

Muz., 2020(61): 37-59
 Annually, eISSN 2391-4815

received – 01.2020
 reviewed – 02.2020
 accepted – 02.2020
 DOI: 10.5604/01.3001.0014.1129

HISTORY OF THE MUSEUM CONCEPT AND CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES: INTRODUCTION INTO THE DEBATE ON THE NEW ICOM MUSEUM DEFINITION

Dorota Folga-Januszewska

Academy of Fine Arts in Warsaw, Museum of King John III' Place at Wilanów

In the course of the Kyoto International Council of Museums (ICOM) General Conference on 1–7 September 2019 an essential modification of the museum definition was proposed. Its new wording was the task of the ICOM standing committee appointed for the purpose in December 2018.¹ Debates over each word and single concept used in the new definition in their definite contexts were analysed, and a report documenting the works² yielding the proposal of the new definition (See: Annex 1: New Kyoto Museum Definition) was sent out to all the national and international committees 60 days prior to the meeting in Japan. Slightly earlier, a consultancy process had started covering January–June 2019. The new definition met with an extremely vivid reaction. Over 250 differently phrased museum definitions had been submitted to the Standing Committee for Museum Definition, Prospects and Potentials (MDPP). During the Kyoto Conference the debate was dominated by the group of the participants who were in favour of rejecting this new proposal, differently justifying their lack of approval: both

for the fear of implementing it in their national and regional legislation (for terminological and legislative reasons) as well as for extremely different interpretations of the terms used in the new definition.

Why such a vivid reaction? In the ICOM Statutes the museum definition is of key importance. It is included in their Art. 3 in the wording voted for at the 2007 Vienna General Conference reading: *A museum is a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment*, and has remained valid until today. This relatively simple definition resulted from numerous changes in the evolution process spanning 1946–2007. (See Annex 2: Evolution of ICOM Museum Definition in 1946–2007); today the concept is used in this understanding in many documents and records, while this very wording of the definition is the grounds of numerous legal acts

in 138 member countries where national ICOM committees have been established.

However, in order to understand the essence of the problem, it is necessary to at least briefly follow the history of museum as well as the use of the word in different history periods and contexts.

Over two and a half thousand years have passed since the 'museum' (*Μουσείον*, *musaeum*) concept appeared in Greek and Latin. Over this long time of civilizational transformations the concept has had many applications both in the sphere of intangible heritage, as well as in order to define existing permanent institutions.³ When beginning the analysis of museology transformations it is worth remembering that by saying the word 'museum' we enter the trend in the cultural tradition related to teaching, education, creativity, sensuality. At the same time we slip past other phenomena that are close to museum: collecting, gathering, amassing worth treasuries, memory policy. Close but not identical!

So what was museum between the 4th century BC and the establishment of the huge research institute in Alexandria around 280 BC? It was a collection of stories, a venue for meetings and feasting, a cave, a hill, a festival. But first and foremost, it was one of the areas essential within the school: *lycaeum* and *gymnasium*, as defined within Aristotle's *Lykeion* in Athens.⁴

A museum was a home of the Muses and what this means was best known by poets, painters, musicians, philosophers, and scholars. Since in ancient times it served mainly as the place of any creativity whose traces in different forms: records, experiments, subjects, remained and served science, cognition, reflection, as well as pleasure.

According to the *Theogony*, in the beginning were the Muses (Μοῦσαι, *Moūsai*, Latin: *Musae*). It was to them that the Greeks attributed creative powers and any inspiration for all the intellectual activity. They were believed to be the daughters of Mnemosyne and Zeus, fruit of nine nights of love, however throughout different regions of ancient Greece both their number (three, six, or nine) as well as their descent were differently described. Alexandria's grammarians when introducing the division of Herodotus' *Histories* into nine books contributed to consolidating the myth of nine Muses,⁵ using the name of a different one as the title for each book: Clio, Euterpe, Thalia, Melpomene, Terpsichore, Erato, Polymnia, Urania, and Calliope. *The oldest songs of the muses were the ones they praised the victory of the Olympians over the titans, in order to celebrate the birth of the new order*, writes Grimal.⁶ This 'new order' is of great importance, since the activity of the Muses is first of all the contribution to ordering the arts and sciences according to inspiration and pointing out to their decisive role in history, whose source is inspiration – after all the Muses were the daughters of Mnemosyne!

An equally important role was played by Musaeus (Μουσαῖος), whose name appeared at two points distant in time: ancient, namely mythical, and late (5th century AD), i.e. historical. That first, mythical, was associated with Orpheus.⁷ Pausanias (I 14) was the one mentioning Musaeus' songs, emphasizing peculiar and multiple skills of the inspired poet and musician. He is said to have been able to heal with music and to have invented dactylic meter. It is also from Pausanias that we learn about the affiliation of the

hill called Mouseion in Athens with the poet and musician.⁸

The tradition of Mouseion as a hill of poetry and venue for making music survived for several centuries, in the meantime transforming into a literary tradition. Musaeus was also the name of a 5th-century Greek poet, author of the most beautiful known poem-epyllion *Hero and Leander* written down in 340 hexameter verses called *Musaeus Grammaticus*;⁹ the name of the author entered several modern languages in the Middle Ages.¹⁰

In the meantime, namely over the period of almost eight centuries: between the 4th century BC and the 4th–5th century AD, also performative and intangible tradition was present: mouseions existed as festivals. In Alexandria of the times of Ptolemy I Philopator (246 or 238–204 BC) regular Apollo-dedicated poetry and music contests were held, the tradition actually continued in the Roman Empire; its participants were to be lodged and to feast at the Mouseion. Furthermore, also outside Alexandria literary tradition was alive. In the records related to Longinus the convert, *musaeum* appears in the meaning of a 'travelling library'.¹² The application of the concept of museum as related to a literature collection had been known several centuries earlier. Alcidas (4th century BC) called a collection of his stories *Musaeum*, this having been reminded by Nietzsche.¹³

When referring to the transfer of the tradition of Greek theatre to the times of the Roman Empire, Sebastiana Nervegna points to the role *musaeia* played as festivals. A catalogue of *musaeia* written down before 212 has been preserved, that is why it is known that they were *an old festival of a well-rooted tradition*.¹⁴

The motif of museum as a literary collection or a set of records (*mouseion*) revived in the Middle Ages and the modern era. The concept of museum was incorporated into French as a synonym of a knowledge institution that plays the role of a library. In the translation of the Code of Justinian (*Digeste de Justinien*), namely the record of the quotes of Roman jurists, the first in Francophone culture definition of museum can be found: *a building where one can dedicate himself to art, poetry, and knowledge*.¹⁵

However, it is the *Inscriptiones* from 1565 by Samuel Quiccheberg that are of major importance for the considerations on the museum definition, the work being not merely the effect of the individual collector's passion of the main advisor to Duke of Bavaria Albrecht V, but first of all the yield of the modern form of description and 'standardizing' of museum collections having been developed for over a century. Those *inscriptions or titles of a vast theatre, containing the individual subjects and images of things such that one may with reason also call this a repository of artificial and extraordinary things, of every rare treasure and precious furnishing, of buildings and pictures that are examined and collected together here in this theatre, in order that through the repeated inspection and study of them, one may obtain in rapid, easy, and certain fashion singular knowledge and a marvellous practical experience of all things*.¹⁶ The author is Samuel Quiccheberg, the edition was published at Adam Berg's printing house in 1565 thanks to the favour and permission of Emperor Maximilian II.¹⁷

Every revival of the ancient tradition in European culture as of the 8th century, regardless of whether in the Middle Ages it proposed the return to the reading of Aristotle's

writings, or was revealed in the fascination with Greek and Latin manuscripts in the 13th–14th-century Florence, or as the rediscovery of ancient science in the Renaissance, was at the same time the return to the idea of museum as the place of academism and learning. Museological studies conducted at the turn of the 21st century brought abundant literature on the subject where we find descriptions of museums as an institution of multi-sensory perception, where the language and the concepts it brings interlace with the experiencing through sight, touch, hearing, smell. In European culture museums were experiencing laboratories; different tools and methods were used in order to make them at the same time personalized and objective. At a certain point the attempts to make them objective turned into the dominating number of collections of objects filling spaces, though in their essence museum exhibits in an educational institution were not to serve the purpose of holding, but studying. In that sense the 17th and early 18th centuries were the period when this critical mass of the collected material objects began to dominate over the idea, concept, knowledge, and experiencing, thus becoming the museums' distinctive feature. This, in turn, began to arouse objections and transformed the profile of those institutions, in the late 18th century only leaving written records to testify to the memory of the past museums.¹⁸

When searching for the old definition of museum one must bear in mind that the concept was then associated with centres of learning from the experiencing of the amassed collections. From the 15th to the 18th century there abounded museum synonyms perceived as 'knowledge sources'. Jeffrey Abt lists them: *pandechion*,¹⁹ *studiolo*, *gabinetto*, *Wunderkammer*, *galleria*, *Kunstkammer*, *Kunstschrank*.²⁰ In the 16th- and 17th century records other synonyms can be found: *bibliotheca*, *thesaurus*, *theatrum*. The term 'museum' was also used in the meaning of 'encyclopaedia', 'anthology', 'dictionary'. The metaphorical definition of such museum of learning as *pandechion* was described by Ulisses Aldrovandi (1522–1605): *a vast forest of knowledge in which everyone can find what poets, theologians, legislators, philosophers, and historians... may have ever written, as well as any objects that come from nature or creativity, that anyone would ever wish to become acquainted with or compose*.²¹ Aldrovandi's concept of *Pandechion Epistemonicon* derived from Pliny the Elder (23–79) is tightly related to the history of science. The reference to the discussed work makes us realize that there existed such a close bond between natural sciences and the museum model as a research and knowledge institution, the concept transferred from Greek Antiquity to Italy of the Renaissance.

Aldrovandi uses the concept of museum as a synonym of the 'collection of knowledge', both as long as it refers to a certain selected group of phenomena (e.g. metals: *Musaeum mettalicum*²²), and the description of the universe. The notions of *pandectae* (πανδέκτης *pandektes*) or *digesta*²³ were applied in ancient Rome to define a collection of laws, associated first and foremost with the *Code of Justinian*,²⁴ throughout the 16th century propagated also through the German translations (*Pandekten*²⁵).

The affinity to this model and such a definition of *musaeum* could be found in the concepts of *theatrum* and *thesaurus*. The demonstration of the fact that they were not

merely titles of literary works or knowledge compendia recorded in texts can only be found in the above-mentioned treatise by Samuel Quicchberg *Inscriptiones vel Tituli Theatri Amplissimi*,²⁶ regarded to have been the first known record of the typology of museum collections, or almost a textbook arranging an ideal-world museum. The translation of Quicchberg's work into English is an interesting contemporary study of recreating historical places through the return to understanding language records.²⁷

The treatise published in 1565 may thus undoubtedly be regarded as the first in Europe adopted modern 'inventory' of principles of creating and defining the concept of museum as serving science study and learning. Krämer²⁸ points to the fact that around the mid-16th century north of the Alps there appeared many outstanding scientists whose ambition was to organize knowledge in the 'museum-like' manner. Among them there was an illustrious Swiss naturalist Konrad Gesner (1516–65), author of the work titled *Bibliotheca Universalis* published in Zurich in 1545, and containing an alphabetically ordered list of 15.000 items by 3.000 authors, constituting a compendium of the almost all known literature at the time. In his work Gesner also applied such concepts as *catalogus*, *elenchus*, *historia litteraria*, *index*, *lexicon*, *repertorium*, *thesaurus*; these terms, shortly afterwards transferred to the museum-related language, had quite a substantial impact on the idea of uniting library structure with museum. The idea, actually, hibernated from the times of the Alexandrian museion, had been on stand-by awaiting its renaissance. Reading Neickel's *Museographia*²⁹ one finds such a list of 'museums of knowledge' distinctly demonstrating that the Quiccheberg model had become universal. Possibly the grandest implementation of the encyclopaedic learning museum was the *Musaeum Kircherianum*, a famous destination, admired by many royalties visiting Rome before the mid-17th-century.

The example of the Jesuit concept that was an encyclopaedia of knowledge of the world as museum survived still for at least another century. Reading through Neickel's list it can be assumed that small *musaea* were widely founded in the 17th-century at schools, universities, convents, and residences. They were generally furnished with library collections, completed with collections of *naturalia* and *scientaria*, if possible also enriched with prints, drawings and illustrations in books. This phenomenon is confirmed by the recommendations of John Amos Comenius (1592–1670), a Czech reformer and teacher. In his *Orbis Sensualium Pictus* [Visible World in Pictures], he characterizes museum as *a place where a scholar, distanced from the people, can dedicate himself to studying books*.³⁰ Comenius' writings demonstrate that museum had become part of the 'universal life', since it had been included in the repertory of the school dictionary serving students.

Many of those museums: education centres, disappeared. Others were described as so-called cabinets of curiosities. In the 19th and 20th centuries the destruction of the majority of resources occurred, in other cases cabinets of curiosities were taken over by newly established large institutions. It was only in the late 20th century that the interest in recreating those pillars of modern education and science, without which there would have been no Encyclopaedist movement in the 18th century, re-emerged. From among numerous

contemporary initiatives let us recall the reconstruction of the model Cabinet of Curiosities, namely the *Naturalienkammer des Halleschen Waisenhauses* established in Halle by August Hermann Francke (1663–1727). The German theologian and Pietist launched widespread Foundations incorporating varied-level schools established mainly for unwealthy youth, while the essential elements of each such school complex was a museum and a library. Following Germany's reunification in 1991, the Francke Foundations were re-established and the reconstruction of the Wunderkammer³² there was started. Gradually, partially replacing the preserved furnishing elements on site, and to a degree also completing the missing elements with items purchased in the antiquarian market,³³ the model of that museum was recreated.

The later history of museums in Europe is better known and described, particularly the widespread movement towards creating museums open to the public in the 18th century has been extensively commented on, and so has the tendency to create national museums in the 19th century. Museum definitions of legislative character appeared in numerous legal acts of large state foundations, such as the British Museum established through the act of the British Parliament in 1753,³⁴ or the Musée des Monuments Français created as a result of the Revolution and the confiscation of ecclesiastical property in 1791.³⁵ The definition of what museum is and what functions it should perform can be found in many texts and comments of the 19th-century museological literature. The conviction that museum's supreme role is to create educational programmes and give pleasure (provide entertainment) appeared in the 19th century e.g. in the writings of the reformer of museology William Flower (1831–1899),³⁶ but it had also been present earlier, since already in the 17th century (Louis Moreri' dictionary³⁷).

Museum definitions in our contemporary understanding of the term appeared in large numbers in dictionaries and encyclopaedias of the 19th and early 20th century. In an extensive museum-dedicated entry, François Mairesse says the following: *According to the Dictionnaire Universel du XIX^e siècle of Pierre Larousse of 1874, museum is a place of literary, scientific, or artistic studies, but also a rich collection of art and objects serving science. The word is also used to define encyclopaedic collections for educational purposes, such as the Musée des familles or Musée des deux mondes, yet its meaning is more and more frequently associated with collections. In the Grande Encyclopédie by Berthelot, Sagnet gives the following definition of museum: Currently a museum is a collection of art works, curiosities, objects serving academic research, and even industrial products or natural specimens that are the property of the state, department or commune and are displayed in public buildings.*³⁸

The development of museums throughout the 19th century extended the institution's definition; with the expansion of colonialism, they were created almost all around the world. It was becoming gradually more difficult to combine the idea of the institutions of science and education with the concept of large 'storerooms' of any possible products of civilization and nature. There appeared concepts of covering whole cities or regions with the name of museum, as in the writing of Quartermère de Quincy³⁹ from the late 18th century regarding whole Rome or Florence as museums in their entity.

In the early 20th century, there already existed many social

theories according to which museums were the 'heart' of regions and locality, to the extent that even the concept of the 'community museum' described by John Cotton Dana (1856–1929)⁴⁰ was created. Dana analysed the museum morphology for that 'Gloom of the Museum' to transform into a public museum for society, easily accessible, turning into a mediation centre. The book, slightly forgotten today, better understood in the context of the construction of modern American society, may be for sure regarded as the source of contemporary changes in museum definitions, and one of the first guides to modern museum management,⁴¹ in which, according to the author, not only definition issues have to be ordered, but all the 'communication' elements as well (captions, works' layout, teaching to children and teenagers), while museum storerooms should be turned into knowledge space accessible to the public.⁴²

The changes that occurred worldwide following WW I, almost immediately reflected in museums as if in a mirror. Manifestoes and artists' museums,⁴³ Avant-Garde Art, technological boom, all these were recorded in museum concepts and definitions.⁴⁴ In the 1911 edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica Lindsay wrote: (...) *modern museum should act for the public benefit, should be a rich source of curiosity and knowledge for whole society;*⁴⁵ this social museum mission was understood as the essence of the 'new' museum. As if summing up and in reaction to all these changes the international conference 'Office international des musées' was held in Madrid in 1934; not only did it actually give the beginning to all the museum organizations, but it also initiated studies in the legislation process within the field.

The fact that in 1946 the International Council of Museums was founded resulted from all the earlier museological activities and works. The ICOM museum definition adopted during the first ICOM Conference (See Annex 2) continued to evolve to take on an essentially new form in 2019 (see Annex 1), making one realize the long and extraordinary evolution the phenomenon called 'museum' has undergone.

The last museum definition proposed in Kyoto in 2019 initiated, as mentioned above, a new wave of reflection and debate. Almost at every spot worldwide where there are ICOM national committees it has taken a different course. Depending on what social, political or educational role is played today by the place called museum, different local 'traditions' of perceiving and adopting this concept have been created. The differences are giant: from treating museum as one of the pillars of statehood and identity to extremely individual and ephemeral artistic and anthropological contexts. In Africa museums are a meeting venue flocked to by people craving for peace and talk; they are large institutions in Europe and Americas visited by millions of tourists; research centres; ecoregions focused on preserving nature; secluded temples; floating 'technology monuments'; Avant-garde architectural forms designed with the use of new technologies and materials; and even space research centres.⁴⁷

The Polish tradition of defining museum, from the time of the Piast *muzeion* in Brzeg Śląski, the tradition of *muzeions* at the schools in Toruń in the 16th century and the Cracow ones in the 17th century up to the *Musaeum Polonicum* (*Thoughts on Establishing the Musaeum Polonicum* by Michał Mniszech, 1775), in the context of Central Europe was an interesting

way of aspiring towards its own identity. This seems to distinguish Polish museology whose social role from the end of the 18th century was rooted in the concept of ‘memory’ (Mnemosyne). Lasting in memory has always been a great value: the kind of lasting that needs to be tended to and supported. This may be the attitude that makes Polish museum professionals differ from the attitude of their counterparts in Asia or Africa. And since law and any regulations should serve values, in the debate on the new museum definition it will not be easy to find ‘common ground’.

Polish museum professionals on the new Kyoto definition

The views presented below this paper (See: SURVEY) expressed by three generations of Polish outstanding museum professionals clearly demonstrate the ‘sensitive spots’ in the understanding of museum’s role in contemporary society, while also revealing a certain novelty, namely reflection on two types of museum in the contemporary world: museum as an institution taking care of the heritage and memory of it on the one hand, and on the other, museum as an institution that stimulates art, science, and social attitudes, a political player, an institution that is ideologically active both in sciences (e.g. environmental studies) and art (commissioning projects from artists).

The most troublesome issue in this context is the distinction between the description of museum as

a phenomenon of social culture and the museum definition as a term essential for legislation. This is the aspect pointed to by Prof. Stanisław Waltoś, co-author of the Polish Act on Museums and the translator of the ICOM *Code of Ethics for Museums* into Polish.

The author of the present paper has asked a group of Polish museum professionals, including two specialists in heritage legal protection, for years involved in legislative processes, to comment on the new museum definition proposal presented by ICOM MDPP. The survey question read as follows: *Would you agree that the new ICOM museum definition proposed at the Kyoto General Conference on 7 September 2019 reflects the changes in museum operating in the contemporary world and defines the essential role of museum?* The following individuals have been invited to reply the question: Paulina Florjanowicz, Paweł Jaskanis, Piotr Majewski, Michał Malinowski, Michał Niezabitowski, Maria Anna Potocka, Andrzej Rottermund, Piotr Rypson, Bożena Steinborn, Stanisław Waltoś, Michał F. Woźniak, Kamil Zeidler.

All of them, except for Piotr Rypson, have replied, and their views are published at the end of the present paper in the alphabetical order. Let us hope that reading through these reflections when confronted with the history of the museum concept, briefly outlining changes and fluctuations of its meaning over the past 2.500 years (see Annex 3: Perception of the ‘Museum’ Concept: Brief History) shall constitute a departure point for a thorough debate on the wonder phenomenon of long and fascinating history.

Annex 1. New Kyoto Museum Definition

The new ICOM definition proposal sent out in 2019⁴⁸ reads as follows:

Museums are democratizing inclusive and polyphonic spaces for critical dialogue about the pasts and the futures. Acknowledging and addressing the conflicts and challenges of the present, they hold artefacts and specimens in trust for society, safeguard diverse memories for future generations and guarantee equal rights and equal access to heritage for all people.

Museums are not for profit. They are participatory and transparent and work in active partnership with and for diverse communities to collect, preserve, research, interpret, exhibit, and enhance understandings for the world, aiming to contribute to human dignity and social justice, global equality and planetary wellbeing.

Annex 2. Evolution of ICOM Museum Definition in 1946–2007⁴⁹

1946

Art. II, p. 2

The word ‘museum’ includes all collections open to the public, of artistic, technical, scientific, historical, or archaeological material, including zoos and botanical gardens, but excluding libraries, except in so far as they maintain permanent exhibition rooms.

1951

Art. II – Definition

The word museum here denotes any permanent establishment, administered in the general interest, for the purpose of preserving, studying, enhancing by various means and, in particular, of exhibiting to the public for its delectation and instruction



1. ICOM General Conference in Kyoto, 7 September 2019; following the presentation of the new museum definition by Jette Sandahl, Chair of the Standing Committee for Museum Definition, Prospects and Potentials, resulting in the submission of many other proposed versions, ICOM General Assembly decided to postpone voting on the new definition to 2020.

groups of objects and specimens of cultural value: artistic, historical, scientific and technological collections, botanical and zoological gardens and aquariums. Public libraries and public archival institutions maintaining permanent exhibition rooms shall be considered to be museums.

1961

Section II – Museum definition, Arts. 3 and 4

ICOM shall recognise as a museum any permanent institution which conserves and displays, for purposes of a study, education and enjoyment, collections of objects of cultural or scientific significance.

Article 4

Within this definition fall:

- a. exhibition galleries permanently maintained by public libraries and collections of archives,
- b. historical monuments and parts of historical monuments or their dependencies, such as cathedral treasures, historical, archaeological, and natural sites, which are officially open to the public,
- c. botanical and zoological gardens, aquaria, vivaria, and other institutions which display living specimens,
- d. natural reserves.

1974

Section II – Definitions

Art. 3

A museum is a non-profit making, permanent institution in the service of the society and its development, and open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates, and exhibits, for purposes of study, education and enjoyment, material evidence of man and his environment.

Art. 4

In addition to museums designated as such, ICOM recognizes that the following comply with the above definition:

- a. conservation institutes and exhibition galleries permanently maintained by libraries and archive centres,
- b. natural, archaeological, and ethnographic monuments and sites and historical monuments and sites of a museum nature, for their acquisition, conservation and communication activities,

- c. institutions displaying live specimens, such as botanical and zoological gardens, aquaria, vivaria, etc.
- d. nature reserves,
- e. science centres and planetariums.

1989

Art. 2 – Definitions

A museum is a non-profit making, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, and open to the public which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits, for purposes of study, education and enjoyment, material evidence of people and their environment.

- a. The above definition of a museum shall be applied without any limitation arising from the nature of the governing body, the territorial character, the functional structure, or the orientation of the collections of the institution concerned.
- b. In addition to institutions designated as 'museums' the following qualify as museums for the purposes of this definition:
 - I. natural, archaeological, and ethnographic monuments and sites and historical monuments and sites of a museum nature that acquire, conserve, and communicate material evidence of people and their environment,
 - II. institutions holding collections of and displaying live specimens of plants and animals, such as botanical and zoological gardens, aquaria and vivaria,
 - III. science centres and planetaria,
 - IV. conservation institutes and exhibition galleries permanently maintained by libraries and archive centres,
 - V. nature reserves,
 - VI. such other institutions as the Executive Council, after seeking the advice of the Advisory Committee, considers as having some or all the characteristics of a museum, or as supporting museums and professional museum workers through museological research, education, or training.

1995

Art. II – Definitions

A museum is a non-profit making permanent institution in the service of society and of its development, and open to the public which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits, for purposes of study, education and enjoyment, material evidence of people and their environment.

- a. The above definition of a museum shall be applied without any limitation arising from the nature of the governing body, the territorial character, the functional structure, or the orientation of the collections of the institution concerned.
- b. In addition to institutions designated as 'museums' the following qualify as museums for the purposes of this definition:
 - I. natural, archaeological, and ethnographic monuments and sites and historical monuments and sites of a museum nature that acquire, conserve and communicate material evidence of people and their environment,
 - II. institutions holding collections of and displaying live specimens and plants and animals, such as botanical and zoological gardens, aquaria and vivaria,
 - III. science centres and planetaria,
 - IV. conservation institutes and exhibition galleries permanently maintained by libraries and archive centres,
 - V. nature reserves,
 - VI. international or national or regional or local museum organisations, ministries or departments or public agencies responsible for museums as per the definition given under this article;
 - VII. non-profit institutions or organisations undertaking research, education, training, documentation, and other activities relating to museums and museology,
 - VIII. such other institutions as the Executive Council, after seeking the advice of the Advisory Committee, considers as having some or all of the characteristics of a museum, or as supporting museums and professional museum workers through museological research, education or training.

2001

Article 2 – Definitions

A museum is a non-profit making permanent institution in the service of society and of its development, and open to the public which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits, for purposes of study, education and enjoyment, material evidence of people and their environment.

- a. The above definition of a museum shall be applied without any limitation arising from the nature of the governing body, the territorial character, the functional structure, or the orientation of the collections of the institution concerned.
- b. In addition to institutions designated as "museums" the following qualify as museums for the purposes of this definition:
 - I. natural, archaeological, and ethnographic monuments and sites and historical monuments and sites of a museum nature that acquire, conserve, and communicate material evidence of people and their environment,
 - II. institutions holding collections of and displaying live specimens and plants and animals, such as botanical and

- zoological gardens, aquaria and vivaria,
- III. science centres and planetaria,
- IV. non-profit art exhibition galleries,
- V. nature reserves; conservation institutes and exhibition galleries permanently maintained by libraries and archive centres; natural parks,
- VI. international or national or regional or local museum organisations, ministries or departments or public agencies responsible for museums as per the definition given under this article,
- VII. non-profit institutions or organisations undertaking research, education, training, documentation, and other activities relating to museums and museology,
- VIII. cultural centres and other entities that facilitate the preservation, continuation, and management of tangible and intangible heritage resources (living heritage and digital creative activity),
- IX. such other institutions as the Executive Council, after seeking the advice of the Advisory Committee, considers as having some or all of the characteristics of a museum, or as supporting museums and professional museum workers through museological research, education or training.

2007

Art. 3 – Concept Definition

Section 1

Museum. A museum is a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment.

term	period	place/language	meaning of the 'museum' concept
Μουσείον – topographical term, e.g. Museion in Athens, hill	7 th –4 th c. BC.	territory inhabited by the Greeks: the Balkans, islands on the Aegean and Ionian Seas, western coasts of Asia Minor language: ancient Greek	hill, meeting venue, place to derive inspiration from
Μουσείον	5 th –3 rd c. BC.	the Mediterranean, Asia Minor language: ancient Greek	educational centre, part of gymnasium, place of worship
Μουσείον Musaeum	4 th c. BC–6 th c.	Greek and Roman colonization: the Mediterranean, South-Western and Central Europe, Asia Minor language: Greek and Latin	research and academic institution, meeting venue, festival of poetry and arts, collection of records
Musaeum Μουσείον Mathaf Musée Museum	5 th –16 th c.	the Mediterranean, Europe language: Latin, Greek, Arabic, French, locally spoken languages in Italy, Old Irish	place for studying, 'library', collection of writings and short stories
Musaeum = theatrum mundi	15 th –16 th c.	Europe, Asia Minor language: Latin, Greek, French, locally spoken languages in Italy, Germanic languages. Irish, Polish, local languages being born	place for studying, academic centre, thematic collection, collection of texts, encyclopaedia knowledge compendium
Musaeum Museum	17 th –18 th c.	Europe, North America, Asia language: Latin, French, locally spoken languages in Italy, Germanic languages, Irish, Polish, local languages coming to existence	collection of objects and texts, public institution, dictionary, encyclopaedia
Museum museum	19 th –21 st c.	all inhabited continents and languages	public institution owning a collection, centre for preserving and studying tangible and intangible

Annex 3. Perception of the 'Museum' Concept: Brief History procedures were created ad hoc; in their course what proved SURVEY

Below are the answers of Polish illustrious museum professionals given to the question asked by D. Folga-Januszewska: *Would you agree that the new ICOM museum definition proposed at the Kyoto General Conference on 7 September 2019 reflects the changes in museum operating in the contemporary world and defines the essential role of a museum?*

Paulina Florjanowicz, archaeologist; (since 2016) director of the DDK (Department of Cultural Heritage) at the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, responsible for museum supervision and memory policy, coordinator of the Multiannual 'Niepodległa' Programme; for 20 years professionally affiliated to NGOs and public institutions within the culture sector; (2010–2013) Director of the National Heritage Board of Poland, afterwards connected with museology (National Institute for Museums and Public Collections); member of: ICOM (ICMS), national and international specialist and advisory panels, e.g. 'EU & Cultural Heritage Reflection Group'; project evaluator in educational and cultural programmes of the European Commission, e.g., jury member of the European Capital of Culture.

It is extremely challenging to define a concept, particularly one that is generally known and applied. Since everyone knows what a museum is, what is there left to discuss? Meanwhile, the definition has a great practical impact on what museums actually deal with, what distinguishes them, and what makes them unique. Since the consequence of adopting a given definition is to define the role and position of museums within social and economic realities, not to mention its legal status.

The basic key words associated with the museum concept are collections, people, and institution. These basic concepts dominate in over 200 proposals submitted to ICOM from around the world as part of the debate on the new museum definition. Regrettably, and hence the main default of the new proposal, which actually disheartens the most is the fact that finally the presented proposal is by no means a resultant of the previously submitted suggestions. Not only is it insulting to the international museum community, but also short-sighted.

Meanwhile, when analysing the new ICOM museum definition proposal presented at the General Conference in Kyoto on 7 September 2019, it is clear that it focuses on neither of the three aspects, emphasizing instead not so much the object of museum activity, but its objective assumed beforehand. Which is the first error. The institution concept has been entirely eliminated from the definition, which gives rise to serious consequences of formal and legal definition of what a museum actually is. Moreover, the collection concept has been eradicated for the sake of chaotic and indefinite artifacts. Last but not least, there are no people in the definition, either as researchers, curators, or the public as addressees of museum work. Instead, ICOM concentrates on the goals of the kind of activity the New Age museums conduct, evidently more focused on the future than on the studies of the past. This is the second error.

Museums have always been treasuries of mementoes, refuge for past events and accomplishments presented in the way that would always allow their re-interpreting in each historic period anew. Meanwhile the proposed definition imposes the interpretation form defining museums as 'democratizing inclusive and polyphonic spaces' and defining the objective of their activity as 'aiming to contribute to human dignity and social justice, global equality and planetary wellbeing'. Stripping museums of academic neutrality and imposing a definite ideology in reasoning is by definition a negation of the objective study and display of collections.

It is also impossible to accept the further part of the ICOM proposal. The wording referring to the future encouraging to further the debate on the international platform blatantly opposes the superior principle of neutral and apolitical character of public institutions. Not only does this provide museums with an opportunity to partake in the current political debate, but it also authorizes the political commitment of museums dependant on the public authorities, this potentially extremely dangerous in non-democratic countries (which the definition authors must have not taken into account). Furthermore, museums' ideological neutrality is the foundation of their credibility allowing them to persist for decades regardless of the political transformations around, fulfilling their academic and teaching mission. Thus, this potential open opportunity of the definition proposal is its third and grave error.

To conclude, let me share a personal reflection. It seems almost evident that the proposed definition is an attempt to discourse with the infamous founding myth of numerous Western museums, particularly ethnographic ones which built their collections and brand thanks to colonialism. It is trying to negate and settle the accounts with the moralistic and arbitrary approach from the previous era. I wish it were not carried out in a moralistic and arbitrary manner, either.

Paweł Jaskanis, art historian and amateur archaeologist (University of Warsaw), historical monument expert through his management practice and custodian of goods of culture; (from 1996) Deputy General Monuments Conservator, (1999–2002) Director General of the Office of the General Monuments Conservator; (from 2002) Director of the Wilanów Palace Museum

(in 2013) renamed Museum of King John III' Palace at Wilanów; in the past and currently member of numerous bodies: Council of Monument Preservation and Museum Council (at the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage), Council of the National Cultural Centre, Council of the National Institute for Museums and Public Collections, Warsaw Municipal Office for Heritage Protection, Office for Commemorating the Struggle and Martyrdom (Institute of National Remembrance), as well as many museum councils; professor at the Heritage Academy (International Cultural Centre), Małopolska School of Public Administration in Cracow, as well as at the postgraduate courses in museology (University of Warsaw)

Definition of a musealium, preservation of a musealium and museum: old ideas for new times, yet still without the language of politicians, but with every individual in mind and every subject that is in this individual's interest.

Before I proceed to what a museum is, it is first necessary to answer what a musealium is. Despite an obvious derivation of the term from museum, namely an 'institution-derived' genesis of this neologism of the last decades, substantially marking out the generic much older terms such as collection (collections) or adding the object of collecting on a unit level, most frequently alternating with: memento, cultural good, historical monument, artifact, semiophore, or in a more detailed way on category level, such as painting, sculpture, then in the reflection on definitions in the times of the proliferation of museum theories and practices which require precision, particularly legal and managerial, the secondary concept moves to the fore ahead of the term defining the institution.

There appear more loops, or better said, spiralling cause-effect interpretations, if into the model of the open definition of both terms we incorporate not so much the notion, but the primary social distinguishing criterion constituting the worth of a musealium, following the assumption that a non-musealium has no social value, namely that micro-museums of one object for one individual will be left outside these remarks, similarly as was in the case of the phenomenon of trading in objects, which were given not only verbal features of a collection of cultural goods, while their repositories or shopping centres were named museums. In other words, Everything will become museum, if we could paraphrase the poetical programme of Edward Stachura Everything is poetry, which entails its emotional and intellectual charms, excluding, however the possibility to effectively convince about values and about social education in values as the ethical ground for museum activity (thus not one individual and no commerce).

Perceiving the value or its lack, we always operate within a social-current context, and in it or through it we deal with sequences of old phenomena which caused and co-created this value; importantly, this value not necessarily increasing or equally appreciated elsewhere due to cultural and existential conditionings. A museum has the power over the thing (in compliance with the Polish legislation) and its values for the good of the community maintaining the institution. It is the values that create /constitute the institution and its social functions.

In the varied world of museums and para-museums, a musealium is already essentially any being of social value which in order for its unique character to be emphasized is attributed meta-value by the use of the museum concept. The object of the collecting process turns into an institution, this resulting from its genotype of 'the shrine to the Muses',

namely the collection of their works of value. The causative effect of the musealium value belongs to its creator and the will of his/her co-workers and their successors to maintain it. If this comes from the world of politics, political or social leaders, namely providers of financial resources sufficient for the upkeep of the value, this being will persist as a musealium.

Musealium

I suggest the largest possible extension of the definition for a musealium, thus for the very museum, too. Musealium is a being of documented values, subjected to professional museum care and made available to the public for the good of all people.

What are the benefits of using the term 'being'? It does not need to be defined, as it has been most thoroughly defined by philosophers, thus we will be transferring the debate onto the holistic universal non-museal platform. Let the museum professionals serve their public, sharing their knowledge of values and multiplying them together. Museum is for people, not for museum professionals. We eliminate all the museum definition disputes. Depending on the status and strategy of the institution, we can apply the areas of phenomenological analysis [e.g. after Wł. Stróżewski On Beauty], meaning that every musealium can be defined in the aspects socially justified: ontological, semantical, and axiological, preferably in all of them jointly. We thus obtain the system to define musealium as a unit, open to adding designata, which cannot be criticized for leaving something out. For instance, we do not have to discuss the quality of being tangible or intangible, as they are individual features, similarly as there is no need to discuss the questions of carriers, recordings, a single or collective designatum (e.g. problems with archaeology: so-called mass finds; content, meaning, and values do not have to be property of the museum though some of their forms: those connected with legal protection, will obligatorily be, for example copyright.

On the other hand, let us not forget that ownership of a given being by a museum does not necessarily mean that this being automatically is/becomes a musealium. The decision to consider it a musealium is to be another causative act bestowing upon it this extraordinary status. It can be a reason for celebration, just like the very creating of a collection, in proportion to the value of the being and its place in the collection. The act represents another personalizing value. I have a special reason for mentioning it, since museums do not care very much for the memory of the accomplishments of their own employees and keeping the continuity of the knowledge of the value object, neither do they care for the subject who defined it and made the decision to administratively authorize the act of raising it to the musealium status.

Preserving a musealium

Paraphrasing a part of the content of Art. 5 of the Act on the Preservation of Monuments and Care of Historical Monuments: Care of musealium consists in museum performing owner's rights, and in particular:

1. studying;
2. keeping, preserving and maintaining in the best possible condition of the substance constituting its worth;

To be specified in the statutes and organizational regulations of a given museum, in compliance with its capacities and preferences to add: 'including conservation, restoration, reconstruction, copying on any carriers for the sake of preserving and disseminating, particularly in the form of exhibitions and image publication'. As the being's substance can be anything, I do not add this kind of characteristics].

3. such availability to the public and dissemination that create and satisfy cognitive and affective needs of

a person enabling their individual and social development and limitless access to linked knowledge.

Museum

Museum is a form of taking care of valuable beings (musealia). For the good of all people it gathers knowledge of them, cares for the knowledge to prevail and be most widely approved of and understood.

In other words, I believe that I have rendered the sense of the Kyoto proposal and the traditional different options and geography for the defining senses of museum. 'Good of all people' speaks of the practical sense without the ideologizing that was protested against. Musealium is every being that creates good. 'Understanding' is education and without it there is no 'approval', tolerance, etc. in compliance with the international conventions in culture and respect for human rights.

Piotr Majewski PhD, Director of the National Institute for Museums and Public Collections, Editor-in-Chief of the 'Muzealnictwo' Annual, Professor at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw (Faculty of Humanities, Chair of Culture Management).

As a delegate to the ICOM General Conference (ID 90946), while following the recommendations of ICOM Poland, in this particular case not contradicting my personal convictions, I voted to postpone the vote on the new museum definition (such was the delegates' voting purpose), which actually means a 'NO' to the question asked in the present Survey. For two reasons. Firstly: the museum definition, which in its content contains a lot of references to democratic values, should also demonstrate its faithfulness to them through its creating process. As since we consider ICOM's recommendations as a model inspiration for legislative works undertaken by sovereign states, the models, particularly those addressed to the states (which are in majority worldwide) who do not share the European model of democracy, should not concern so much the essence, but the form of lawmaking, procedures, and their transparency. I certainly was not the only one convinced that the process of creating the Kyoto definition proposal presented at the General Conference was not able to follow the values it declared in its content. Secondly, let us get to the point. I do not expect

from a definition as such (also bearing in mind my own institutional experience) first of all a one-dimensional projecting of the reality, but more a precise rendering of its varied actual state. The museum universum, in the amplex of organizational solutions, financial and management ideas, differentiated scale of their occurrence, legal and systemic conditions for their implementation, as well as socio-cultural contexts, thus expects a 'minimal' definition, search for the essence of 'museum' and 'museality' in the times which for different reasons respective of different parts of the world mark the world of culture and science with the imprint of usefulness. The limited space given for the answer forces the conclusion: the 'minimum' should be the collections (both in their tangible and intangible version) and the story about them created with the public in mind by the people who are aware of the cultural importance of their work and subjectivity of their addressees. I would leave the 'maximum' of museum duties to the creators of respective museums and communities in which they live, thus keeping the faith in their creative powers and common sense.

Michał Malinowski, museum professional, imagination engineer, and a professional fairy tale teller, teacher, writer, artist, traveller, ethnographic researcher; he studied in Poland, Switzerland, Japan, and the USA; (2002) in Konstancin Jeziorna n. Warsaw he established the Museum of Fairy Tales and Stories, the first museum worldwide dedicated to the tradition of oral conveying of history and intangible heritage which he has been running with passion organizing meetings, workshops, and festivals of storytelling; (since 2014) member of the Council for Intangible Heritage at the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage.

During the 2019 Kyoto ICOM General Conference I participated in numerous debates dedicated to working out the museum definition. I heard a lot very complex and

contradictory opinions on what museum is and should be. In view of the lack of consensus and confusion due to the complex character of the proposal, I would like to unruly

simplify the digressions to the metaphor of museum as a hat on culture and nature, taking care of the roots and wings, and contributing to discovering the essence of existence, harmony, and blooming.

In my feeling the symbolism of a hat is the most appropriate to reflect the sense of what the museum institution should be. In many cultures the hat represents authority and power. Furthermore, since it covers the head, it contains thoughts. As for museum, it should evidently have authority and power (not strength) over shaping experience and constructive thinking of all the people related to it. Etymologically, the word 'hat' comes from Indo-European 'kadh' or 'shad', and means 'protective covering'. In the world of devalued authorities and values museum remains one of the few credible institutions which can protect the symbolic world of positive narrative. The positive side of a story does not consist only in telling exclusively favourable things, but in finding the light of hope even in the darkest recesses of human behaviours and discovering humanistic solutions to the problems, no matter how complicated.

The above-mentioned taking care of the roots refers to the basic task of amassing, preserving and making available to the public of tangible and intangible collections and preserving of the broadly conceived tradition. The wings have to do with the function of making the treasures of cultural and natural heritage available to the public in exhibitions, workshops, festivals, and other forms of dissemination in real and virtual worlds. The experience created through these activities should energize, encourage to fly, and be maximally attractive to the continuously changing young generation. In the era of increasing lecture 'Museum of Artificial Intelligence' that contained elements of this definition was repeated to a wide circle of

misinformation and narrative manipulating, museum should remain a noble medium always presenting credible information and stories. Through contact with museum, individuals should be able to communicate with themselves, other people, and nature. A proper interaction with museum experiences contributes to transforming the perception of the world in which museum should become public-private space within which we become co-responsible for the heritage and the surrounding world. The hat is private territory which through being visible shapes the identity of its surroundings. Similarly, museum should become a personal courtyard of imagination in which participants discover values, bond with the community, and work out a new vision of the future.

The symbolism of a hat is very rich. A hat can express moods, individuality, taste, and the sense of humour. A hat does not only serve as an ID badge and a discriminant, but it can also help overcome unhappiness and fight against evil eye. Furthermore, it can symbolize bonds with heaven and the world of sacrum. In ancient Rome, it used to be the symbol of freedom. For this reason, freed slaves would get a headgear from their masters. In some cultures, the right to wear a headgear is reserved only for chiefs and shamans to demonstrate their spiritual superiority. Inspired by those hat's attributes, let us not forget that museum should always keep freedom and inspire to comprehensive development.

The idea to compare museum to a hat and the interpretation of its symbolism proved extremely interesting to the Chinese delegation who invited me as a keynote speaker to the AI conference in Yunnan in late September 2019. The students at the Wuyi University in Jiangmen.

Michał Niezabitowski PhD, historian, museum professional, museologist, university professor, culture manager, expert on Cracow; graduate from the Institute of History, Jagiellonian University, and from the post-graduate course in museology, Institute of European Studies, Jagiellonian University; (since 1985) working at the Historical Museum of the City of Cracow, (since 2004) the Museum's Director; Editor-in-Chief of the 'Krzysztofor' Annual; (2016) President of the Programme Council of the 1st Congress of Polish Museologists; (since 2018) member of the Academic Council of the 'Muzealnictwo' Annual; ICOM member, Board member of ICOM CAMOC.

If the question were phrased differently to imply the answer: 'Do you consider the definition appropriate so that it could be voted on?', I would most likely have to respond NO. However, if Prof. Folga-Januszewska is asking whether the content of this definition (...) reflects the changes in museum operating in the contemporary world and defines the essence of those institutions, I would tend to respond YES.

The content of the new definition proposal in my opinion gives a decisive solution to the debate over the paradigm: are collections the paradigm of museum existence? Or maybe the public are?

I have spoken many a times in public on this issue (also in my Kyoto paper); furthermore, I have published several articles on it. For the purpose I have even coined my bon mot: museums are not for gathering collections, but for gathering the public around the collections. This controversy

(collections v. the public) has been our 'corporate' debate; defined as the 'problem of universals' in the Middle Ages, it was the continuation of the dispute between Plato and Aristotle. My presumption is that today Plato would perceive museum collections as ideas that actually exist, therefore he would consistently refute the Kyoto proposal. Moreover, I suppose that Aristotle who rejected the universal existence of ideas, would regard it as appropriate, for since our cognition occurs through senses, and 'creation' has them, he would recognize in the new definition the subjectivity of the sensually shaped public. In this eternal controversy I must admit that I have always found Aristotle closer to my views. That is why I respond YES. I have a feeling that it is not exaggeration on my part to be measuring the dispute with 'the problem of universals' that was fervently debated over from the Antiquity to Thomas Aquinas, since such

a perspective allows to reject the superficial judgement claiming that the essence of the definition debate consists in the confrontation between 'political correctness' and 'conservative consistency'.

However, as said above, this phrasing of the definition would not have my support, since as I continue hearing and reading, a substantial part of the museum-related circles (in

my assessment constituting a minority, but still substantial) would not feel at home with such-defined museum. The definition must not exclude anyone, while the leaders of ICOM (the organization which also represents me), have to dialogue internally to achieve the wording that yields consensus. Additionally, the Kyoto proposal's format arouses my legislative doubts.

Maria Anna Potocka PhD, philosopher of art, Director of the MOCaK Museum of Contemporary Art in Cracow; (1972–2010) founder of 4 author's galleries, (1973–2010) creator of the international collection of art donated to MOCaK, curator of numerous exhibitions; (1990–94) editor of the 'Tumul't artistic and philosophical magazine; author of the books: *Malarstwo* [Painting] (1995), *Rzeźba* [Sculpture] (2002), *Estetyka kontra sztuka* [Aesthetics vs. Art] (2007), *To tylko sztuka* [It Is Only Art] (2008), *Fotografia* [Photography] (2010), *Wypadek polityczny* [Political Accident] (2010), *Nowa estetyka* [New Aesthetics] (2016), *Zofia Posmysz. Szrajberka 7566* [Zofia Posmysz. Schreiber 7566] (2018), *150 lat malarstwa polskiego* [150 Years of Polish Painting] (2019); member of: IKG, AICA, ICOM, Polish Writers' Association.

Terminologically, a distinction should be made between the institutions of the Museum of History and the Museum of Contemporaneity.

The Museum of History: museum of art and old objects is the place using artefacts and their interpretations in order to relate the past to the present. The obligatory part of this task is 'perception activation'. Public members, regardless of their age, are never left on their own with the object. Their perception is activated through an appropriate comment, introduction of contexts, or the variety of teaching methods. One of the major tasks of such museum is to create the image of cultural and civilizational continuity.

The Museum of Contemporaneity, museum of contemporary art is the place studying, criticizing, and evaluating the

present through works of art, artistic texts, and performative actions. Its mission is to destroy harmful obviousnesses, untruthful concealments, and inherited phobias. At the same time, its task is the choice of the most valuable works and expressions, formally and intellectually. Similarly, as in the case of the old museum, its task is to 'activate perception' through commentary and a variety of educational methods. The responsibility of such museum type is to implement democratic thinking.

The historical museum should be ideologically passive, the contemporary museum should reveal ideology. The responsibility of both museum types is modern, continuously updated prevention against destruction and theft of the works they own.

Prof. Andrzej Rottermund, art historian, professor in humanities, museologist; he used to work at the National Museum in Warsaw, (1975-83) Deputy Director of the National Museum in Warsaw; (from 1971) involved in the reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw, (1991–2015) Director of the Royal Castle; member of ICOM Poland, (1990–96) its President, (since 2002) corresponding member of the Polish Academy of Sciences.

The response to your question requires an extremely thorough analysis of everything that has been happening in museology for some dozen years. As you know, museum as an institution rooted in culture is ruled by norms, values, traditions, and practices of a definite community. That is why it is so hard to find a definition for it that satisfies all the communities. In order to achieve the result expected by the community, museologists should first of all understand the 'museal structure' (this is the term I apply to define all

the conditionings related to a given museum) of their museums. A museum will not be useful if it focuses on culture only, and forgets other reality components, such as morality, justice, compassion, solidarity... At the same time there appear ideas – apparitions, such as a 'universal museum' meant only to hide other stories shameful for some museums. All this should be taken into consideration in the debate, or at least it seems so to me. It is and extremely responsible task.

Bożena Steinborn PhD, PhD in art history; (1953–83) she worked at the National Museum in Wrocław (Assistant, Deputy Director for Academic Content), (1983–86) at the Warsaw Royal Castle (Art Department Curator) and (1986–90) at the National Museum in Warsaw (Deputy Director for Academic Content); (1995–2014) she was professor at the Post-Graduate Museology Course at the University of Warsaw.

The ICOM museum definition proposal (Kyoto Conference 1–7 Sept. 2019) does not introduce any new elements to the essence of the mission fulfilled by museum almost ever since it came to existence. It only rephrases it differently, in harmony with the trends of today's language of culture researchers.

I do not think it appropriate to change the museum definition to the rhythm of changes occurring in our existence (au cours des dernières décennies, as the definition authors suggest). The rhythm of changes, both material, mental, as well as technological. Those changes, their variants, or nuances reveal themselves differently in different parts of the globe and differently in different communities. Therefore,

the definition given by the organization associating all the museums in their variety should define only the basics: foundations of the institutions.

A museum has to creatively and compatibly adjust its programmes to all the versions and colouring of the present time which surround the museum, namely in harmony with the needs of the environment in which it operates. Such a creative attitude of museum professionals shall never be replaced by even the most refined ICOM specialists' directives, as much as generically right, like in the 2019 proposal.

The role of the cornerstone on which every museum is to build its individual shape is sufficiently played by the succinct 2007 definition.

Prof. Stanisław Waltoś, lawyer, historian of law and culture; honorary professor at the Jagiellonian University, he holds a number of honorary doctorates; former Director of the Jagiellonian University Museum in Cracow; former Vice President of ICOM Poland; author of over 450 academic publications, e.g. Polish translation of the ICOM Code of Ethics for Museums, Tracking Doctor Faustus, Looting of the Veit Stoss High Altar, Collegium Maius, Wandering across the Isles of Memory.

The Kyoto definition proposal is neither a definition in its classical meaning (definitio fit per genus proximum et differentiam specificam) nor in the meaning of a projecting definition or a relational definition in the contextual meaning. What was proposed is more a declaration of ICOM ideals in which elements coming from the old definitions, beginning as of 1961, have been inserted.

Therefore, if it is regarded as it deserves to be regarded, namely as ICOM's ideological programme, as a general direction of its activity, then without going into details it should be appreciated. It reaches into the future, benefits from the experience gathered in the past, and calls for shared action in the development of the museum movement, in the spirit of co-acting by people of different orientations and of democratic cooperation. However, if one were to go into the details of the new definition, the style of the discussed text and its legitimacy should be analysed.

An ideological manifesto cannot go without lofty

well-known quotations. It cannot, however, be written in a hermetic way, which was exactly what the authors of the Kyoto proposal did, using, for instance the phrase calling museums democratizing inclusive and polyphonic spaces, which in itself is a classical pleonasm. A manifesto, however, even if written correctly, cannot replace a definition. And the latter has to be factual, easily understood by a museum professional and others, too.

The constitutive elements of the museum definition, such as artefacts, collecting, preserving, educating etc., are dispersed throughout both paragraphs of the text. Instead of a genus proximum of the type: 'organizational unit' or 'institution', we have an undefined space for critical dialogue. What has disappeared is the requirement for museum's permanent existence. Next to verbiage we have to do in this case with implicit statements. All in all, the Kyoto proposal is nothing but rubbish.

Michał F. Woźniak PhD, art historian, museum professional; professor at the Chair of Heritage Studies and Museology, Nicolaus Copernicus University (UMK) in Toruń; (1976) MA from UMK; (1986), PhD from the Adam Mickiewicz University, (2013) post-doctoral degree from the Institute of Art of the Polish Academy of Sciences; (since 2001) licenced curator; in the past working for museums in Poznań, Malbork; (1990–2000) Director of the District Museum in Poznań; (2007–19) Director of the Leon Wyczółkowski District Museum in Bydgoszcz; member of several museum councils and consultative bodies.

Essentially, the question contains the request to formulate the opinion not so much on the definition itself in the shape presented and debated over with the intention on being voted on during the Kyoto General Conference, as on

its 'correspondence' with contemporary civilizational transformations.

Then, indeed; the definition tries to define the shape and operating of museums in the intensively and violently

changing reality. This is where its worth can be found. The second valuable aspect is the balancing of the perspective between the function of storing memory with the use of museum objects as carriers and the look into the future. The definition's authors thus avoided the too frequent today paradigm of progress and modernity, with its aspiration to be exclusive.

What troubles me, however, is some lack of coherence between the two paragraphs composing the debated text. If in the first paragraph the main aim facing museums is acting for the sake of dialogue in the democratically defined polyphonic space, when (only) one of the ways leading to it is holding artefacts and specimens, then in the next paragraph this social aspect, quite grandiloquently formulated, is balanced by the second, seemingly equivalent, namely the scope of goals being traditionally and specifically museographic (collecting, preserving, studying, interpreting); it is present in the majority of the so-far definitions, both the 'Riviere' one as well as others derived from it.

Interestingly, those traditional museum goals are enumerated only in the second paragraph, that is not the definition strictly speaking, but constituting a kind of a commentary: a short descriptive development. Therefore, it is hard not to notice the basic change in the so-far thinking of the museum institution. In this respect the definition is innovatory and reaching too far, not relating to the majority of contemporary phenomena and cultural occurrences called museums. In consequence, out of being descriptive, the definition becomes normative. Is this or should it be ICOM's intention? This contradicts the necessary attempt and desire to formulate the definition in the shape acceptable by institutions and

people representing various attitudes in view of the specificity, function, goals, and means undertaken by museums. The ICOM definition must not be exclusive. The same also concerns the 'official' definitions formulated for legislative or statistical purposes. Authors of museological definitions formulated for the need of the conducted research are and can be in a different situation. Which does not eliminate the option that in the future a similar phrasing may be, with the change of social attitudes, incorporated more widely and accepted in a descriptive definition.

Furthermore, the proposed definition is also formally faulty. In the presented wording the genre closest to the museum concept is extremely wide: it is democratic and polyphonic space. The introduced genre difference does not guarantee identification of museum and does not differentiate it from other akin institutions of memory, knowledge, and education. Whereas the traditional museum function, always perceived as essential and not losing its relevance and attraction, becomes too marginalized.

It is true, indeed, that contemporary culture is characterized by blurring borders, by interpenetration of institutional and content forms; this is important for emphasizing the institutional context of museums. Thus the formulating of the definition requires all the more thorough reflection, since the definition should be able to distinguish it from other organizational forms and define its specificity, with the full approval of the dialogue and mediation function, focused on understanding the world and achieving socially valuable goals.

To conclude, the definition in the proposed shape is not acceptable to me.

Kamil Zeidler PhD, with a post-doctoral degree in law; prof. at the Department of Theory and Philosophy of State and Law, Faculty of Law and Administration, University of Gdansk; author of almost 400 papers on theory and philosophy of law, international law, and legal aspects of cultural heritage preservation.

During the 2019 ICOM Congress in Kyoto several subjects were tackled, however the debate was dominated by the topic of the new museum definition.

The importance of ICOM for both world museology as well as museology in respective states is essential, while the standards this international organization sets, including ethical norms, are widely accepted and applied (see erroneous: A. Barbasiewicz, *Are Polish Museum Experts Bound by the ICOM Code? Remarks on the Legal Aspects of Museum Ethics*, 'Muzealnictwo' 2012, No. 53, pp. 196-200; and polemics: K. Zalasńska, *The ICOM Code of Ethics for Museums as Generally Accepted Norms of Professional Ethics – a Voice in the Discussion*, 'Muzealnictwo' 2013, No. 54, pp. 247-56).

The same applies to the definitions adopted by ICOM, and it does not need an explanation that the museum definition is a central definition, of coherent, systemic importance. One can thus be sure that as such it will be adopted in consequence in the legislation of respective states as a legal definition. And as a legal definition it is the definition coming from the legislator and contained in a legislative act, which, in consequence, will bind the law addressees with such and only such understanding of the concept in the process of

applying law (see more on legal logic). In view of this one cannot remain indifferent towards the proposals on such important issues by ICOM.

Recalling the Latin proverb *omnis definitio in iure civili periculosa est* (Javolenus, D. 50, 17, 22) and extending its meaning beyond civil law to the definition in law in general, we remember that each attempt at defining concepts, even the basic ones, is extremely risky. It seems that in Kyoto the risk was not successfully avoided.

Evaluating the proposed definition it has to be unequivocally stated that it has a very limited normative character, neither has it been formulated in an analytical way (see: L. Wittgenstein and his analytical philosophy of the language), namely characteristic of the European legal culture. This definition is only apparent, as a matter of fact preserving the shape of a classical definition (A is B featuring C qualities), though not extremely correctly formulated. Structured as it is, it does not explain a lot, but first of all yields a problem as for defining of the name's scope, since this is the most important and basic task of each definition. On its grounds it will be difficult to say in many cases what forms part of the defined concept (the 'museum' name), and what does not.

And like this the goal of the definition, namely ordering the concepts of a given language, is not fulfilled.

Therefore, from the point of view of correct legislation such a definition is barely acceptable. If there is an attempt to leave the content it has now, it should either be phrased

in the preamble to the normative act, since it seems the most appropriate place for such a goal-defining 'narrative'; or in subsequent regulations of a normative act, where the mission, goals, and tasks of contemporary museums are defined.

Abstract: The topic discussed in the paper is the change and evolution the concept of museum (Greek: museion, Latin: musaeum) has been undergoing for over 2.500 years, as well as many of its different meanings: from the definition of a spot in space, including a place of worship, up to the name of learning form, research and knowledge centre, collection of texts and poetry, music and theatre festival, synonyms of a dictionary and encyclopaedia, library and a secluded study spot, up to large institutions co-creating culture and educating socially. Once museums had become social institutions, the process of defining their organizational form and their mission limits began.

The International Council of Museums (ICOM), as an organization grouping museum employees and museologists, namely both practitioners and theoreticians, ever

since its establishment in 1946 has on a number of occasions initiated works on a shared definition of museum. The paper assembles all the ICOM-proposed definitions in 1946–2007 presented both in English and Polish. The latest proposal submitted at the Kyoto ICOM General Conference on 7 September 2019 (Annex 1), however, for the first time aroused a heated debate and was not finally voted on by the ICOM General Assembly; instead, the debate has continued on the proposed phrasing since.

The historical overview of the museum concept and the history of the ICOM museum definition presented against the opinions of invited Polish museum professionals is the 'record of time', documenting the considerations on the role and tasks of museum in contemporary society.

Keywords: International Council of Museums, ICOM General Conference, museum definition, concept's evolution, debate, voting.

Endnotes

¹ Standing Committee for Museum Definition, Prospects and Potentials (MDPP).

² All the documents available at ICOM websites, <https://icom.museum/en/activities/standards-guidelines/museum-definition/> [Accessed: 8 Dec. 2019].

³ On the history of the use and multiplicity of meanings of the museum concept, see more: D. Folga-Januszewska, *Muzeum. Fenomeny i problemy* [Museum. Phenomena and Problems], 'Muzeologia' Series, Vol. 8, Universitas, Kraków 2015, pp. 14-18; there also literature on the subject. See also: D. Folga-Januszewska, *Język muzeum i pojęcie muzeum w języku. Od starożytności do wieku XVI* [Language of Museum and the Museum Concept in the Language. From the Antiquity until the 16th Century], in: *Velis quod possis. Studia z historii sztuki ofiarowane profesorowi Janowi Ostrowskiemu* [Velis Quod Possis. Studies in Art History Presented to Prof. Jan Ostrowski], Kraków 2016, pp. 445-51.

⁴ In the course of the preparation for the building of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Athens (in Rigillis Street), in 1996 remains of the Lyceum were found; botanical gardens had formed part of the Lyceum. In 2011, the territory was transformed into a museum that was opened to the public, <http://www.greeceathensaegeainfo.com/h-athens/ancient/lyceum-aristotle.htm>; the discovery written about by G. Hoeppe, *Why the Sky Is Blue?*, Princeton University Press, 2007, <http://press.princeton.edu/chapters/s8369.pdf>

⁵ In the entry 'Muses' Pierre Grimal speaks of different traditions and beliefs, basing himself on, e.g. *Illiad* by Homer, *The Theogony* by Hesiod, *Description of Greece* by Pausanias, *Greek Questions* by Plutarch; see: P. Grimal, *Słownik mitologii greckiej i rzymskiej* [Dictionary of Greek and Roman Mythology], J. Łanowski (ed.), Ossolineum, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków 1990, 2nd Edition, pp. 241–42; English quotes in the translation from Polish by M. Iwińska.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 241.

⁷ According to different versions he was his son, friend, disciple, or master. It was Selene who was the mother of Musaeus; see: *Ibid.*, p. 241.

⁸ Pausanias, *Descriptions of Greece*, I 22,7, Polish quote after: Vol. 1-7, J. Niemirka-Pliszczyńska (translation and edition), Vols. 8-10, J. Niemirka-Pliszczyńska and H. Podbierski (Polish translation), Wrocław 1968–1989; English transl. from Polish by Magda Iwińska.

⁹ *Musaeus Grammaticus, Hero and Leander: The Divine Poem of Musaeus: First of All Books Translated According to the Original*, George Chapman, 1616 – the most popular English version, frequently reprinted in the 17th c.

¹⁰ Musaios, Musée, Musaeus, Mousaios, Musaion. It is him he precisely recalls under the entry 'museum' (Musée) Louis Moreri in: *Le grand dictionnaire historique ou Le mélange curieux de l'histoire sacrée et profane...* Basle 1734, Vol. IV, p. 128.

¹¹ M. El-Abbadi, *Life and Fate of the Ancient Library of Alexandria*, (2nd edition), Paris [UNESCO] 1992, p. 89.

¹² *Eun. VSp.456 B*, por. H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3D%2368883&redirect=true> [Accessed: 1 March 2014].

¹³ See discussion on Alcidas, in: F. Nietzsche, *Der Florentinische Tractat über Homer und Hesiod, ihr Geschlecht und ihren Wettkampf*, 1–2, 'Rheinisches Museum für Philologie' 1870, No. 25, pp. 528–42; R. Mariss, *Alkidamas. Über diejenigen, die schriftliche Reden schreiben, oder über die Sophisten: eine Sophistenrede aus dem 4. Jh. v. Chr., eingeleitet und kommentiert*, 'Orbis Antiquus' 2002, No. 36.

- ¹⁴ S. Nervegna, *Menander in Antiquity: The Contexts of Reception*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2012, p. 101.
- ¹⁵ *Un édifice ou l'on se livre à l'art, à la poésie, à l'érudition*, quoted after: *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*, A. Desvallées, F. Mairesse, Armand Colin (ed.), Paris 2011, p. 274.
- ¹⁶ *Inscriptiones vel Tituli Theatri Amplissimi, Complectentis rerum vniuersitatis singulas materias et imagines eximias, ut idem recte quoq; dici possit: Promptuariarum artificiarum miraculosarumque rerum; ae omnia rari thesauri et pretiosae supellectilis structurae atque picturae, quae hic simul in theatro conquiri consulantur, ut eorum frequenti inspeccione tractationeque, singularis aliqua rerum cognitio et prudentia admiranda, cito, facile ac tuto comparari possit. Autore Samuele a Quiccheberg Belga Monachii Ex Officina Adami Berg typograph. Anno M.D.L.X.V. Cum gratia et privilegio Caeserco.* English translation of the quoted fragment by M.A. Meadow and B. Robertson. After Koji Kuwakino 'The Great theatre of Collective Thought', *Journal of the History of Collections*, 9 Jan. 2013].
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁸ The examples presented below list selected texts from the numerous group of 16th-18th-century editions. Among them the most important elements for this modern museological bibliography include: S. Quiccheberg, *Promptuariarum artificiosarum miraculosarumque rerum rari Thesauri&preciosae supellectilis...*, Munchen 1565 [see also Quiccheberg, footnote10]; [E. Brackenholfer], *Museum Brackenholferianum Argentinense*, Argent 1577, Le Cabinet du Roy de France par Moyen, Paris 1581; [F. Imperato], *Ferrand. Imperati Historia Naturalis*, Napoli 1599, *Francisci Calciolarii Museum a Benedicto Ceruco Medico inceptum et ab Andreo Chiocco perfectum...*, Verona 1622; [P.J. Spener], *Museum Spenerianum*, Leipzig 1663; [J. Tradescant the Younger], *Museum Tradescantianum or a collection of rarities reserved&sont Lambeth neer London by Johann Tradescand*, London 1656, *Memoire del Museo di Ludovico Moscardo*, Padua 1656; P.M. Terzago, *Museo Settaliano Milanese*, Tortona 1666; A. Olearius, *Die Gottorffische KunstKammer*, Schlesswig 1674; L. Legati, *Museo Cospiano annesso a quallo del famoso Ulisse Aldrovandi e donato alla sua patria dell'Illustrissimo Signor Ferdinando Cospi (...)* *descrizione di Lorenzo Legato Cremonense*, Bologna 1678; Nehemiah Grew, *Museum Regalis Societatis Anglicanae. Catalogus&Descriptio variarum regiam*, London 1681; J. Mabillon, M. Germain, *Museum Italicum seu Collectio veterum scriptorum ex Bibliothecis Italicis (...)* D. Johanne Mabillon & D. Michaele Germain..., Paris 1687-1689; C. Molinet, *Le Cabinet de la Bibliotheque de S. Genevieve a Paris*, Paris 1692; [T. Corneille], *Le Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences*, vol. 1-2, Paris, 1694, *Ristretto delle Cose piu notabili della Citta di Firenze*, Firenze 1698; G.C. Bohn, *Curiosa Derer sich ein Reysender durch EUROPA, vermittelt eines richtigen Wegweisers und Beschreibung Der vornehmsten Städten zu bedienen hat*, [S.l.] 1699; M.B. Valentini, *Museum museorum, oder vollstandige Schau-Buhne aller Materialien*, Frankfurt am Main 1704; [J. Pettiver], *Museum Pettiverianum, rara Naturae opera continens...*, London 1705, *Das Museum Gottvaldianum*, Gedan 1714; J.C. Kundmann, *Promptuarium Rerum Naturalium&Artificialium...*, Wratislaviae 1726.
- ¹⁹ Sometimes defined as *pandectae*.
- ²⁰ J. Abt, *The Origins of the Public Museums, in: A Companion to Museum Studies*, S. Macdonald (ed.), Chichester [Wiley-Blackwell] 2011, p. 120.
- ²¹ Quoted after: P. Findlen, *Possessing Nature: Museum, Collecting, and Scientific Culture in Early Modern Italy*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1994, p. 64.
- ²² U. Aldrovandi, *Musaeum metallicum in libros 4 distributum Bartholomaeus Ambrosinus ... labore, et studio composuit cum indice copiosissimo*. Bononiae!, Marcus Antonius Bernia, 1648, see also: F. Krämer, *Ulisse Aldrovandi's Pandechion Epistemonicon and the Use of Paper Technology in Renaissance Natural History*, 'Early Science and Medicine' 2014, No. 5 (19), pp. 398-423.
- ²³ Both concepts meant 'encompassing all'.
- ²⁴ Interestingly, the word *musaeum* has lived in the European languages since the translation of the Code of Justinian into those languages. E.g. the word *musée* emerged in the 13th c. together with the translation of the *Digeste de Justinien*. In the quotes of the Roman jurists there appeared the first in Francophone culture museum definition: *the building where one can dedicate himself to art, poetry, knowledge*, quoted after: F. Mairesse, *Les origines des musée*, in: *Dictionnaire encyclopédique...*, p. 274.
- ²⁵ J.I. Kelly, *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 11, [The Encyclopedia Press] 1913, entry: Pandects, http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_%281913%29/Pandects [Accessed: 21 Feb. 2015].
- ²⁶ *Inscriptiones vel Tituli Theatri Amplissimi, Complectentis rerum vniuersitatis singulas materias et imagines eximias, ut idem recte quoq; dici possit: Promptuariarum artificiarum miraculosarumque rerum; ae omnia rari thesauri et pretiosae supellectilis structurae atque picturae, quae hic simul in theatro conquiri consulantur, ut eorum frequenti inspeccione tractationeque, singularis aliqua rerum cognitio et prudentia admiranda, cito, facile ac tuto comparari possit. Autore Samuele a Quiccheberg Belga Monachii Ex Officina Adami Berg typograph. Anno M.D.L.X.V. Cum gratia et privilegio Caeserco.* English version in the translation by M.A. Meadow and B. Robertson.
- ²⁷ See: *The First Treatise on Museums. Samuel Quiccheberg's Inscriptiones*, 1565, M.A. Meadow i B. Robertson (ed. and transl. into English), The Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles 2013.
- ²⁸ F. Krämer, *Ulisse Aldrovandi's Pandechion...*
- ²⁹ C.F. Neickel (NEICKELIO), *MUSEOGRAPHIA Oder Anleitung Zum rechten Begriff und nützlicher Anlegung der MUSEORUM, Oder Raritäten=Kammern... In beliebter Kürze zusammen getragen, und curiösen Gemüthern dargestellt... Auf Verlangen mit einigen Zusätzen und dreyfachen Anhang vermehret von D. Johann Kanold.- Leipzig und Breslau (Hubert), Leipzig und Breslau 1727.*
- ³⁰ J.A. Commenii, *Orbis Sensualium Pictus. Hoc est, omnium fundamentalium in Mundo rerum et in vita Actionum, Pictura et Nomenclatura / Visible Word, or a Picture and Nomenclature...*, London 1659.
- ³¹ The centre is also of importance for the history of Polish culture; in the Library collections there are numerous Poland-related artefacts, including the correspondence of Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten with the Zaluski brothers.
- ³² See: T.J. Müller-Bahlke, *Die Wunderkammer. Die Kunt- und Naturalienkammer der Franckesche Stiftungen zu Halle (Saale)*, Halle (Saale) 1998.
- ³³ A manuscript from the Halle *Wunderkammera* has been preserved. This allows to identify the objects which had formed part of the collections prior to 1939.
- ³⁴ So-called British Museum Act of 1753 r. (26Geo 2 c 22) – An Act for the purchase of the Museum or Collection of Sir Hans Sloane and of the Harleian Collection of Manuscripts and for providing one general repository for the better reception and more convenient use of the said collections and of the Cottonian Library and of the additions thereto; dated 7 June 1753.
- ³⁵ See: *Un musée révolutionnaire. Le Musée des Monuments français d'Alexandre Lenoir*, G. Bresc-Bautier, B. de Chancel-Bardelot (ed.), Hazan, Paris 2016.
- ³⁶ *Essays on Museums and Other Subjects*, London 1898; on the formation of the museum definition, see: M. Borusiewicz, *Nauka czy rozrywka? Nowa*

muzeologia w europejskich definicjach muzeum [Education or Entertainment? New Museology in European Museum Definition], 'Muzeologia' Series, Vol. 4, Universitas, Kraków 2012.

³⁷ L. Moreri, *Le Grand Dictionnaire historique, ou Le mélange curieux de l'histoire sacrée et profane*, Lyon 1674.

³⁸ *Dictionnaire encyclopédique...*, p. 278. The *Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Museology* has been translated into Polish (K. Bartkiewicz – transl.) and will be published in 2020 by the Museum of King John III' Palace at Wilanów.

³⁹ A. Quatremère de Quincy, *Lettres à Miranda sur le déplacement des monuments de l'art de Italie* (1796), Macula, Paris 1989.

⁴⁰ J. Cotton Dana, *The Gloom of the Museum*, Vol. 2, 'Museum Series', The Elm Tree Press, Woodstock, Vermont 1917.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, Part III of the book is titled The Literature of Museum Management, pp. 31-45.

⁴² *Ibid.*, *Is the Department Store a Museum?*, pp. 23-24.

⁴³ I write more about it in: D. Folga-Januszewska, *Muzeum jako realizacja artystyczna* [Museum as an Artistic Implementation], in: *Sztuka dzisiaj* [Art Today], proceedings from the conference of the Association of Art Historians, Warsaw November 2001, M. Poprzęcka (ed.), SHS, Warszawa 2002, pp. 57-64.

⁴⁴ See: *Dictionnaire encyclopédique...* – description of the process in many entries of the Dictionary.

⁴⁵ Quoted after: M. Borusiewicz, *Nauka czy rozrywka?...*, p. 41. Transl. from Polish M. Iwińska

⁴⁶ On the history of ICOM see: S.A. Bghli, P. Boylan, Y. Herreman, *Histoire de l'ICOM (1946–1996)*, ICOM, Paris 1998.

⁴⁷ NASA Visitors Centers called NASA museums.

⁴⁸ D. Folga-Januszewska, transl. from English English of the new definition of Kyoto museum.

⁴⁹ D. Folga-Januszewska, transl. from English the English definition of a museum in 1946–2007.

Dorota Folga Januszewska PhD, professor at the Academy of Fine Arts in Warsaw

Art historian, museologist, critic; graduate from the University of Warsaw; professor at the Warsaw Academy of Fine Arts: Head of the Department of the Theory of Graphic Arts, Deputy Director of the Museum of King John III's Palace at Wilanów; (1979–2008) she worked at the National Museum in Warsaw: a long-standing Curator of the Cabinet of Contemporary Graphic Arts and Drawings, Deputy Director for Academic Content and Education, Director; (2008–14) head of the Chair and Director of the Museology Institute at the University of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński in Warsaw; ICOM member: (2002–08 and 2012–18) ICOM Poland President, (2014–16) ICOM MOCO President, ICOM SAREC member, (2016) President of the ICOM Resolution Committee; expert: Council of Europe for Museums, UNESCO High Level Forum on Museums, and in the programmes of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education: member: AICA, team of the National Programme for the Development of Humanities, Committee of the Sciences on Culture of the Polish Academy of Sciences, as well as many scientific and museum councils; author of numerous publications on museology, theory and art of the 17th–21st c.; curator of 56 exhibitions mounted in e.g. Poland, Austria, Germany, Ireland, Russia, France, USA; e-mail: dfolgajanuszewska@muzeum-wilanow.pl

Word count: 13 127; **Tables:** –; **Figures:** 1; **References:** 49

Received: 01.2020; **Reviewed:** 02.2020; **Accepted:** 02.2020; **Published:** 04.2020

DOI: 10.5604/01.3001.0014.1129

Copyright©: 2020 National Institute for Museums and Public Collections. Published by Index Copernicus Sp. z o.o. All rights reserved.

Competing interests: Authors have declared that no competing interest exists.

Cite this article as: Folga-Januszewska D.; HISTORY OF THE MUSEUM CONCEPT AND CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES: INTRODUCTION INTO THE DEBATE ON THE NEW ICOM MUSEUM DEFINITION. *Muz.*, 2020(61): 39-57

Table of contents 2020: <https://muzealnictworocznik.com/issue/12766>

