

Museology and its constituent dialogues: inside and outside the boundaries

*Más allá y hacia adentro de fronteras en construcción: diálogos constituyentes
de la Museología*

Luciana Menezes de Carvalho and Tereza Cristina Moletta Scheiner



Electronic version

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/iss/700>

DOI: 10.4000/iss.700

ISSN: 2306-4161

Publisher

ICOM - International Council of Museums

Printed version

Date of publication: 1 June 2016

Number of pages: 95-105

ISSN: 2309-1290

Electronic reference

Luciana Menezes de Carvalho and Tereza Cristina Moletta Scheiner, « Museology and its constituent dialogues: inside and outside the boundaries », *ICOFOM Study Series* [Online], 44 | 2016, Online since 06 February 2018, connection on 23 October 2019. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/iss/700> ; DOI : 10.4000/iss.700

Museology and its constituent dialogues: inside and outside the boundaries

Luciana Menezes de Carvalho⁶

Graduate Program in Museology and Heritage (PPG-PMUS,
UNIRIO/MAST) - Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Federal University of Alfenas (UNIFAL-MG) – Brazil

Tereza Cristina Moletta Scheiner⁷

Graduate Program in Museology and Heritage (PPG-PMUS,
UNIRIO/MAST) - Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Preliminary thoughts

Science practitioners of the 17th and 18th centuries started to divide knowledge into niches to understand the aspects of the world that still had to be known. The classification of knowledge, started in the 18th century, influenced those knowledge branches that already existed. This work was initially developed, memorably, by Diderot and D'Alembert, who used a “knowledge tree” graphic to divide knowledge into three parts related to human understanding: “memory (including the history and the natural history), reason (philosophy, mathematic and law) and imagination (the arts)” (Burke, 2012, p. 73).

The expression “science practitioners” was used to refer to the 17th and 18th centuries because the term “scientist” was only created in 1830. These were scholars of the natural and social world, although they were distinguished from previous scholars; they gradually changed their practices into professions and organized themselves as a community – the *science community*. Therefore it is possible to infer that each discipline creates its own world – or reality – based on how this kind of knowledge is noticed as a collectivity; this collectivity, by the way, can be the West (macro) or a specific knowledge area (micro).

Interdisciplinary debates on Museology are as old as the first debates about Museology itself. Thus, the discussion about the nature and objective of Museology has always been permeated by interfaces with other fields. According to the paper presented at the 2014 ICOFOM meeting, Museology exists as a claim on the part of museum professionals for recognition of their distinctive knowledge and objective, resulting from a systematic, disciplined, and academic process, as provided and encouraged by museum courses. The arising question is: why has Museology been configured as interdisciplinary since its beginning? To answer this question, the following trajectory is proposed: 1) Reflection about the concepts of field, discipline, and interdisciplinarity using Pierre Bourdieu for a

⁶Master and PhD student in Museology and Heritage at the Federal University of the State of Rio de Janeiro – UNIRIO. Museologist and Director at the Museum of Memory and Heritage of the Federal University of Alfenas – UNIFAL-MG, Minas Gerais, Brazil.

⁷PhD in Communication and Culture (Federal University of Rio de Janeiro – UFRJ). Professor and Coordinator of the Graduate Program in Museology and Heritage (PPG-PMUS, Federal University of the State of Rio de Janeiro - UNIRIO/ Museum of Astronomy and Related Sciences - MAST), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

theoretical framework; 2) brief notes about the first relevant debates related to interdisciplinarity in Museology; and 3) a case study analysis of the Graduate Program in Museology and Heritage and its interdisciplinary dialogues. The final considerations intend to point out the importance of Museology professionals, not only in shaping the boundaries but also in building interdisciplinary dialogues.

Microphysics⁸ of the fields: Bourdieu and his methodological contributions to the social universe analysis. The systematic field case

According to Bourdieu, a *field* can be defined as a social universe, as well as a range of forces and disputes that is dialectically articulated to preserve and change itself; a “social space of objective relationships” (Bourdieu, 2012, p. 64) between distinct groups, a field possesses its own reality as a symbolic system. In other words, it is a relatively autonomous microcosm that obeys its own laws. While a field responds to a macrocosm (e.g. society) and its laws, it also affords autonomy; this autonomy resides exactly at the interface: the microcosm (field) takes advantage of the same mechanisms of its own society to free itself from external impositions and create conditions where it can only recognize its own internal impositions (Bourdieu, 2003, pp. 20-21). These impositions can be called *capital*: each field is a place for constituting a specific form of capital (Bourdieu, 2003, p. 26).

The efficacy of a symbolic field resides in its capacity to reproduce the natural and social world, sorting this world by means of representations and senses that are allegories of the real structures of social relationships. Considering this premise, the more autonomous a certain field is, the more it reflects social impositions, changing them in such a way that they might be unknowable – that is, these impositions might seem to belong only to this given field. Furthermore, the field autonomy gives its agents a specific authority that allows them to go beyond the field boundaries, and then to speak about the field with authority and efficacy (Bourdieu, 2003).

The concept of capital, known in economics and common sense as a set of material properties, is different within cultural fields (in a more intelligible way than in economics): capital is symbolic (and incorporated), but also represents a power acting upon the field; capital also can be accumulated – considering the fact that each field possesses particular types of capital. Forms of capital are not just defined in each field, they are organized, institutionalized and mainly recognized by those in the field. The symbolic capital only exists by means of the agents’ acknowledgement, endowed with perception categories of the field in which they participate (Bourdieu, 2012).

Science can be defined as a power field⁹. It is not the only one; every society is constituted by a set of fields, claimed by Bourdieu as “spaces of position” ordered in a hierarchical way according to established rules of these fields, on which every field is subordinated to the same segmentation and “polarizing logic” (2013, p. 18). What is at stake in the scientific field is to obtain the scientific competence or the scientific capital monopoly, i.e., the capacity or power to act

⁸It refers to Michel Foucault’s book “Microphysics of Power”.

⁹This is Lone Valle’s affirmation at the book presentation of Pierre Bourdieu, *Homo Academicus*. As stated by Bourdieu, the university field is entered in the power field and in the social field (2013, p. 65).

with authority and be authorized, in a legitimate and recognized way, by its participants (Bourdieu, 2012, p. 1). The scientific field structure can be defined by means of struggle between the leaders, and they can be agents or institutions that dispute the distribution structure of a symbolical capital.

Bourdieu pointed to the Copernican revolution (in the sense given by Kuhn) as a demand for autonomy of a specific field that desired to be “scientific”; this autonomy would be from the religious, philosophical and political fields. It was a demand that resulted in “the affirmation of the scientists’ right to decide scientific issues” (2012, p. 21). The belief in knowledge that distinguishes itself from others, independent of social claims, is also the result of an arbitrary movement that exposes the science itself. The main goal of “struggle” or dispute in a scientific field, beyond positions and classifications, is the monopoly of recognition that a certain point of view is legitimate, not considering that each one is “particular, located and dated” (Bourdieu, 2013, p. 51).

Museums played a fundamental role in the diffusion of a specific way of thinking that is actually hegemonic: the scientific way. Being an institution or phenomenon, the museum entity also participated in the consolidation of the scientific field. As an unquestionable source and reference (the museum discourse is rarely put to the test), museums served as a diffusion center and legitimizer of knowledge.

The disciplines and (inter)disciplines cycle

Specialization within the sciences may have allowed human beings to know more than they had already, offering niche variety to many different scholars (Burke, 2012, p. 203). Consequently, specialization took part in a division of labor process, considering Adam Smith, Ferguson and even Marxian perspectives. However, it is necessary to consider that, in general, it was not a spontaneous and non-intentional process (Burke, 2012, pp. 206-208). Burke points out the fact that the 19th century was permeated with the appearance of numerous groups – “the age of associations,” reports Karl Preusker – which had an important role in the creation of new disciplines; many of these associations started with the aim of creating a new discipline (2012, p. 208). International meetings and congresses, including their publications, also assumed important roles in shaping the identity of disciplines, even through conflicts between participants.

The main highlight of this process was the foundation of many subjects and an institutional “explosion” in universities during the second half of the 19th century; these universities, known as educational institutions, broadened out to become research centers while the disciplines became independent (Burke, 2012, p. 212). Therefore this is a recent process, although usually seen as timeless by their members; in fact, this fragmentation of scientific knowledge as we know it nowadays started only a few centuries ago. As claimed by Burke, the disciplines are historical artifacts that were gradually built, in a certain time and space, to answer challenges and problems (2012, pp. 212-213). It is possible to forecast a trajectory (not universal but common) of a discipline: from a society to a journal; and then from a chair in a faculty to a seminar; and finally from a department or institute where it belonged before becoming independent, even sometimes by strong ruptures. The pioneers in this process were the United States and Germany (Burke, 2012, pp. 212-213).

In some cases, there are disciplines that started by means of a personal effort by scholars such as Humboldt (Geography), Linnaeus (Botanic), Adam Smith (Economy), Durkheim and Weber (Sociology). By contrast, some theoreticians criticize this perspective; Foucault said that no one creates disciplines (Burke, 2012, p. 216). It is important to stress that some of these agents and others had important roles in the defense and institutionalization of their future disciplines in the corresponding universities. It is said “future” because these disciplines did not exist before their actions – if they are “founding fathers”, so, by definition, they could not belong to the disciplines that they were creating (Burke, 2012, p. 217). Thus according to Burke, based on Hagstrom, the new disciplines were heterogeneous by themselves because their antecedents had distinct origins - this fluidity is a particular characteristic of this first moment. When a second generation comes (those who graduated from this discipline), they take the existence of the discipline as a consolidated fact (2012, pp. 217-218).

Bourdieu (2013, p. 153) considered an academic discipline to be a subfield within the university fields (as well as Languages, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences, among others); it is important to emphasize something that is already known but barely said: every discipline that has claimed itself to be a “science” is a human creation - that means it is not natural. Science is constituted of its own members struggling for monopoly, as well as its own “di-vision”; it is a viewpoint achieving sense and consensus and consequently producing discontinuity. In other words, the creation of a discipline is a result of the wish to acquire authority (Bourdieu, 2012, p. 113). The boundaries are just results of a division more or less close to the “reality”. In reality, which is not natural either, it is an outcome of a “legitimate delimitation” (Bourdieu, 2012, p. 115). Science itself – by means of its agents – invokes its authority to found the arbitrary division that it wants to impose. The power said to be ‘scientific’ brings or makes possible the existence of a group and a space with a specific vision and division – a vision of a specific identity and unity (Bourdieu, 2012, pp. 116-117).

Interdisciplinarity arose as a movement against specialization. According to Burke, it is not a new movement if we consider the way that knowledge used to be categorized. However, it is only possible to think of interdisciplinarity as we know it today, after the emerging concept of disciplines. The need for interdisciplinarity arose to fill the gaps in disciplinarity itself, which did not allow broader approaches and relationships between knowledge fields (Burke, 2012, pp. 223-224). This movement also started as more or less organized and in the same way as the disciplines, by means of societies, publications, and institutions. At the time (essentially the second half of the 20th century with some earlier traces) the organization of certain studies were proposed, such as Middle Eastern Studies, Near Eastern Studies, among others. In the specific case of the United States, these studies were promoted by political efforts in order to stimulate teamwork (Burke, 2012, pp. 224-225).

The museum became an exclusive subject appropriated by the discipline of Museology from the moment that this cultural capital rendered it “a distinct gain” (Bourdieu, 2013, p. 214). Claiming to be a “specialized field”, Museology organized itself with the same logic as any area: “as the specific capital amount possessed and as its antiquity” (Bourdieu, 2013, p. 217). In an ongoing search for the

monopoly and such points of view, a question that has always arisen is the very definition of the discipline, in which such points of view have a place – therefore each person will use a definition that is closer to his or her interests.

However, the “great turn” that changed the museum field’s pathway occurred in the 20th century. After the creation of ICOM, a group of professionals from different countries met to debate museums in a distinct way from other discussions about museums in Anthropology, Social Sciences and other human disciplines, by means of their personal and even academic experiences. For some theorists, museum practices are not just the subject of study, but the museum in itself, its existence, meaning, and – mainly – the possibility of a specific systematic discipline for museums.

Constituent dialogues of Museology – ICOFOM and its importance as a centralizing agent and diffuser of a new discipline

Considering ICOFOM as an important agent in the process of shaping Museology and its boundaries is no coincidence. This committee arose exactly when ideas and theories about Museology or Museum Studies were being developed throughout the world, and they converged in this space. In the second ICOFOM meeting held in Poland in 1978, an Editorial Board was established, composed of G. Dieszner, W. Klausewitz, A. Razgon and Vinos Sofka - whose task would be to work on paper selections based on “fundamental museological problems” (Jelínek, 1980, p. 57). In the following year, during the 1979 ICOFOM meeting held in Torgiano, Italy, the creation of a debates journal by assembly was approved, initially called Working Papers.

In the first volume of MuWoP – Museological Working Papers – Vinos Sofka presented it as a birth: “A new arrival is announced in the international museum community. Nickname: MuWoP. Size: 67 pages. Weight: 203 g” (1980, p. 3). The purpose of MuWoP was to provide an open forum for Museology’s fundamental questions, in which such discussion would occur in the form of themes according to a defined program that could be changed by the ICOFOM community. Another reason would be to become a forum for the development of a specific museological terminology.

MuWoP n°. 2: interdisciplinarity in Museology

In addition to discussing questions about a definition of Museology, its subject of study, and terminology, there was a concern by ICOFOM members regarding the potential interdisciplinary nature of Museology. Interdisciplinarity was the theme of the second volume of MuWoP, with the contributions of each author presented here.

According to Vinos Sofka, the MuWoP authors could be divided into two groups: those who defined Museology as a discipline, an emerging social science; and those who emphasized its practical aspect – it would be simultaneously an art or an applied science. Considering that, the authors of the second volume directed their inferences about the limits and boundaries of Museology and how much is interdisciplinary or not.

In the Czech Josef Benes’ perspective, the museum domain was a cultural specialty (1981, p. 10-12); the American Flora S. Kaplan considered Museology as a social science (1981, pp. 14-15); Zybnek

Z. Stránský claimed that a science specialist or theorist would not be able to answer the question of Museology being a science or not due to the lack of personal experience and contact with museums' reality and practice. Therefore, Stránský considers the experience with the museum phenomenon as an important fact in Museology analysis (1981, pp. 19-21); the Polish Jerzy Swiecimski enunciated that the museum's problems could be seen by means of scientific-analytical approaches, i.e., the practical understanding of museums in the light of individual systematic aspects – history of culture, specific branches of philosophy, art theory, and others (1981, pp. 22-24).

The American G. Ellis Burcaw started his paper explaining the difference between “multi” and “inter” – “multi” means more than one and “inter” is between or among. He pointed that the “Museology science” has basically worked in connection with other sciences, on the basis of the multi and interdisciplinarity (1981, pp. 29-30). In a more pragmatic perspective, the Israeli Michaela Dub ensured that for each kind of museum a set of specific knowledge areas are necessary; as an example of interdisciplinarity in museums, she mentioned the exhibition process that in turn requires action of various professionals from different knowledge areas (1981, pp. 30-31).

Museology is an interdisciplinary approach, as pointed out by the Czech Anna Gregorová, both in a practical museum viewpoint and for Museology itself: 1) considering the fact that museum activities are conducted and influenced by a large variety of scientific, social and natural disciplines; and 2) Museology, studying the specific relation of man to reality, can be related to other analytical disciplines such as: Ontology, Gnosiology, Psychology, Axiology, Ethics, Pedagogy and Sociology (1981, pp. 33-36). The German Ilse Jahn emphasized that, if there is an interdisciplinarity, it presumes the existence of a discipline “museology” (a “real science”) and of a specific museological knowledge. The interdisciplinarity would work as a knowledge exchange to resolve problems that cannot be solved with a specific knowledge (1981, pp. 37-38). Therefore, the interdisciplinary relationship in Museology should be firstly examined through Museology's nature itself, as maintained by the American Flora S. Kaplan, but it could be found in the practical museum, in which “each museum professional partakes of the interdisciplinary nature of museology” (1981, p. 40).

The Canadian Louis Lemieux worked with the concept of discipline as a study field, but he considered that, if a professional practice (Medicine, for example) requires knowledge from other disciplines, such a profession is multidisciplinary; and when a variety of disciplines interact in the pursuit of a common objective, this action is interdisciplinary. In the museum universe, the exhibition was used again as a good example of interdisciplinary activity (1981, pp. 41-42).

The Catalans Domènec Miquel i Serra and Eulàlia Morral i Romeu highlighted the pluridisciplinary concept – the coexistence of distinct disciplines leading to interdisciplinarity, as two dimensions that are complementary; they used the Catalan museums as a study case (1981, pp. 44-45). In this range, the Czech Jirí Neustupný declared that museum work and Museology's character are heterogeneous (1981, p. 46), in which Museology has applied the theories and methods of other disciplines to museum work.

The American Robert W. Ott pointed to the importance of interdisciplinarity in the context of art museum exhibitions – in order to understand interdisciplinarity in museums, a basic enlightenment of “the various philosophies of interpretation and criticism in arts” (1981, p. 48) is necessary: mechanistic criticism, contextualistic criticism, organistic criticism, formalistic criticism, and an integration of these viewpoints. As pointed out by the Russian Awraam M. Razgon, “Any effort to interpret Museology as a scientific discipline inevitably brings up the necessity of determining the nature of museological research” (1981, pp. 51-53); the French Georges Henri Rivière approached the dynamic of the role of interdisciplinarity in the museum institution (1981, pp. 54-55); and the Brazilian Waldisa Rússio Guarnieri maintained that interdisciplinarity should be a research method in Museology, in museum work, and in Museology training courses for museum professionals (1981, pp. 56-57).

The German Klaus Schreiner asserted that “every scientific discipline examines a certain field of reality and its specific laws”, and that

Museology examines the complex process of the acquisition, the conservation, the identification and recording, the research, the exhibition and communication of selected movable original, authentic objects of nature and society. (1981, p. 58).

Even with its specialization, every field of activity of a discipline includes a connection and reciprocal effects of different fields of knowledge (1981, p. 58). Yugoslav Tibor Sekelj also mentioned, as an example, exhibition work as an interdisciplinary cooperation in museums (1981, pp. 60-61). The debate about interdisciplinarity in Museology arose in connection with the debates about the basic character of Museology, as proposed by the Polish Jerzy Swiecimski.

Therefore, we start right from this point of view. Although the MuWoP discussion comes from the 1980s, we approach it here in this paper for the following reasons: 1) We consider the period of 1950 to 1980 of prime importance in understanding the Museology formation process; and 2) a worldwide forum was established to discuss interdisciplinarity as an emerging discipline. As we said before, it is only possible to talk about interdisciplinarity on the basis of the existence of disciplines and, in this case, of a specific discipline. Although most contributions mentioned above are based on practical museum work, the authors tried to justify an already existing interdisciplinarity in Museology. Indeed, this is possible to infer not because of interdisciplinarity involving museums’ practical work, but because of the epistemic moment when Museology configured itself as a discipline. Museology made room as a systematic discipline in the Academy in the second part of the 20th century, when its supporters aspired to a study objective that permeated museums with distinct perspectives. It all happened simultaneously in the moment when the theme of interdisciplinarity was in vogue.

Those first authors who reflected about Museology did not belong, obviously, to the discipline, as it was not a proper discipline at the time; in order to consolidate its existence as a subject, they brought along methods, theories, and investigative techniques from their consolidated original areas. Now they claimed for Museology the status of an interdisciplinary subject to justify their existence within this emerging area and to validate their thoughts. Finally, if Museology were not interdisciplinary, a thought, method, or theory

based on Philosophy, Communication, or Arts, for example, would not have a reason to exist inside that discipline.

PPG-PMUS and its interdisciplinary dialogues

According to Capes¹⁰, the core of a graduate program is research, performed exclusively by students through dedicated study¹¹. Their results contribute directly to the amount of knowledge produced in a certain field and, in addition, consolidate it together with their master's and doctoral studies. An area offering graduate courses can be seen as a discipline holding a consolidated production of knowledge, validated and recognized both internally and externally.

The Graduate Program in Museology and Heritage (PPG-PMUS) is the result of a partnership between the Federal University of the State of Rio de Janeiro (UNIRIO) and the Museum of Astronomy and Related Sciences (MAST). This is the first Museology graduate program in Brazil, offering a Master's program since 2006 and a PhD program from 2010. It is not necessary for a candidate to have a degree in Museology in order to start a Master's or Doctoral degree in this program, indeed the student can have graduated from any field of study and be enrolled in the program. The teaching staff is composed of professors from the following areas: Museology, Arts, Information Science, Social Sciences, Communication, Education, Engineering, Geology, History, History of Science, and Linguistics.

The basic subjects of this course are "Theory and Methodology in Museology" and "Heritage Theory", being of equal importance in the discipline of "Museology, Heritage, Documentation and Information". However, the program offers students a range of topics, such as: "Museology and Conservation", "Museology and Communication", "Museology, Heritage and Sustainable Development", "Culture and Society: symbolic itineraries", "Heritage, Nature and Biodiversity", "Heritage, Museology, Education and Interpretation", "Museology and Art", "Museum: Theory and Practice", besides the study seminars and those matters related to dissertations and thesis development.

Nevertheless, the most interesting indicators of how diversified PPG-PMUS is are its research lines. The two areas, named "Museum and Museology" and "Museum, Total Heritage and Development", include research projects discussing a large variety of themes, such as the terms and concepts of Museology; exhibition languages; memory of Museology; "Education as a Cultural and Personal Heritage", imagined communities, inventory of geodiversity valorization, among other specific and distinct themes¹². It is along these lines that dissertations and theses are developed – so it is possible to visualize the diversity of investigations and results (dissertations and theses) already existing in Brazilian Museology.

If the existence of an undergraduate course is a fundamental part of shaping a new discipline, a graduate program ensures a methodological status to this discipline. The Museology Program

¹⁰CAPES (the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior) is the Brazilian Federal Agency for the Support and Evaluation of Graduate Education. It is a foundation of the Ministry of Education (MEC), and it establishes guidelines for the Graduation courses *strictu sensu* (Master and Doctorate) across the whole country. CAPES – *Historia e Missão*. (2015, August 29). Available at < <http://www.capes.gov.br/historia-e-missao> >.

¹¹This perspective can be found in the Plano Nacional de Pós-Graduação (National Graduate Program) 2011-2020.

¹²The information presented here can be found at PPG-PMUS site. *PPG-PMUS homepage*. (2015, August 29). Available at: < <http://ppg-pmus.mast.br/inicio.htm> >.

(PPG-PMUS) approaches a large variety of subjects, making it heterogeneous and even interdisciplinary. The investigations carried out in this program extrapolate Museology boundaries – boundaries that for some are already defined, but are still undefined for others. An important addendum: those seeking a closer approach to Museology, especially because of the undergraduate course in Museology, usually defend the idea that Museology has limits and a defined object of study; for others, from other subject areas, Museology has not only undefined boundaries but also wide boundaries, as it allows their points of view to be included within the discipline.

Final Remarks

Foucault (2007) pointed out the end of the human being as an object of study. It is possible to figure the end of science as an entity whose knowledge is the only legitimate one. The whole process of knowledge production is permeated with the relativity of knowledge and human perception. Therefore what we can see are systems created by groups seeking to legitimize their own specialties using the symbolic capitals of science and other analytical subjects, trying to conceal the arbitrary as much as they can (Bourdieu, 2007, p. 164).

The human is an invention of the human being itself, as stated by Foucault, but this one also invents something besides himself/herself – in Kant's opinion, through the construction of a world it is possible to know the real world. However, more than the attempt to know the real world, humans have created distinct worlds through the process of systematizing knowledge, using his/her way of thinking based on his/her society. Science is a created world that, despite the fallacy that it can understand what can be named as the real world, it has conquered for itself through the time autonomy from this fallacy and today the science already exists in itself.

In the same way, that process also happens with disciplines: they start from an attempt to understand a certain object, and the more they become autonomous, the further they stand from their objects - because their existence is no longer conditioned to have an object and to support them. At long last, their agents are many and have distinct perspectives when disagreeing to legitimize their viewpoints, all with claims to obtain the exact answer about the *discipline's objective*; knowingly or not they take part in a movement that has yet to reach a verdict. Maybe the existence of a verdict about such an object will make the act of seeking obsolete, and along with it the science and its discipline; however in contradiction, the seeking is also its motor, driving the field.

It is important to mention that no discipline is interdisciplinary in itself – what is interdisciplinary are the agents or members. Nevertheless, after discussing a field as a social construct, no knowledge is solely disciplinary. The discipline is an artificial distinction of the overall knowledge, which in turn is a speech or a way of seeing the world; interdisciplinarity can also be a justification of the peculiar characteristics given to Museology.

It is also important to consider that “what is at stake in the internal struggle by the scientific authority in the science socials field, that is, the power to produce, impose and instill the legitimate representation of the social world, it is what is at stake between the classes in the

political field” (Bourdieu, 1976, p. 27). Museology or Museum Studies started its first steps in the beginning of the 20th century. The first one was created in the United States in the 1900s; Museum courses, afterward denominated as Museology, were created after the 1920s in countries like France and Brazil. However it is possible to disguise two trajectories, both considering the interdisciplinarity phenomenon, as these currents started to consolidate around the world in the second half of the 20th century, in distinctive ways: 1) a perspective through which museum studies is configured using approaches from different disciplines, with the purpose of improving practices in the museum universe; and 2) a slope which claims the existence of a specific subject for analysis and systematic study, even though methodological approaches or theoretical bases from other disciplines are necessary – for such a slope, the name Museology is more appropriate.

References

- Bourdieu, P. (1976). *O Campo Científico*. (2012, October 24). Retrieved from http://uaiinformatica.net/luciana/campo_cientifico_bourdieu.pdf.
- Bourdieu, P. (2003). *Os usos sociais da ciência. Por uma sociologia clínica do campo científico*. Tradução: Denise Barbara Cartani. São Paulo: UNESP.
- Bourdieu, P. (2012). *O Poder Simbólico*. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil.
- Bourdieu, P. (2013). *A Economia das Trocas Simbólicas*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.
- Burke, P. (2012). *Uma história social do conhecimento*. Da Enciclopédia à Wikipédia. Trad. Denise Bottmann, vol. 2. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor.
- CAPES – História e Missão. (2015, August 29). Retrieved from <http://www.capes.gov.br/historia-e-missao>.
- Desvallées, A., & Mairesse, F. (Eds.). (2010). *Conceptos claves de Museología*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Foucault, M. (2007). *As Palavras e as Coisas*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- ICOFOM. (1981). *Museological Working Papers*, 2.
- PPG-PMUS homepage. (2015, August 29). Retrieved from <http://ppg-pmus.mast.br/inicio.htm>.

Abstract

The debate on interdisciplinarity in Museology is as old as the debate about the museological field itself. In fact, the discussion about the nature and object of the Museology field has always been permeated by interfaces with other fields. As we asserted in the 2014 ICOFOM meeting, Museology exists as a claim for recognition of museum professionals for our specific knowledge and objectives. It is the result of a process that is willing to be systematic, disciplined and academic, fostered and formed by the museum's major programs. Therefore, the question is: Why has Museology set itself as an interdisciplinary field since its beginning? In order to answer this question, we propose the following topics: 1) Reflection on the concept of discipline and interdisciplinarity using Pierre Bourdieu and Peter Burke for the theoretical framework; 2) Brief considerations of the first discussions related to interdisciplinarity in Museology; 3) Case study analysis: the graduate program in Museology and Heritage of Rio de Janeiro and its interdisciplinary dialogues. The final consideration points out the importance of museum professionals in the museological field, not only in the configuration of its boundaries, but also in the construction of its own interdisciplinary dialogues.

Keywords: museology, interdisciplinarity, Bourdieu

Resumen

Más allá y hacia adentro de fronteras en construcción: diálogos constituyentes de la Museología

El debate sobre la interdisciplinariedad en la Museología es tan antiguo como las primeras discusiones alrededor del propio campo museológico. Con efecto, las discusiones sobre la naturaleza y el objeto del campo de la Museología siempre han sido permeadas de interfaces con otros campos. Como hemos afirmado en el encuentro del ICOFOM de 2014, la Museología existe como reivindicación de profesionales de museos por una especificidad de conocimiento y objeto, y es resultado de un proceso que se desea científico, disciplinario y académico, propiciado y fomentado por los cursos de museos. La cuestión que se presenta es: ¿por qué la Museología ya se configura, desde sus primordios, como interdisciplinaria? Para responder a esa cuestión, se propone la siguiente trayectoria: 1) reflexión sobre el concepto de disciplina e interdisciplinariedad, utilizando como referencial teórico a Pierre Bourdieu y Peter Burke; 2) breves apuntamientos sobre las primeras discusiones relevantes relacionadas a la interdisciplinariedad en la Museología; 3) análisis de un estudio de caso: el Programa de Posgrado en Museología y Patrimonio de Río de Janeiro y sus diálogos interdisciplinarios. Las consideraciones finales apuntan para la importancia de los actores en el campo museológico, no sólo en la configuración de las fronteras, sino también en la construcción de los propios diálogos interdisciplinarios.

Palabras clave: Museología, interdisciplinariedad, Bourdieu