

"MUSEUM MONUMENT": A MODERN INTERPRETATION OF THE CONCEPT

^aYEGANA EYVAZOVA

^a*Azerbaijan State University of Culture and Art, 39A, H.Zardabi Str., Yasamal, AZ1065, Baku, Azerbaijan*
email: "eyvazova.yegane@mail.ru"

Abstract: In modern museum terminology, there are several concepts, which vagueness in the definition leads to some confusion and makes it difficult to understand important aspects of museum activity. "Museum object", "object of museum importance", "museum treasure", "museum value", "museum monument" – all this gives the impression of similar concepts used in almost all educational or scientific publications with the same semantic load. What is the true state of affairs? In this article, the main purpose of which is to present the museum monument as a status phenomenon, the morphological relationship of this concept in the layout of other concepts is examined and the status-forming criteria are argued in the context of museology and monument studies. For the first time, it is in the presented article that the "museum monument", being analysed as a status phenomenon in the context of museum hermeneutics, museum interpretation, museum axiology, is theoretically substantiated as a separate category of "monument of history and culture". Our conclusions regarding museum monuments represent the scientific novelty of this study.

Keywords: museum object, museum monument, museum terminology, historical and cultural monument, monument studies, museum studies.

1 Introduction

Today, as in all sciences, the improvement of the professional scientific language is one of the topical issues of museology. The solution to this problem lies in the further improvement of the terminology and conceptual apparatus of this science. Both the museum experience and the teaching of museum knowledge require the formation of a clear terminological system, museum vocabulary. As A. Sundieva, who studies this problem, notes, "improving the professional language is one of the most urgent problems of the emerging museum science. The formed scientific language is one of the signs of the maturity of a scientific discipline." [18, p.4].

The noted circumstance does not mean a statement in a categorical form of the thesis about the absence of museum terminology. The fact is that as museology strengthens its position in the system of the humanities, the presence of a kind of scientific language becomes an urgent need. It is for this reason that the discussions on museum terminology are held by the International Committee for Museology, which is a specialised committee under the International Council of Museums, and world-famous museologists, the compilation of terminological dictionaries are designed to fill gaps in this area.

Terminological perfection, that is, the development of museological knowledge, clarification of terms means the correct organisation of practical activities. Unfortunately, this is often not observed both on a practical and theoretical level: several concepts, giving the impression of their identity, lead to confusion. We will try to explain our assumption with the following example. In the arguments "this object is a valuable monument of this museum", or "museums are a place where monuments are protected", there is no doubt that we are talking, without excessive connotations, about museum objects exhibited or stored in the fund. It was not in vain that we mentioned connotation, that is, the accompanying meaning of the word. As the terminological explanation of the concepts "monument" and "museum object", perceived by us in the ordinary sense, dictates, in fact, different content.

2 Materials and Methods

The purpose of this article is to present a new model of the latter by studying the relationship between the "museum object and the museum monument" against the background of museal relations. It should be noted that both concepts are the basic concepts of museum terminology. Such concepts play an important role both in practice and in theory; In this regard, one cannot but agree with the opinion of A. Sundieva: "Special attention deserves a group of terms that are basic both for museum practice and for the emerging museum science. With

their help, today we can not only state and describe, but also explain the most important museum processes" [18, p.5]. Indeed, evaluating the processes taking place in a museum requires the correct use of museum vocabulary, so clarifying the functional purpose and status of each concept is of particular importance. For morphological analysis of our assumption, we should return to the relationship between the concepts of "museum object – museum monument". Let's start with the "museum item". In the museum legislation of the Russian Federation and the Republic of Azerbaijan, this concept is enshrined "as a cultural value, the quality or special features of which make it necessary for society to preserve, study and publicly present it." It is these objects that form the backbone of museum work; museum collections, the museum fund, the exposition and the museum collection are finally formed on the basis of museum objects. The museum itself as a socio-cultural institution has historically existed thanks to this phenomenon.

In the system of museum practice and knowledge, this concept has revealed peculiar dynamics of formation. For a long time, the aforementioned concept was replaced by the phrase "museum exhibit", which meant original, unique, genuine things. "Museum exhibit", translated from Latin meaning "object put on display" (from Latin *exponatus*), is the primary structural element of the museum exhibition. Such a semantic frame limits its ability to fully represent the composition of museum collections and collections. As the exhibits themselves are selected from the collections.

The introduction of the concept "museum object" into the professional museum language in the second half of the 1950s and its transformation into one of the actual terms of museum business in the 1960s-1970s is considered to be one of the important events in the museum vocabulary. As a carrier of information, a thing becomes a museum item that reflects the historical, cultural or natural process, the relationship of people with the outside world.

Such a diverse content of the museum object, attracting the attention of such museologists as V.V. Tsukanova [20], V.V. Kondratiev [11], T.P. Kalugina [8] and others, turned it into an object and subject of various studies. These scientific studies make a significant contribution to the knowledge of the museum object as a special phenomenon, to the identification of its various properties. For example, the judgment expressed by T.P. Kalugina about the museum object as a phenomenon that has a multifaceted and complex dualistic essence [8].

3 Results

The studies carried out in the course of solving the problem posed in this article revealed, in addition to the original nature of the museum object, one more of its essential aspects. Along with being included in a museum collection for protection, a museum object can also be transformed into an object with a highly hierarchical special status (*monument!*) due to its potential value. This argument is a kind of leitmotif of this article. Axiological, epistemological approaches used in the study of museum objects are accompanied by the study of their properties, theoretical verification, which is of great importance from the point of view of clarifying the scientific nature of the phenomenon.

T.I. Kimeeva reveals the significance of this for museology as follows: "Within the framework of these approaches, the process of selecting objects of museum significance in the environment of existence was analysed on the basis of such criteria as informative, attractive, expressive, representative; the content of the museum object was determined on the basis of attributive characteristics, including the name, material, manufacturing technique, time and place of existence and acquisition" [9].

These are exact properties, allowing one to perceive a museum object as a museal being, that contributed to its transformation into a status concept in practice. Many researchers perceive museum items as equivalent to a "monument", based on these

properties. But what exactly is a "monument" in museum practice and the system of museum knowledge, what is its essence and semantic load expressed, in what way does it converge and differ from a "museum object"? Or are they separate essential aspects of the same object?

To answer these questions, it is necessary to approach them not only in the museological context but also in the monumental context. Indeed, the main object, the basic concept in monument studies, which was formed in the 1980s, is the more modern concept of "monument of history and culture", which consists of several terminological elements. The sharply increased interest of scientific circles and the public in recent years in monuments of history and culture has put forward a scientific approach to their classification as a topical problem. It should be noted that the term "monument of history and culture" was first introduced in the USSR in 1965 after the creation of voluntary public organisations for the protection of monuments. In 1976, a new law on the protection of monuments was named with this term. The phenomenon, previously described as a "monument of antiquity", "monument of the revolution", "monument of nature", "monument of history", "monument of culture", was fixed in the legislation with the generalised term "monument of history and culture". Does this situation give reason to think that two areas of knowledge – museology and monuments – duplicate each other? To answer these questions, let us consider, first of all, the definitions of historical and cultural monuments in monument studies. For example, P. Boyarsky, the founder of monument studies, expresses his definition as follows: "monuments of history and culture are a set of material objects and memorable places that make up a conditionally continuous series that reflects all aspects of the historical development of human society in the biosphere system" [2, p.28]. In the definition compiled by another monument specialist A.N. Dyachkov, monuments are commented as follows: "A monument of history and culture is one of the functions of the objective world of culture, singled out by people for the transfer of socially significant cultural and technological traditions from the past to the future" [4, p.41].

4 Discussion

A common feature that attracts attention in both definitions is the presentation of a monument as an object with material, objective properties. Based on these properties, historical and cultural monuments are classified as movable (*mobile*) and immovable (*stationary*). Even the second article of the Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan "On the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments" enshrined the idea of protecting movable monuments in museums. This property can be characterised as the main reason for the similarity between the concepts of "monument" and "museum object". As in museology a "museum object" is perceived as a movable, material thing.

In museum terminology, for the first time in the "Dictionary of Museum Terms" published in 1986, and then in the "Russian Museum Encyclopedia", "museum object" is approved in connection with the concept of "monument" [19]. In the Dictionary of Museum Terms, a museum object is interpreted as "a movable monument of history and culture, a monument of nature, characterizing the processes of development of society and nature, having scientific, historical, artistic or memorial value, removed from the environment and included in the museum collection" [5, p.114].

As can be seen from the content, according to its features, the museum object is identified with the monument. Surprisingly, such a terminological interpretation was not reflected in the legislation. So, in the Federal Law of the Russian Federation "On the Museum Fund of the Russian Federation and Museums of the Russian Federation" of April 24, 1996, and in the Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan "On Museums" of March 24, 2000, the concept of "monument" does not even occur. By mentioning this, we are not at all asserting that there is an insurmountable obstacle between the two concepts; on the contrary, by studying the relationship between these concepts, we strive to present a new model of the "museum monument" based on a more

objective and scientifically based methodology, which will be of great importance for both practice and theory. As the question of the clarity of terminology in the field of monument protection has been worrying scientists for many years. This is primarily due to the need to solve both theoretical and practical problems.

An explanation in the terminological dictionary gives reason to think about the identity of these concepts. It can be assumed that any object presented in museum collections is a monument of history and culture. This is where the first tangle of terminological confusion appears. Such an interpretation of the "museum object" in the context of the phenomenon of "historical and cultural monuments", creates confusion in understanding the content of the "monument" concept. As the "monument" is already perceived in society as a separate concept, as a special category of historical, cultural and even natural heritage, which has the status of a storage unit. This status is awarded not to every historical, cultural or natural object, but only to those that are distinguished by high criteria of value. It was the study of objects belonging to this category, the scientific refinement of the selection criteria that served as the main reason for the emergence of monument studies. In this sense, B. Gavrilov assesses the formation of monument studies as a new stage in the cognition of the concept of "monument of history and culture": and functions. Monuments are considered within the framework of this discipline as an independent subject of scientific knowledge, regardless of the time of their operation, type, relation to any field of scientific activity" [6, p.4].

In museum terminology, the modern interpretation of a "monument" is presented at two levels: 1) in historical social communication – a sign that refers the recipient to a certain phenomenon that took place in the past, to carry out the act of transferring or updating socially significant information; 2) in the legal sphere – a status that is assigned to objects of cultural and natural heritage that have a special value for society [4, p.58].

The first level clearly shows that there is no significant difference between a "museum object" and a "monument". It should be noted that the monuments have the same museal properties as museum items. Since the monuments that carry rich information in their "bosom" (informativeness), allow to revive history (representativeness), evoke impressions and associations (associativity, expressiveness) in a person. Thanks to these properties, N.I. Reshetnikov evaluates a museum object as a monument: "A museum object is a monument with a complex mechanism of interaction of the social information contained in it. It can serve as a source, a key to revealing the secrets of being, a link in the chain of events. It provides not only knowledge but also evokes certain emotions" [13]. Here the author, to more objectively emphasise the importance of the museum object, used the concept of "monument" as a metaphor denoting the value of the object.

As mentioned above, the rhetorical appeal and metaphorical meaning of this word have already become an important factor in the formation of a collective opinion about the monument in society. At the same time, such expressions as "Literary monuments", "Musical monuments", "Monuments of nature", "Monuments of art", often mentioned in the media, played a huge role in the formation of this opinion. However, there is a second level of the modern perception of the concept of "monument", which, as it is interpreted in the terminology, is associated with its legal aspect. It is this aspect that determines the level of status of a monument of history and culture, highlighting it in a separate category of historical, cultural, as well as natural heritage.

The factor that reduces to a common denominator the scientific conclusions of the fundamental works of researchers involved in the study of the legal aspects of the protection of cultural heritage – M.M. Boguslavsky [1], I.E. Martynenko [12], L.R. Klebanova [10], S. Suleymanly [17] is associated precisely with the awareness of the phenomenon of "monument of history and culture" as a unit of protection of cultural heritage. The level of "status" of this phenomenon is scientifically substantiated in the

dissertation of the St. Petersburg researcher A.B. Shukhobodsky "Status of historical and cultural monuments in modern Russia" [15].

Thus, the legal status of a "monument of history and culture" is explained by the fact that an object assigned to this status is a special unit of protection of cultural heritage. It should be noted with regret that this important aspect of the historical and cultural monument is not reflected in the legislation of any country. We think that the discrepancy between legislation and terminology, logical incompleteness is one of the main reasons for conceptual confusion both in museum practice and in the system of museum knowledge. For example, the meaning of the word "monument", which is contained in the second article of the Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan "On the protection of historical and cultural monuments" dated April 10, 1998, in the sentence "Movable monuments are stored in museums, archives, funds, exhibitions and other relevant places", remains unclear. In this case, it is not entirely clear whether the monument means status or an important thing.

But at the same time, this article found its objective solution in the Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan "On the National Archival Fund" of June 22, 1999. In the first article of the Law, the content of a "documentary monument" as one of the types of the movable monument is defined as "an archival document of rare or special historical and cultural value, duly classified as a "documentary monument", which means the status of the concept.

This idea, being concretised in the seventh article of this Law, is stated as follows: "Archival documents and documentary collections of the special historical and cultural value of the National Archival Fund are considered monuments of rare documents." In S.O. Schmidt's monumental judgments, documentary monuments are characterized precisely by their value characteristics as one of the types of historical and cultural monuments [16, p.9].

In archival practice and archival science, the concepts of "unique document", "document of special value", "secret document" are perceived as structural elements of a "documentary monument". Approaching the "museum monument" with the same logic is the best way to put an end to the confusion of concepts, both in practice and in theory. The prescriptions arising from the normative documents concerning the museum business are a weighty argument in the scientific substantiation of the high legal status of this concept. For example, referring to existing regulations, such as the "Uniform Rules for the Organisation of the Acquisition, Accounting, Storage and Use of Museum Items and Museum Collections" of the Russian Federation, "Instructions for the Accounting and Protection of Museum Values and Museum Collections of the Republic of Azerbaijan", it can be argued that the used in these documents, such concepts as "material monuments", "written monuments", "pictorial monuments", "material and cultural monuments", "monuments reflecting the historical situation, relating to the life of a famous person or a memorable event", do not clarify on the question of the differences between so-called monuments and museum items.

Such concepts as "museum object", "cultural value", "monument" expressed in the normative documents are identical in meaning. This circumstance is inherent in all documents related to museum legislation, which should be regarded as a negative phenomenon. Whereas in museum practice there is a prerequisite that allows the purposeful use of the concept of "monument". Each museum is proud of its unique, original and authentic items, historical and cultural values that it protects and displays! For example, the 21st article of the "Instructions for the Accounting and Protection of Museum Values and Museum Collections of the Republic of Azerbaijan" states: "All museums must have perfect and precise control over the safety of valuable samples of material and spiritual cultural monuments" [7, p. eleven]. This provision provides for the selection of the most valuable museum objects from the point of view of monument studies for storage under a special protection regime. "Special

protection regime" is the main criterion for the storage of objects with the status of a monument, that is, monuments of history and culture.

This provision should not call into question the value potential, the procedure for the protection of other museum items stored in the museum. We support the opinion of A.R. Sergeev on this matter: "From the foregoing, one cannot conclude that cultural values that are not recognized as monuments of history and culture should not be subject to special protection. On the contrary, this protection should be carried out in a somewhat different framework and form than to historical and cultural monuments" [14, p.154]. For example, the clothing collection of the National Historical Museum of Azerbaijan contains samples of clothing of different classes and strata of the population of certain historical periods. Among them, there are pieces of clothing made later on the basis of historical facts and examples.

One of the main items enriching the clothing collection is the clothes of the famous Azerbaijani poetess Khan kyzy Khurshidbanu Natavan. From the point of view of monument studies, the dress of Khan kyzy should be considered a "museum monument". Because compared to other clothes in the museum collection, this museum item has a universal value. First of all, these clothes, being the subject of the attire of a historical person, carry, first of all, historical, memorial, aesthetic and artistic value, they are unique due to the manufacturing technology and texture. The authenticity of these clothes places them in a more privileged position in terms of value compared to other clothes from the museum collection. This is the essence of the subtle conditioning we have mentioned. Thus, exclusivity in the storage of this type of clothing can be ensured under a special legal regime. The content of the "special legal regime" includes all aspects of intra-museum protection and restoration. In the Instruction to which we referred, this aspect is emphasized as follows: "Restoration of museum treasures of special value except for the simplest conservation work is allowed only with the permission of the Ministry of Culture, and is based on the conclusion of a commission of highly qualified restorers" [7, p. 12].

This rule, arising from the legislation, objectifies the approval of the object received for protection in the museum as a "museum monument". We will try to substantiate this statement on the example of another museum exhibit of the same museum. Let's make a small digression: we used the term "museum object" to analyse our judgments. In our opinion, this circumstance does not require any scientific presentation when identifying the relationship between "museum object" – "museum monument". Regardless of the museum value, each object submitted to the museum for protection based on an expert opinion initially acquires the status of a "museum object".

One of the most valuable museum items of the National Historical Museum of Azerbaijan is the lower jaw bone of one of the oldest people in the world – "Azykhanthrope", which was discovered in 1968 by archaeologist Mammadali Huseynov in the Azikh cave in the Khojavend region of Azerbaijan. Due to its scientific value, this unique find of world archaeology is stored in the Special Fund of the Museum under the regime of special protection (special funds created in many museums serve to protect museum objects of special value). The design of this museum item, which differs from others in terms of value, in the status of a "museum monument", is considered the fairest, both from a practical and theoretical point of view.

The rules for the protection of museum items and collections also provide for the implementation of special documentation when organizing a regime for the protection of more valuable items. Particular attention is drawn to this in Article 21 of the "Instructions for the Accounting and Protection of Museum Values and Museum Collections of the Republic of Azerbaijan": "The museum should open an individual case for monuments, in which all documents related to the change in the state of preservation of the object and its restoration should be collected" [7, p.11].

One of the main factors determining the status of a "monument of history and culture" is the registration of objects of this category in special state registration documents. In this regard, the following opinion of I.E. Martynenko: "Monuments are cultural values that are taken under state protection by including them in state lists and establishing a special regime for the protection and use. Obviously, not every cultural value can be considered a monument. The assignment of an object to the number of monuments entails legal consequences: it is taken under the protection of the state. And it is from this that it is necessary to proceed when determining the legal regime of an object of historical and cultural heritage" [12, p. 13].

The museum's instructions include the compilation of separate inventories for works of special value, especially gems, metals, weapons and works of art, as well as for instructions for applying a special treatment to this category of museum objects. All this confirms, in the context of monuments, the judgment about the possibility of constructing museum objects of special value in the status of "museum monuments". The selection of a "museum monument" as a separate category of historical and cultural monuments lays the foundation for the formation of museum monument studies as a special area of complex monument studies. This scientific level is fully consistent with the model of the structure of monuments presented by S.O. Schmidt. Since S.O. Schmidt, when classifying monuments, repelling from the degree of study of monuments of history and culture, derives theoretical and concrete (or concrete applied) monuments. The author proposed to build the object and subject area of a specific monument study according to the principle of diversity, and the result turned out to be effective in practice. The formation of such areas of specific monument studies as temporal (monument studies of the ancient world, the Middle Ages, etc.), territorial (Russian, Ukrainian monument studies, etc.), sectoral (book, technical monument studies, etc.) is successful a manifestation of a deeper study of historical and cultural monuments. In this classification, it is very expedient to present museum monument studies in the sectoral dimension.

5 Conclusion

Further forecasts of museum monuments, which may arise at the intersection of two scientific areas - museology and monuments, are encouraging: terminological confusion will disappear once and for all, the construction of the phenomenon of "museum monument" will be ensured both in museological and monumental terms.

Thus, summing up the analysis, it is necessary to note the following scientific conclusions: the value potential of the "museum object", one of the key concepts of museum terminology, is the main factor determining its hierarchical position in the museum collection, i.e. depending on its value, the object falls either into the category of "museum object", or can receive the status of "museum monument". The status of a "museum monument" can become an object of museum monuments, establishing itself as a separate category of historical and cultural monuments. Confirmation of these scientific discoveries in practice and theory, first of all, will make it possible to clarify museum terminology and improve the organization of security activities in the museum.

Literature:

1. Boguslavskii, M. (2005). *Cultural values in international circulation: legal aspects*. Moscow: Lawyer. (In Russian)
2. Boiarskii, P. (1990). *Introduction to Monument Studies*. Monographic. Moskva: Tsentr "Kul'tura i mirovoi okean". (In Russian)
3. D'iachkov, A. (1987). "Monuments in the context of the historical and cultural sphere." Collection of scientific works. Moscow. (In Russian)
4. *Dictionary of actual museum terms*. (2021). Museum, 5. Available at: https://musrn.ru/uploads/images/files/MUZEY_5_2009.pdf
5. *Dictionary of museum terminology*. (2010). Collection of scientific works. Issue 31. Moscow: GMSIR. (In Russian)

6. Gavrilov, B. (2003). "You must protect..." how monuments were protected in Russia in the 18th and early 20th centuries. *Istoriia*, 38, 98. (In Russian)
7. *Instruction on registration and protection of museum treasures*. (2008). Museum collections of the Republic of Azerbaijan. Baku. (In Azerb.)
8. Kalugina, T. (2020). On the question of the dualism of a museum object: Authenticity or authenticity? *Muzei. Pamiatnik. Nasledie*, 2(8). (In Russian)
9. Kimeeva, T. (2017). Research methodology of an ethnographic subject on the example of collections on the culture of the indigenous peoples of the Tomsk region. *Izvestiia Ural'skogo Federal'nogo Universiteta. Seriya 1.Problemy obrazovaniia, nauki i kul'tury*, 23(4), 168, 210. (In Russian)
10. Klebanov, L. (2012). *Monuments of history and culture: legal status and protection*. Monographic. Moscow: Norma. (In Russian)
11. Kondrat'ev, V. (1982). *Issues of selection of contemporary materials for the museum collection*. Formirovanie i izuchenie muzeinykh kolleksii po istorii sovetskogo obshchestva, 135. (In Russian)
12. Martynenko, I. (2005). *Legal status, protection and restoration of historical-cultural heritage*. Monographic. Grodno. (In Russian)
13. Reshetnikov, N. (2014). *Museum and design of museum activities: uchebnoe posobie*. Moscow: MGUKI. (In Russian)
14. Sergeev, A. (1990). *Civil protection of cultural property in the USSR*. Leningrad: Izd-vo LGU. (In Russian)
15. Shchukhobodskii, A. (2012). *The status of a monument of history and culture in modern Russia*. Abstract of PhD Thesis in Philosophy. Saint Petersburg University.
16. Shmidt, S. (2009). *Monuments of writing in the culture of knowledge of the history of Russia*. Volume 2. Ot Karamzina do «arbatstva» Okudzhavy. Book 1. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur. (In Russian)
17. Suleymanli, S. (2018). *Problems of international legal regulation of cultural heritage and the legislation of the Republic of Azerbaijan*. Baku: Azerbaijan.
18. Sundieva, A. (2009). On the basic concepts of museum science. *Museum*, 5. Available at: https://musrn.ru/uploads/images/files/MUZEY_5_2009.pdf (In Russian)
19. *Terminological problems of museology*. (1986). Collection of scientific works. Moscow: TsMRS. (In Russian)
20. Tsukanova, V. (1987). *Museum item and historical source. "On the question of the relationship of concepts"*. Aktualnye problemy sovetskogo muzevedeniia. Moscow. (In Russian)

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AL