

Interdisciplinary Research of Museum Forms End of XX–XXI Century

Vacovets Anna Laleksandrovna

Associate Professor of Design
Cherkasy State Technological University
Ukraine

ABSTRACT

In the article is reviewed the interdisciplinary of approaches to the analysis of modern museum form as an object of culture subsystem that is important and relevant not only from the standpoint of museology and art history, but culture in general. It is shown that in the second half of the XX century – at the beginning of XXI century museum becomes a new type of institution — it has new functions, new areas of influence. Keywords: museum, culture, interdisciplinary, art, ecomuseum, visual culture.

Introduction

The phenomenon museum was studying by different sciences: anthropology, philosophy, mathematics, psychology, pedagogy, cultural and many other studies, as the term «museum» is multidimensional and can be considered as interdisciplinary. At the turn of the century, particularly for the art criticism, fundamentally important and relevant is the understanding of the museum as cultural phenomenon in interconnection with the development of contemporary art and taking into account the diversity of modern museum forms activity. Among the most prominent foreign scientists who at the end of the XX – at the beginning of XXI century actively participated in the development of ideas about museology as a scientific discipline, the following names should be recollected: J. Benes, J. Neustupnyy, A. Gregorova (CSSR), Z. Stransky (Czechoslovakia). Let us consider the most common statements and assumptions some of them.

So, for example, J. Neustupnyy considers museum mainly as a scientific research institution. And such traditional museums functions as collection, storage and promotion of collections, in his opinion, are secondary and should therefore be subordinated to the requirements of research, designed to make full use of scientific knowledge in the field, but not to be limited by the available collections, assemblage. J. Benes puts to the fore the social significance of the museum. The scientist believes that the main task of museums is to develop and educate visitors, to combine aesthetic and scientific approaches in the design exposition, to use modern audiovisual media. The value of works of the scientist determined, not only by the fact that they are all written on the basis of own professional experience but also by factual material obtained

through Benes' administration in Czechoslovakia museums management. Benes has not developed his own scientific theory of museology, but development and confirmation of empirical material colleagues' ideas, summarizing existing experience let him to be considered one of the most important figures of theoretical museology of the second half of the XX century.

Special kinds of museum communication theory are considered the concepts of Slovak museum scientists Z. Stransky and A. Gregorova. The first of the above-mentioned researchers names the primary function of the museum, as social and cultural institute, the museum specific process of implementing special «museum» attitude to the reality that surrounds man, manifested in the intention to acquire, preserve and increase to transfer the future generations those values which shape the cultural form (accounting) of person. Contemporary museum, according to Stransky, is a historically created pattern of implementation of this intention, a form that at some point got its specific institutional expression. A. Gregorova as Z. Stransky, highlights the museum specificity in implementation of special relation of man to reality. This specific attitude was gradually born from the human need to collect, store and use in their activities accumulated with the help of items socio-cultural information, including information of human development.

Thus, the two defined concepts, which have right to be called philosophical understanding of information communicative approach to the museum, consider the phenomenon of the museum as a need of society realization to obtain information about a person through the objects, ways of human historical development and surroundings from the origin of the world to these days. Both above mentioned Slovak researchers called the described specific relation of man to reality «museum» because at this historical stage this ratio is realized by social institution «museum». Let us have some of the modern scientific works, which, in our opinion, are to some extent determinant as for the various aspects of the object of our study. Special attention, in particular, in the organization of modern museums, galleries, exhibition centers and art exhibition space as a whole, in recent years need visual researches (Visual Studies), which as an independent research line was formed about twenty five years ago.

One of the leading theorists of visual researches was John B.T. Mitchell, who said that these years in the humanities are characterized by the appearance of numerous works devoted to visual culture. Thus, under the auspices of visual studies work representatives of different branches of scientific knowledge — art historians, designers, philosophers, cultural studies scientists, anthropologists, psychologists, political scientists, psychologists and others. As a supplement, you can say that about the same time begins to be developed such a direction as computer scientific visualization, dealing mainly in designing interactive visual environments for solving applied research problems using the computer, so the interest to visibility topics goes beyond just humanitarian research. The appearance in recent years a huge number of interdisciplinary fields of study, an example of which are visual researches, prompts scientists to comprehension this situation, which in the sphere of institutional science structuring can be considered the third stage from the emergence of science in its modern sense.

Note that on the first, classical stage, there were quite clear boundaries that divide scientific disciplines (like biology, physics, philosophy, and later they added psychology and social sciences, etc.), number of which was insignificant. In the XX century (the second stage of the science organization) institutional structure of science has undergone significant changes which were in fragmentation great classical branches of knowledge in numerous small, with narrow specialists in their field who had typically only a general idea of their colleagues' work in related with them areas. Interdisciplinary is a specific feature of the third stage (the end of the XX century – beginning of XXI century). Representatives of some research areas, without losing their membership of a particular scientific community gather in interdisciplinary local communities on the basis of the need to unite to solve certain tasks or studies of individual domains, formed as a result of certain social changes on the demand of time and need to concentrate the efforts of specialists of various branches of scientific knowledge.

A striking example of such object researches can be considered the study of globalization processes. It is quite natural that the community of professionals involved in visual studies can also be attributed to this kind of association due to the fact that the interest to visuality called by certain socio-cultural changes that brought on the agenda the question of a special study of visual culture, visual perception, imagination and thinking. Demonstration of interest in visuality by representatives of different sciences prompted its more radical researchers announce a paradigm shift in the field of social and humanity study — visual turn. Thus, in the traditional disciplines dealing with visual images — art criticism — held a turning point in relationship to art as an autonomous sphere of art. Work of art was not perceived as an independent invention of genius already, as forms of its vision largely are dictated by day and context. Moreover, art was faced with the “crisis of paradigm” within the meaning of the term by T. S. Kuhn and found itself unable using traditional methods to describe art, new practices that have emerged recently and operate visual images, as well as video art, media art, TV etc.

So, summing up, we can state that visual culture or visual studies, where in focus are the processes by which value is created in a cultural context, is a new interdisciplinary direction, which appeared at the intersection of theory of culture, design, philosophy, sociology, museology and art history, the main problem of which is the study of cultural logic of “postmodern”, “mass media” and “visual” turn. Visual culture is becoming the dominant and decisive. The development of the idea of the museum renewal towards more active its social mission happens in the second half of the XX century and is due to the change of cultural paradigm in post-war Europe and post-colonial world. Substantial revision of the system of values that occurred after World War II led to the rapid development of culture of everyday life.

Appeal to the average person as a person, his interests and needs in the field of museum embodied in the origin of the movement for «new museology». It emerged in the late 60's – early 70's. of the XX century and manifested in the creation of fundamentally new museum — anthropological museum or ecomuseum, which had a

profound resonance in theory, technique and methodology of museum study. Anthropology process of this field of knowledge moved museum science to new frontiers of knowledge of interdisciplinary direction. Herewith in the definition of science the term museology is used oftener than former museum study. Ecomuseum concept was born and was firstly implemented in France by Georges Henri Rivi re. By the author was firstly given a general definition of ecomuseum as a new type of institution and emphasized four characteristics that define its essence as a socio-cultural institution: it's a mirror where people can see themselves and the world of nature and culture; it's a laboratory study of the past and present, of the region; it's reserve, that promotes the preservation and evaluation of local natural and cultural heritage; finally, a school that involves local residents to work on the study and protection of heritage, promotes better awareness of their future.

Thus, the museum as a channel of cultural communication is the most important institution in the cultural identity of man and begins to be considered as the most important factor in the development of the individuality, and hence the society as a whole. It should be noted that ecomuseums significantly changed the idea of a museum object, museum space and the museum's heritage. First of all, it is an environmental museum that gives a holistic system (multidimensional) image of history and culture. Unlike traditional specialized museums it is so versatile and based on an interdisciplinary approach. Canadian museologist Pierre Meyran notes that new museology operates with such concepts as communal museology, interdisciplinarity, human development. Its philosophical principles are the socialization of museology and changing approach. The need of problems solution related to the environmental crisis in next years has made another contribution to changing the status and structure of museum science. In these circumstances, museums assume another social mission — laying the foundations of ecological culture, in practical implementation of which appears the new system of museum-type institutions, which implemented other significant knowledge of the legacy, ways of preserving, museumification and use in environmental education. The functioning of these institutions is the interdisciplinary approach, implemented in the integration of instruments humanitarian and natural sciences.

A significant contribution to interdisciplinary research in various aspects of relations between society and the environment, introduced, as was already noted, the outstanding Russian and Ukrainian scientist V.I. Vernadsky, whose works formed the basis for the formation of systemic ideas about man and nature, which became well known as biosphere type of mindset. Today the museum becomes a new type of institution — it has to perform new functions affect new areas. In the second half of the XX century – at the beginning of XXI century world researchers' efforts were again directed to the socio-cultural understanding of museum phenomenon and its role in the life already postindustrial society (U.V. Zinovieva, D. Cameron, I.V. Panteleichuk, Van Pratt, Z. Stransky, A.V. Chugunova, L.M. Shlyahtina, T.U. Yuryenyeva,) growing interest in theoretical aspects of the museum as a social institution in teaching (T.U. Byelofastova, O.A. Botyakova, L.M. Voronova, F. Yyenavayn, B.B. Kaminska, N. S.

Martem'yanova, S.V. Murawska, Ch.M. Medzhydova, B.A. Stolyarov, A. Hausen, L.M. Shlyahtina), historical (U.A. Omelchenko, K.E. Ribak, G.Y. Skripnik, L.D. Fedorova), art (O.G. Barshynova, A.A. Bilyk, O.D. Gladun, O.A. Kotova, S.V. Marinova, O.M. Petrova, Z. Stransky, I.A. Yakovets) philosophical, cultural (L.M. Bagata, A.G. Bakanursky, L.I. Zayeva, T.P. Kalugina, O.Y. Kalnitska, B.A. Lychkovah, O.G. Myeschyerina, S.V. Ovcharenko, A.P. Ovchinnikova, O.A. Pushonkova, O. S. Sapanzha, O.P. Shchokina) aspects.

Conclusion

It should be noted that any of museological approach is problematic and inefficient to cultural studies. The problem is that when the main object of scientific study revealed the museum itself as a cultural institution, isolated institutional and phenomenological analysis doesn't allow to understand why the museum is necessary to the culture, what functions it performs, why at some stage this cultural and historical phenomenon was formed, if it has more prospects and development potential, or whether it is merely a product of a particular historical period, and should go into the past. According to the philosopher T. P. Kalugina, it's impossible to understand and solve this problem, analyzing only the museum as an institution, as a channel of cultural communication or as a system of «selforganizing».

Much more productive, says the author, is the study of the museum, including art, as one of cultural forms, that is the combination of elements that make up this cultural form, in their genesis and modern development. Thus, one could confirm that interdisciplinary researches of the museum forms as an object of culture subsystem is important and relevant not only from the standpoint of museology and art history, but also culture in general, as cultural establishments and institutions represent a form of life and can give invaluable material for analysis of existence methods and algorithms of cultural development in the future.

References

- Cameron, I.V. (2016) Philosophical, Cultural and Historical Concept of Museology. AJERSA. Pg. 15-25.
- U.V. Zinovieva, D. (2014) Growing interest in theoretical aspects of the museum as a social institution in teaching. IJPAC.
- Van Pratt (2009). XXI century world researchers.