

Biedermann, Bernadette

The theory of museology : museology as it is - defined by two pioneers: Zbyněk Z. Stránský and Friedrich Waidacher

Museologica Brunensia. 2016, vol. 5, iss. 2, pp. 51-64

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

Stable URL (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5817/MuB2016-2-6>

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/136264>

Access Date: 21. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

STUDIE/ARTICLES

THE THEORY OF MUSEOLOGY. MUSEOLOGY AS IT IS – DEFINED BY TWO PIONEERS:¹ ZBYNĚK Z. STRÁNSKÝ² AND FRIEDRICH WAIDACHER³

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”⁴ 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.⁵ As he argues, it corresponds to the epistemological basis of a “scientific discipline”,⁶ 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>.

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.⁷ 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.⁸ 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,⁹ from source disciplines,¹⁰ cultural studies¹¹ and museum studies.¹²

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 museology¹³ in which Friedrich Waidacher was also involved.¹⁴ While Stránský developed a “Brno school” of museology,¹⁵ Waidacher established a “school” of museology in Graz, where museological Stránský-Waidacher thoughts are currently adopted and reflected upon in several museology courses.¹⁶

Stránský published nearly 400 scientific works,¹⁷ 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 age¹⁸ as well as with museums in the

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

There are several connections between the two museological pioneers Z. Z. Stránský and F. Waidacher, on which this article will focus.²³ These connections between the two museologists have not been subject to detailed research until now.²⁴ 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>.

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*. 3rd 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>.

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.²⁵

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 “Vitinologie”.²⁶ Additionally, both were confronted with “*widespread tunnel vision on the part of museum staff working with source disciplines.*”²⁷ This ultimately resulted in their need to “*look beyond the borders.*”²⁸

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”²⁹

As early as 1971, Stránský submitted two articles entitled “Der Begriff der Museologie”³⁰ and “Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie”,³¹ 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”.³²

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

later used by Stránský.³⁴ Waidacher³⁵ 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.³⁶ With regard to G. H. Rivière³⁷ 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”.³⁸

Studying the question of a suitable object of knowledge³⁹ for the discipline, Stránský especially refers to the considerations of Z. W. Gluziński.⁴⁰ 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."⁴¹ 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."⁴²

Following these thoughts,⁴³ 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.⁴⁴ 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'."⁴⁵

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.⁴⁶

Taking into account K. R. Popper's scientific epistemology of falsification,⁴⁷ Stránský concluded that, in an academic discipline, neither the museum nor the museum objects could be the object of investigation in museology.⁴⁸ 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*. 9th 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 VIEREGG, 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."⁴⁹ The subject of “museum theory” thus comprises the “entire area of the museum or activity of the museum.”⁵⁰ But the “museum reality” is more, namely “the expression of human activity”. It “carries a certain benefit for society.”⁵¹

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.⁵² 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,”⁵³ 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>.

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>.

of philosophical metatheory for the process of documentation.⁵⁴

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.”*⁵⁵ Stránský named this specific aspect of reality “museality”.⁵⁶ He saw museality as a “special aspect of reality, which can only be conceived through a recognizing and evaluative relationship of man to reality.”⁵⁷ *“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.”*⁵⁸

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.”*⁵⁹

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.”*⁶⁰

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.”*⁶¹

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.”*⁶²

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.⁶³

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>.

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*. 3rd 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”.⁶⁴

These thoughts formed the basis of the discipline’s system. In his text on “museology as a science” first published in English in 1980⁶⁵ and later in multiple German writings,⁶⁶ Stránský submitted the most consequential systematization of museology: he divided museology into “historical”, “theoretical” and “applied” museology.⁶⁷ This classification was further developed and deepened by Waidacher.⁶⁸

The foundations of this division can be found in his early 1971 work titled “Grundlagen der Allgemeinen Museologie”.⁶⁹ 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.*”⁷⁰ With regard to Stránský, carriers of museality are seen as “*authentic unmediated evidence*”⁷¹ of reality. The related process is known as the process of musealization.⁷²

In several papers⁷³ 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).⁷⁴ 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).⁷⁵ 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.*”⁷⁶ In doing so, the abstract is presented by the concrete.⁷⁷

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*. 3rd 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>; 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>.

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).*”⁷⁸ “*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.*”⁷⁹ 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.⁸⁰

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

tions.⁸³ 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 Mensch⁸⁴ and Friedrich Waidacher⁸⁵ 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.⁸⁶

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.⁸⁷ To determine the character of museology from the position of a general philosophical and metascientific position, Stránský had even coined the term “metamuseology”⁸⁸ and stressed that it does not deal with “special museology”, but with a “heuristic system”.⁸⁹ 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.*”⁹⁰ He continued: “*components of theoretical museology are not functions, but knowledge systems.*”⁹¹

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”.⁹² He divided museology into a “diachronic”,⁹³ a “synchronous”,⁹⁴ a “theoretical”⁹⁵ and an “applied” level.⁹⁶ In his opinion, this system would comprehensively cover the “*theoretical and practical knowledge levels and represent a basis for authentic museological research.*”⁹⁷ The individual disciplines would thus form a “dynamic system”.⁹⁸

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.⁹⁹ 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,*”¹⁰⁰ 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 addendum¹⁰¹ 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”.¹⁰² Stránský approached both topics critically.¹⁰³ 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”.¹⁰⁴

Methodologies

To fulfil the tasks of an academic discipline, museology would have to develop appropriate methods.¹⁰⁵ 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.¹⁰⁶

A whole chapter in Waidacher’s “Handbuch” is dedicated to the methodologies of investing in the object of knowledge.¹⁰⁷ Accordingly, museology should use an “*elastic multilayered approach in the choice of its methods,*”¹⁰⁸ 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*”.¹⁰⁹ Moreover, he emphasizes the essence of museology as an interdisciplinary subject that applies methods of the source disciplines as well as neighbour sciences.¹¹⁰ Therefore, the methods of knowledge have to be borrowed depending on the question and corresponding to the thesis in relation to museality.¹¹¹

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.¹¹²

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 1974,¹¹³ as a “pioneering” act. He therefore supported the publication of a “Dictionnaire museologicum”, the first edition of which was published in 1978.¹¹⁴

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.¹¹⁵ He also established the term “Nouophors”, naming musealia as carriers of sense and meaning.¹¹⁶ 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”.¹¹⁷

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”.¹¹⁸ 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.*”¹¹⁹

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.*”¹²⁰

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>.

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>.

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>.

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.”¹²¹ 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”¹²² 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.¹²³ Stránský placed particular importance on the point that “museum staff, therefore, perceive present life, pursue its problems and take their own dedicated position.”¹²⁴

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>.

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.¹²⁵ After Stránský published his article on training programmes, some more courses were started, taking place at Leipzig University of Applied Sciences¹²⁶ and at Julius Maximilian University in Würzburg.¹²⁷

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.”¹²⁸

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/>.

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.”¹²⁹

Stránský received this compliment for his review of “museology as a communist science”¹³⁰ 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”.¹³¹ 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.¹³² 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.*”¹³³ 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 29th 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.

¹³² STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Thema mit Variationen zu Friedrich Waidacher. *Museum aktuell*, September 2004, pp. 9–13.

¹³³ 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*. 3rd 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>. 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>.

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 MAIRASSE (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>. ISBN 978-2-200-25398-1.
- DOLÁK, Jan and Jana VAVŘÍKOVÁ. *Muzeolog 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/icofofom>>.
- 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>.
- 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/>.
- 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>.

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.