a slávě země. Dějiny Moravského zemského muzea*. Brno: Moravské zemské muzeum, 2002. ISBN 80-7028-193-9.

**2. Article in a periodical**

SCHNEIDER, Evžen. Specifické vzdělávání muzejních pracovníků a jeho usoustavnění v ČSR. *Muzeologické sešity: Supplementum* 3, 1985, pp. 85–126.

DOUŠA, Pavel. Ústřední muzeologický kabinet 1955–1989. *Muzeum: muzejní a vlastivědná práce*, 2011, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 3–14. ISSN 1803-0386.

**3. Article in an anthology, contribution in a monograph**

NEUSTUPNÝ, Jiří. Teorie ne návod k praxi. In STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. (ed.). *Sborník materiálů prvního muzeologického symposia Brno – 1965*. Brno: Moravské muzeum v Brně, 1966, pp. 18–19.

INGLE, Marilyn. Pupils' perceptions of museum education sessions. In HOOPER-GREENHILL, Eilean. *The Educational Role of the Museum*. London, New York: Routledge, 1994, pp. 316–323. ISBN 0-415-11287-7.

### 4. Archival material

Full quotation (in the article):

*Archive of DAM, Centre of Museology* (unsystematized), file Muzeologie hlavní dokumenty, subfile Studium muzeologie (všeobecně). Studijní program: denní a specializační studium muzeologie (Brno 1994; Katedra muzeologie FF MU), pp. 6–19.

Short quotation (in bibliography):

*Archive of DAM, Centre of Museology* (Department of Archaeology and Museology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic) (unsystematized).

### 5. Electronic source

Web site: Masaryk University Information System: Open Services of Information System [online]. Brno: Masaryk University, Faculty of Informatics [accessed 2015-03-23]. Available from www: <<https://is.muni.cz/?lang=en>>.

Article on web site: STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Muzeologie hledá sebe sama. In UNESCO Chair of Museology and World Heritage [online]. Brno: Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts, 2009 [accessed 2014-09-22]. Available from www: <[http://www.phil.muni.cz/unesco/Cesky/clanek\\_8.html](http://www.phil.muni.cz/unesco/Cesky/clanek_8.html)>.

Book on web site: DODD, Jocelyn and Ceri JONES. Mind, body, spirit: How museums impact health and wellbeing [online]. Leicester: University of Leicester, School of Museum Studies, Research Centre for Museums and Galleries, June 2014 [accessed 2015-11-19]. Available from www: <<https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/museumstudies/rcmg/publications/mind-body-spirit-report>>. ISBN 978-1-898489-49-8.

## TIRÁŽ/MASTEHEAD

**MUSEOLOGICA BRUNENSIA**

vědecký recenzovaný muzeologický časopis/ peer-reviewed scientific museological journal  
periodicita 2x ročně (jaro a podzim)/periodicity twice a year (spring and autumn)

EV. číslo/Reg. Number: MK ČR E 20739

toto číslo vychází 17. 12. 2016/ issued 17 December 2016

ISSN 1805-4722 (Print), ISSN 2464-5362 (Online)

**VYDAVATEL/PUBLISHED BY**

Masarykova univerzita/Masaryk University

Žerotínovo nám. 9, 601 77 Brno

IČ 00216224

Czech Republic

**REDAKCE/EDITORIAL OFFICE**

Ústav archeologie a muzeologie, Filozofická fakulta Masarykovy univerzity/

Department of Archaeology and Museology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University

Arna Nováka 1, 602 00 Brno

e-mail: museologica.brunensia@phil.muni.cz

<http://phil.muni.cz/journals/museologica-brunensia>

**ŠÉFREDAKTOR/EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

Mgr. Otakar Kirsch, Ph.D.

e-mail: 9857@mail.muni.cz

**REDAKTORKA/EDITOR**

Mgr. Lucie Jagošová, DiS.

e-mail: jagosova@phil.muni.cz

**REDAKČNÍ RADA/EDITORIAL BOARD**

Prof. dr. sc. Darko Babić (Croatia)

Prof. Alexandra Bounia (Greece)

PhDr. Jan Dolák, Ph.D. (Slovakia)

Mgr. Ondřej Dostál, Ph.D. (Czech Republic)

Mgr. Lucie Jagošová, DiS. (Czech Republic)

Mgr. Otakar Kirsch, Ph.D. (Czech Republic)

Prof. Peter van Mensch, PhD. (Netherlands)

PhDr. Irena Loskotová, Ph.D. (Czech Republic)

prof. PhDr. Zdeněk Měřínský, CSc. †

Martin R. Schärer, PhD. (Switzerland)

doc. PhDr. Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský, CSc. †

prof. PhDr. Pavol Tišliar, PhD. (Slovakia)

Dr Sheila Watson (United Kingdom)

**GRAFICKÁ ÚPRAVA/GRAPHIC DESIGN**

Bc. Šárka Trávníčková

**FOTOGRAFIE NA TITULNÍ STRANĚ/  
COVER PAGE PHOTOGRAPHY**

Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský & Výuka muzeologie na brněnské univerzitě na počátku 80. let 20. století/

Museology class at Brno University at the beginning of 1980s

(Zdroj/Source: Archiv Ústavu archeologie a muzeologie, Masarykova univerzita, Brno/

Archive of Department of Archaeology and Museology, Masaryk University, Brno)

# MUSEOLOGICA BRUNENSIA

MB



MUZEOLOGIE  
BRNO

ISSN 1805-4722 (Print)  
ISSN 2464-5362 (Online)

# MB

2016 /05 /02

VĚDECKÝ RECENZOVANÝ MUZEOLOGICKÝ ČASOPIS/  
REVIEWED SCIENTIFIC MUSEOLOGICAL JOURNAL



MUZEOLOGIE  
BRNO

