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Summary:

The French Museology

This paper is dedicated to the French research in the field of museology, and it points out different scholar institutions, research centers and journals that influenced its development. The first part of the paper traces chronologically back different phases of museology in the French society during the last decades. Some of the main points are: the foundation of the School of Louvre that influenced the education of curators and the subsequent changes of this institution, the influence of different governments on the governance and ambition of museums, as well as foundation and renovation of several important museums. Furthermore, the
Rivière’s classes at the Sorbonne and the influence of the French philosophical and historical reflection on the museum studies are pointed out, as well as the adoption of museology by French universities, the internationalization of several academic programs and the debates about museology promoted by some research departments inside or outside the Heritage national administrations. The second part of the paper is related to the intellectual debates in relation to grand presidential museum projects from the creation of the Beaubourg up to the Grand Louvre and Quai Branly Museum. Furthermore, research centres established particularly in Paris, but in other French cities are mentioned as well, alongside with journals of museology published by museums, research centres or cultural institutions, cultural journals that published articles about museums. Finally, the last part of the article is related to today’s status, as well as limits of French museology.

Résumé:
Muséologie française

Cet article est consacré à un tableau de la recherche française dans le domaine de muséologie. Il met l’accent sur les institutions académiques, sur les centres de recherche et sur les revues les plus notoires. La première partie évoque les différentes étapes de la reconnaissance de la muséologie dans la société française au cours des dernières décennies. On y met en évidence le poids de l’Ecole du Louvre dans la formation des conservateurs et par conséquent sur la gestion et les ambitions des musées, comme l’importance de la fondation par l’Etat de nouveaux musées parisiens. On y rappelle l’influence des cours de G.-H. Rivière à la Sorbonne sur les études muséales, et, au-delà, les voies multiples de la reconnaissance de la muséologie dans les universités françaises, les programmes académiques et les départements de recherche de l’Administration du patrimoine. La deuxième partie de l’article s’intéresse d’abord aux débats intellectuels sur les grands projets présidentiels – de Beaubourg au Grand Louvre et au musée du Quai Branly. L’auteur passe ensuite en revue les centres de recherche fondés à Paris et en province, ainsi que les revues muséologiques publiées par des musées, des centres de recherche ou des institutions culturelles. La dernière partie de l’article est consacrée au statut actuel de la muséologie française, et francophone, ainsi qu’à sa portée internationale.
THE FRENCH MUSEOLOGY

French theoretical approach in museology is deeply rooted in history: writers, curators, intellectuals, administrators have been particularly influential for its development. The origin of the term “museology”, as we know it, can be traced back to the 18th century, and its evolution is closely intertwined with different stages of the public museums’ history, especially with their Revolutionary and Republican foundations. French historiography of collections had started with the beginnings of the “scholarly” Art History in the first half of the 19th century and experienced a remarkable scientific development later on with the works of Edmond Bonnaffé (Collectors of the old France: notes of an amateur, 1873). The series of upheavals brought by the French Revolution and Napoleon’s Empire, the mark of vandalism, as well as reactions that these events provoked, particularly the debates regarding the legitimacy (or illegitimacy) of Republican museums, which stirred up political confrontations and conflicts over memory during the 19th and the 20th century, have left their mark on the French heritage (patrimoine). French historiography embodies this turbulent history.

The development of a French tradition in museum studies is subsequently linked to the early 20th century, and the works of writers, aesthetes and historians, but famous practitioners as well, revisited upon commemorations and celebrations (Quatremère de Quincy, Victor Hugo, Montalembert, Viollet-le-Duc, Maurice Barrès, Frédéric Mistral…). Various cultural movements fuelled these polemics, and thus, pervaded the patrimonial field – as Surrealism or Communism in the interwar period and Counterculture in the 1960s. The term “patrimoine” appeared approximately with André Malraux’s Ministry of Cultural Affairs, but came into common use with the following generation, during the “Patrimoine years” (1980-2000). The notion coincided with the new institutional terms and conditions, such as the foundation of the Beaubourg Center, but intellectual ones as well – the emergence of the “new museology” and the impact of the “French Theory” identified through several major authors within the social sciences and humanities. Thus, reflection upon museums fits into an intellectual context marked by the persistence of a generalist intellectuals’ figure, and by the influence of journals. In fact, Les Temps Modernes, Le Débat, Traverses, Art Press, Commentaire, Revue des Deux Mondes, Médiologie, Hermès, etc. often commented the “grand works” of the Fifth Republic presidents, but went beyond the circumstantial nature of the enterprise, and deepened their analysis, frequently used in books and scholarly articles.

However, museology has become a constitutive element of academic knowledge and a component of teaching and researching disciplines. In that
sense, it largely took part in the interests Heritage movement provoked within the social sciences and humanities – as well as in the professional circles. During the last decades of the 20th century, French museological reflections gained a unique place within the history of ideas. Thus, the conceptions of museum, its use, study and management, have been discussed among French curators and academics. The results of their collaborative thinking sometimes sparked international interest, depending more or less on the origin of the institution and on its context. Nevertheless, museology stayed in the sidelines of Heritage or Museum studies, originating from the academic English-speaking world, and consequently, globalized. Lastly, the main issue to be addressed is, how French museology can fit within the national model based on the completion of a Ph.D and scientific research, which keeps museum curators away from international academic practices.

This chapter will firstly present, in the form of a chronological synthesis, different stages of history of museology in the French society. Afterwards, it will look over different places and means of development and distribution of museological research, namely, institutions, laboratories and scientific publications, or popular scientific journals which disseminate museological reflections. Consequently, the successive configurations of the discipline, in its diverse institutional and scholar’s writings will be outlined.

**Museology in the French Cultural History during the Last Decades**

When it comes to museology, France represents one of the most important countries. It was defined as such at the crossroads of different intellectual influences, but as well within the specific context of the museums of France, marked by the impact the Nation-state had on the definition of the institutions’ status, their collections and curators. A review of the historical situation of museology requires, consequently, considering museums’ life as a whole, and onwards, the more general debates about the notion of heritage (patrimoine) which characterized the subsequent periods.

The foundation of the School of Louvre (École du Louvre) dates back to 1882, namely to Gambetta’s government: it was intended to be a “school for the museum management” with the aim to form curators, but also the “école pratique’ of Archaeology and Art History” whose objective was to “to place a practical, alongside with the theoretical and speculative, education about Archaeology and Art History, based on the positive knowledge and which could emerge from the study and understanding of the monuments preserved in national collections”. This idea of a “école pratique” was taken from the
German model of universities, and was considered as a mean to reform the old French universities, which were mostly devoted to teaching History and Art History to “amateurs”. Louis de Ronchau (1816-1887), the founder, and afterwards the director of the school, suggested the following: “education will give birth to conservation, as conservation was born from collection”. In 1927, teaching of museography, entrusted to Gaston Brière, has started and included “history of collections and of museums of Modern art”, organization of museums, the role of their personnel, maintenance, restoration and protection of collections, construction of the new buildings, social and educational factors… The term “museology” appeared in programs in 1949: lecturing about museology was initiated by Germain Bazin, an assistant at the time, and successor of René Huyghe (in 1951) as the head of the Louvre's Department of Paintings. Germain Bazin was interested in museology as a curator eager to reproduce the context of works, but as an Art Historian as well, attached to the history of his discipline – alongside with History of Museums, he gave courses in History of Art History.

The creation of the Ministry of Cultural Affairs (Ministère des Affaires culturelles), announced in the Journal officiel of the 4th of February 1959, had to be, according to André Malraux, an important institutional turning point for French museums. His observations about museums are famous: “Our civilization is the first one to perceive a universal Humanism, and to attempt to establish the universal notion of man. Not, as the Greeks had done it, through creation of heroic or divine models, but through research of the most profound element of the civilizations that succeeded. And I believe that the museum is one of the places around which this notion is created”. However, museums were not a priority for Administration. This paradox is emphasized by Jacques Sallois, in charge of French Museums during the 1980’s: “Quite unexpectedly, Malraux, the author of the Imaginary Museum, is more passionate about the houses of culture and of living theatre than about museums, whose works, on the other hand, fascinate him”. The new ministry took over, in general, the forms of previous services and its resources remained limited. One of its civil servants and historian of the Ministry, Christian Pattyn, emphasizes that the Ministry of Cultural Affairs was “established on the minimal basis: many honours, little resources”. Thus, the Ministry was highly fragile. In 1965, only 0.38% of the national budget corresponded to the budget of the Ministry of the Cultural Affairs. In 1972, this amount rose to 0.46% of the budget.

Nevertheless, the new administrative status of national museum curators dates back to 1963 and establishes their recruitment at the level of the

---

bachelor’s degree, followed by a period of internship of eighteen months in
museums. This was a new frame of reference for the intellectual formation.
However, the number of public employees remained limited, as French histo-
rarian Loïc Vadelorge remarked: “Until 1964, the museums of France have only
131 official ‘curators’ with different statuses (…) numbers raised on 169 cura-
tors in 1969 (…) however without exceeding 200 members before 1983”. But
during the 1960s, French museology is certainly one of the most influential in
the world, supported essentially by the education issued from the School of
Louvre (École du Louvre), and by the book by Germain Bazin, who is the fruit
of this school. As Hans Huth wrote in 1968, “the Ecole du Louvre (is) the only
school offering an all-round curriculum for the education of students in the
field of museology”.

Another characteristic is that France, or rather some of its curators, had
numerous responsibilities within the direction of the International Council of
Museums (ICOM), and particularly in its sections related to the museum’s the-
ory, or “museology”, as G. H. Riviére called it. In ICOM, an organization located
in Paris, French presence was well-known. Let us remember, as Sluga notes,
that of the 557 posts available in the UNESCO’s secretariat in 1947, 514 were held
by either English or French nationals. In other words, this decade represents
the golden age of the “École du Louvre” in French museology, based mainly
on a traditional historical knowledge regarding national collections and on
education about different museographical techniques, both of them related to
a specific professional tradition. The price of it is a marginality of the discipline
in the general framework of academic education and research.

During the next decade, administrative organization of the Union of National
Museums (Réunion des Musées nationaux) improves particularly with the foun-
dation of the Department for exhibitions. Reconstruction and foundation of
several museums continued in the context of the “strong involvement of the
President Georges Pompidou”, even if, after 1974, the budget of the Ministry
decreased again with president Valéry Giscard d’Estaing (Jean-Luc Bodiguel).

---

Selon Georges Henri Riviére, ed. Association des amis de Georges Henri Riviére, Jean-François
Barbier-Bouvet and Hélène Weis (Paris: Dunod, 1989), 51 sq. This book was completed with
personal notes from students of the Riviére’s lectures, and with previously published material.
French museology of these decades was often only elaborated and transmitted on an oral
basis, such as the lectures on museology at the School of Louvre by Michel Colardelle and by
other professional curators.
4 Glenda Sluga, Internationalism in the Age of Nationalism (Philadelphia: University of
In the framework of decentralization, consideration given to the local level in the cultural administration was growing and in 1977, the Regional Offices of the Cultural Affairs were created (Directions régionales des Affaires culturelles).

The most remarkable achievement of this period is with no doubt the creation of the National Center of Art and Culture in Beaubourg quarter, in Paris. Conceived in 1969, the Center was inaugurated in 1976, managed by Pontus Hultén who has been called in 1973 from the Modern Museet of Stockholm. Defined by the architects Renzo Piano and Richard Rogers as an information and entertainment center, with initially a slight reminiscence to Times Square, the Center offered an important new tool for curators. Its priorities were the support of living French artists, constitution of contemporary artistic heritage, in order to surpass the delay with important foreign institutions, and finally, democratization through a set of innovations, sometimes copied from theatres and festivals (subscriptions, different loyalty plans, diversification of audiences). Cultural project of the Center – its multidisciplinary nature, its accessibility to the public and its priority given to the Contemporary art – influenced the museums in France and even abroad: we are talking about a “post-Pompidou age”.

With Valéry Giscard d’Estaing, the framework legislation related to museums, established the 11th of July 1978 for a period of five years, tended to reconcile the imperatives of museums’ valorization, conservation of heritage, rationalization and profitability of cultural and artistic activities. The decision to found a museum of the 19th century in the premises of Orsay railway station (1977) and the City of Sciences (Cité des Sciences) at the Villette, was taken. The projects of these new cultural institutions, with regard to their size and complexity, led the French administration to give them certain autonomy and to define a particular status for them within the cultural administration, as it has already been the case with the Beaubourg Center in 1974.

In the terms of museology, this decade corresponds to the period of George-Henry Rivière’s classes at Sorbonne, from 1970 to 1982. This period is marked by new propositions, stemmed from the intellectual and institutional changes that occurred in May 1968. On one hand, the foundation of the Beaubourg Center inaugurated a new era for the notion of multidisciplinary exhibition. Articles and works related to the Center established a new way of thinking (but also a strong criticism) which led to intellectual debate, significant both

---

5 In May 1937, as part of the International Exhibition in Paris, the Palace of Discovery was opened and on March 13, 1986 the Cité des Sciences et de l’Industrie, in the Parc de la Villette. In 2009, the Cité des Sciences et de l’Industrie and the Palace of Discovery are grouped in a common institution, Universcience. The double anniversary of 30 and 80 years provides an opportunity for a conference in 2016 about the museology of science (La muséologie scientifique, toute une histoire, Palais de la Découverte, november 2016).
nationally and internationally. On the other hand, spreading the ATP (Musée des arts et traditions populaires) model through reinvented regional museums all over provincial France, made Rivière’s museology an essential element of the new museal landscape. The invention of the ecomuseum and its first successes, and finally, the international echo of these experiences, led to strong French influence in the so-called “new museology”\(^6\). On a strictly intellectual level, the success, firstly, related to the sociology of the museum’s public owed to Pierre Bourdieu, secondly to Michel Foucault’s writings on the museums as heterotopias and on the relations between power and knowledge, and finally, to Jean Baudrillard comments on “Beaubourg effect” (1977), had started to influence the critical research of museology in the world. Moreover, this period of French museology could be qualified, in the more general sense, as the Beaubourg’s age, due to what extent museological and philosophical questions seem to have been bound to this institution, at the time, to its activities and to the reactions it provoked among the French intelligence.

The influence of the French philosophical reflection – the “French Theory”, is, indeed, important in the field of museum studies. Furthermore, it seems to have been even crucial for some contemporary authors. Radical critique of what Laurajane Smith calls “the authorized discourse” in the contemporary movement of the Critical Heritage Studies resembles to the critique by French Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser of the “Ideological State Apparatuses”, named AIE, in the 1970’s. Furthermore, Tony Bennett conceives the concept of what he calls “the Exhibitionary Complex” influenced by Michel Foucault’s books on knowledge and power, and he elaborates his own sociology of culture from Pierre Bourdieu’s sociology. The work of Jacques Derrida inspires also some studies all over the world, led by archivists and curators about their institutional practice’s concerns.

During the years 1980-2000, an unprecedented growth of the number and quality of museums in France has occurred, which was marked by a new generation of grand presidential projects (Orsay, Grand Louvre, Museum of Natural History, City of Sciences), and by the increase of regional projects, due to the multiplication of investments within the Ministry of Culture. Election of François Mitterrand in 1981, led in fact, with Jack Lang, into a new era of the cultural action of the state: the missions of the Ministry of Culture were

\(^6\) André Desvallées, a student and a friend of Georges-Henri Rivière, thought that the true “écomusée” was forgotten in the new institutions of the 1980’s onwards. He tried to maintain the ideal type of the new museology in papers and conferences: see “L’esprit et la lettre de l’écomusée,” Écomusées en France, Actes des Premières Rencontres nationales des Écomusées (L’Isled’Abeau, 1987).
redefined in the decree from the 10\textsuperscript{th} of March 1982\textsuperscript{7}. The accent was, firstly, put on the contemporary creation with the National Foundation for Contemporary Art (FNAC) and Regional Foundations for Contemporary Art (FRAC), which were not actual museums, but in charge to buy and to collect contemporary art in the different regions of the country\textsuperscript{8}. Artistic centers were developed and supported by the State, and the Ministry paid particular attention to the public and cultural practices. The budget for the culture was nearly doubled, passing from 0,50% of the national budget in 1980 to 0,93% in 1986. Another important political decision was decentralization of the State’s services, which changed the framework in which the relations between the territorial collectivities and the State were taking place. In 1991, the Ministry gave an overview of its interventions. “The years 1981-1991 were marked by the opening of four national museums: the Orangery Museum of Tuileries, in 1983, the Picasso Museum in the old Hôtel Salé, in 1985, the Orsay Museum, in 1986, the Pyramid of Louvre and its new reception spaces, in 1989. (…) In ten years, the State provided financial support for more than 258 construction sites”\textsuperscript{9}. However, the rules imagined in 1945, which supposedly had to organize the administration of the French museums for a short period of time, were not reformed.

The opening of the \textit{Auditorium} of the Louvre Museum and the development of an ambitious scientific and cultural program made the museological reflections about the actuality of museums (a so-called \textit{Musée-musées} program of lectures and conferences set up from April 1989\textsuperscript{10}) and about their history, available to a Parisian public. Jacques Sallois, general director of the museums of France at the time, created an official committee to study the history of museums, which was never officially set up. The commemorative context of these days, with the celebration of the bicentenary of the French Revolution, added a lot of new thinking about the historical consciousness. Pierre Nora renewed, with the idea of “realms of memory”, research methods within the new history, by taking Maurice Halbwachs as a model and his notion of the topography of remembrance, through which he wanted to think about heritage throughout an extended analysis of the collective memory. Historians and art

\textsuperscript{8} Philippe Urfalino and Catherine Vilkas, \textit{Les Fonds régionaux d’art contemporain. La délégation du jugement esthétique} (Paris: L’Harmattan, 1995), 4-5.
historians, as well, could not have claimed a naïve heritagization anymore: a distance, probably new, marked a new relation of any historian with museums, even if he or she still contributed, inevitably, to create them, to enrich them, if not to legitimate them. If the French case did not have anything exceptional for the critical analysis of the memorial institutions that reach the common intelligence, some of its initiatives occupied the central place.

Between 1990 and 2000, the expansion of museums continues, particularly due to the project of the Grand Louvre entrusted to Ieoh Ming Pei. The Direction of the museums of France (Direction des Musées de France) and the local communities enrol as well in several renovations in the provinces, in Lyon, in Lille, in Strasbourg, in Carré d’Art in Nimes. However, this sequence is marked by a return to order that could be perceived through the vicissitudes of the display of art in Orsay and the Grand Louvre: if the lessons from Beaubourg bear their fruit in the terms of pluridisciplinarity and visitor policies, some classical choices were finally taken in relation to museography, as an outcome of, sometimes, very vivid, debates. The dispute between the new, historical, contextualization of works of art and the traditions of Art History was concluded in the Orsay museum with the defeat of the propositions for the renewal. Simultaneously, National Museums experienced aggressive commercial politics, which turned up to be adventurous, based on the promotion of “derived products”: the French expertise in the domain of profitability of museums and exhibitions was exported to other countries, like Italy. Quite paradoxically, if we consider that a socialist politician, François Mitterrand, had two presidential mandates in France and that the intellectuals related to his party were carriers of the “new heritage” and of “museums of society”, the traditional museology and the managerial model, triumphed in the public sphere and in the professional education.

This development came along with a series of decisive transformations regarding the “National School of Heritage” (École nationale du patrimoine) in 1990, that became in 2006 a “National Institute of Heritage” (Institut national du patrimoine). Changes can also be observed in the “École du Louvre” that became more and more similar to a specialized school of the Ministry of Culture. With the reforms of 1994 – a mandatory admission test was set up for the 1st year students. Four years later, the School was renovated with new auditoriums, and a building much more satisfactory than the ones of Parisian universities, situated in the Louvre’s wing of Flore. Most importantly, the School became an independent public institution. Simultaneously, and for the first time, studies of museology were introduced in numerous universities for different diplomas: Art History, information and communication sciences,
mediation or cultural management… Due to the growing number of students it was possible, for the first time also, to publish textbooks about museology.\footnote{Dominique Poulot, \textit{Musée et muséologie} (Paris: La Découverte, collection «Repères», 2005) 122 p, 2\textsuperscript{e} éd. 2009 is now translated in Italian, Spanish, Portuguese and Korean.}

Finally, the research in museology was made available to the scientific community of social sciences and humanities by the appearance of two journals. \textit{Publics et Musées} was published by Lyon University Press between 1992 and 2002 and financed by the “Department of the public” of the Museums of France. The second one was the first version of the \textit{Lettre de l’Ocim}, published in Dijon (1988-2003) and related to the museums belonging to the Ministry of National Education, not of Culture. The journal was designed to diffuse among the curators of these institutions the results of the inquiries related to the academic museology. This geography of the journals on French museology, curiously provincial according to the norms of academic and cultural centralization, testifies in many respects about the marginal nature of the studies of museology in the universities, in comparison to the School of Louvre and the National Institute of Heritage. French museology was, therefore, characterized during this period by the “Louvre effect”, a triumph of the museum and of the school with the same name that managed to impose their choices as the legitimate ones, with the expertise of some innovative curators, and of museologists who were the newcomers on the academic scene.

The first decade of the 21\textsuperscript{st} century inherited the previous transformations, but a new law on museums in 2002 changed their administrative situation, which had remained untouched since 1945. The law established, in the first place, a “Museum of France” label, to harmonize the status of the museums recognized by the State, with respect to their specificities. For the first time, and following the definition of ICOM and the examples of international policies in that matter, the law applied to all museums recognized by the State. Regardless to the administrative supervision, a Council of the Museums of France (\textit{Haut Conseil des musées de France}) had to represent all different types of institutions. Protection of collections was an essential element: their inalienability was conceived as a part of the public property in a very constraining way, while the preliminary discussions rather planned to rely on the de-accessioning model, typical of Northern-American museums.

Finally, the law fitted into a logic of decentralization, organizing the transfer of the property of the so-called “dépôts” of the State made before 1910 to local authorities, namely, several tens of thousands of works of art. This was considered the beginning of numerous reorganizations desired as part of inter-communal cooperation that authorized, for example, cession of a museum (or
of its parts) between the public entities. The reorganization of the museums’ landscape was made according to three basic conditions, related to the status of the museum, the existence of an inventory of the collection, and the definition of a Scientific and Cultural Project. Validation, or not, of such a project, proposed by each museum, remained a tool of effective intervention of the Direction of the Museums of France. It is exactly on that level that the museological competence of the curator was considered important.

Having this in mind, the development of museology responded to an increasing professional demand, because this Scientific and Cultural Projects, actual briefings of the museums, allowed the acquisition of financial aids. Curators were encouraged to think about the meaning of the exhibited collection, but equally about the relation of museums with their environment, all in order to fight against the criticism regarding the “proliferation of museums” considered too stereotyped (namely, according to the phrase of the Inspector of the Museums Edouard Pommier\textsuperscript{12}). In relation to the perspective, already outlined after the Liberation by Georges Salles, once Director of the Museums, the question was to rely on specificity, as a proof of originality and a factor of attractiveness.

French Universities adopted museology as a discipline, from that moment on, since the subject started to appear in the educational program as mandatory, to the extent that the bachelor’s degree of Art History, in particular, could not be obtained without an initiation in the theme. The subjects related to the research master’s degree usually focused on the monographs of museums, on the history of collections, which is also the case of dissertations written at universities and in erudite programs such as the École de Chartes. Simultaneously, visiting and study practices represented the new preoccupations of museum studies, and even a new subject for Cultural and Literary History\textsuperscript{13}. Set of phenomena related to the appropriation of museums received a new significant attention from the social sciences – Geography and tourism studies included\textsuperscript{14}.

\textsuperscript{12} Edouard Pommier, “Prolifération du muse,” Le debat n° 65 (mai-aout 1991): 147 sq. launched a dispute and the curators of ethnological museums, such as Musée Dauphinois, protested against the contempt of their collections and politics. About the situation of museums of ethnology and heritage see Dominique Poulot, “Intangible Heritage in France. Between Museographical Renewal and ‘Project Territory’,” Ethnologies 36 (1-2) (2016).

\textsuperscript{13} Jean Galard, Visiteurs du Louvre un florilège (Paris: Editions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1993).

Finally, the comparative analysis of museums’ mechanisms, exhibitions and theme parks have all become the new scholarly themes.

Numerous challenges related to the institutional division of disciplines influenced museology. The School of Louvre has been increasingly assimilated into an institution of higher education, in accordance with Bologna’s regulations, since it has adapted, in 2002, its education system to fit the European academic framework, known as LMD (licence, master, doctorat). The National Institute of Heritage remains a unique institution in the European, or even more so, global, landscape related to the training of museum curators (but without teaching museology precisely). Museology is taught everywhere in France at the level of master only – which is the level accessed, from 2006, at the School of Louvre, by the quarter of 1500 students. One of the most remarkable traits of its evolution is its multidisciplinary nature, which responds to the growing diversity of types of museums and of collections, but also to diversity of challenges that these institutions encounter (social, anthropological, economic, technical…).

The intellectual models of French museology experienced, during the last decades, an internationalization into several stages. The museological team gathered around Jean Davallon at the University of Avignon created a specific international Ph.D in collaboration with the University of Quebec in Montreal (UQAM). This association produced numerous Ph.D thesis related to the topics of museum studies and articles that were, nearly exclusively, published in Culture et Musées. In spite of incontestable success, the team from Avignon was not able to be recognized beyond a small circle of specialists, distant from the biggest universities and institutions of professional education. The museological education of the National Museum of Natural History (Muséum national d’histoire naturelle) suffers from the same troubles, while having hardly produced, on the contrary, numerous dissertations.

In the field of museums, after Beaubourg and the Grand Louvre, it is the Museum of Quai Branly (MQB) that introduced to our community almost exclusively English-speaking museology and anthropology, by the choice of, in particular, its research department guided by Anne-Christine Taylor. Double tutelage of the Ministry for Higher Education and Research, on one hand, and of Culture, on the other, is certainly an advantage for the MQB, comparable to the former collaboration between CNRS and the museum of ATP (Musée des arts et traditions populaires), even if, in the everyday life of the institution and professions this collaboration is not evident. Seminars and symposiums of MQB were particularly related to the actuality and richness of international research crossing anthropology and museology, some of the elements of which could be found within the center started up by Daniel Fabre, between
EHESS and Ministry of Culture: the Laboratory of History and Anthropology of Culture (LAHIC).

This situation falls within, on one hand, the long intellectual history of folklore studies, and, on the other, the particular administrative framework that have promoted during the last generation research and publications on museology and identity, namely, the Mission of ethnological heritage (*Mission du patrimoine ethnologique*). The dialogue with the museologies developed in Quebec is very vivid, on the initiative of the Ministry of Culture, in the search for know-how regarding the inventory of intangible heritage: this proves the richness of the Francophone space in museology.

**Research Centers and Specialized Journals on Museology**

What interested intellectuals in relation to the French museology was the new museums and the debates they provoked. During the first decade, 1960-1970, museology remained located in the School of Louvre, and the projects of new museums or reconstruction of the old ones did not spark a special interest beyond the narrow circle of specialists, namely, the curators who were directly involved in them, or the managers of the central government.

After launching the Beaubourg Center project under the President Pompidou, all the grand presidential projects were, to the contrary, the object of discussions. The debates were led about their museological choices, in the broadest sense of the term, caught in the political and ideological confrontations. Museum curators could not participate in those discussions because of their obligation of confidentiality that was sometimes clearly formulated by the State, but sometimes from a simple precaution. In any case, it was only under the pseudonym, like “Jean Clair”, that curators could intervene in the public debates in a willingly polemical manner. On the other hand, and these two aspects are surely not coincidental, the debates exceeded largely “museology”, often *de facto* identified with museography, in other words, the discussion about the technical aspects. Indeed, it is in relation to the Beaubourg Center, as a whole, more than regarding this or that program of the National Museum of the Modern Art, which was part of it, that the debate started to appear in the intellectual journals. Interventions of Jean Baudrillard, who became famous by his reflections upon the “system of objects” and the philosophy of collection – therefore, a field that is slightly near the one of museums – were remarkable in this regard. Afterwards, the journal *Traverses*, of the Center of Industrial Creation of Beaubourg (*Centre de Création Industrielle, or CCI*), dedicated issues or articles to the reflection on heritage and museums. Likewise, the CCI published, in 1986, a book under the direction of Jean Davallon dedicated to
the history and semiology of exhibitions: *Claquemurer, pour ainsi dire, tout l’Univers*. The title of the book, imagined by Dominique Poulot, came from a quotation picked from the history of the gardens in the 18th century. With a subtitle, *Exhibiting (mise en exposition)*, the book fitted into the association *Expo-Media* – which was part of the debate about cultural policies, exhibitions, media and the audience.

At the same moment, the analysis of the activities of the Beaubourg Center library’s audience (*BPI or Bibliothèque public d’information*) by Eliseo Veron, represented an important moment in the forthcoming description of the visitors of exhibitions and museums. The influence of a museology professor from Quebec, Bernard Schiele, in relation to the museology of sciences, or of Daniel Jacobi, who conducted a research at the University in Dijon about the informal education, were also evident. It is between the educational sciences and the ones related to information and communication, and in dialogue with sociology, that Jean Davallon, a former Roland Barthes’s and Louis Marin’s student, created the Center for research in museum studies in Lyon, Saint-Etienne and finally, Avignon.15

During 1983-1984, the Direction of Libraries, Museums and Scientific and Technical Information (*Direction des Bibliothèques, des Musées et de l’Information Scientifique et Technique*, DBMIST) within the Ministry in charge of higher education, planned a cooperative technical center in charge of museums related to national education. The Center was named “Office of the Museographic Cooperation and Information” (*Office de Coopération et d’Information Muséographiques*, OCIM). Its goal was “to find a solution to the technical isolation of numerous museums and sections of natural history of the provinces and to support their development through acting, when needed, on three levels – formation, technical assistance and documentation”. OCIM, created in January 1985 at the University in Montpellier to be at service of museums in the provinces, was subsequently transferred to the University of Bourgogne in Dijon, in 1988, and published a journal, *La Lettre de l’OCIM*, diffused then in 300 copies. Every two months, all aspects of the life of museums, restoration included, were approached in short articles without references, of the museological field’s researchers, written to inform curators and museums’ staff. For example, in the number from the summer 2016, an article about women’s museums and women’s studies was published, which is one of the rare articles on this theme in French journals.

15 Among a lot of students some became professors of media or communication studies, such as Joelle Le Marec, *Le visiteur en représentations: enjeux de l’évaluation préalable en muséologie* (Ph.D diss., Université Jean Monnet-Saint-Etienne, 1996).
The beginning of the 1990s witnessed the creation of a Laboratory of museology at the University of Bourgogne in Dijon. The First International Exhibition of Museographical Techniques (Salon International des Techniques Muséographiques, SITEM), was also organized in Dijon, on the initiative of the Museums’ Mission (Mission Musées) of the Ministry in charge of higher education, with 105 exhibitors and 2000 visitors and with all the types of museums confounded. The fair, today carried by Museum Experts, takes place in Paris in the commercial spaces of the Louvre Carrousel and organizes lectures and colloquia about the new museums or the ones in renovation.

The Revue du Louvre et des musées de France (Journal of the Louvre and of the Museums of France) is a journal of Art History, much more than of museology, as the majority of journals directly related to museums are. Quai Branly Museum publishes its own journal, Gradhiva, formerly edited by JM Place, which claims to be a journal of History of Anthropology and its museums, with a close relation to History, if not Art History, or at least visual cultures. A big part of the old Gradhiva was dedicated to the history of exhibitions and ethnographical museums, and this tradition was continued in the new version, with an issue about, for example, the exhibition of Catlin’s works in nineteenth-century Paris, but also with issues related to difficult pasts approached by museology, etc. Other museums have given up their specific publications, which was the case with the Museum of Engineering and Technology (Conservatoire des Arts et Métiers) and its journal of history of technical collections. If the Revue de l’association des conservateurs des muséeset des collections publiques (Journal of Association of Museum Curators and of Public Collections) is properly multidisciplinary, it is especially dedicated to the institutional, administrative and professional aspects of the life of museums. Museum, firstly published regularly in French, which was not the case afterwards since the journal became Anglophone, alienating without any doubt the French readership, publishes articles whose only a part is related to museology. It is the same with the generalist cultural journals, like Le Débat, in particular, which published regularly important articles about museums, just like Esprit, more rarely, or the Revue des deux mondes and also the journals dedicated to communication studies (Hermès, in particular).

The journal Publics et Musées, claimed to be “the first scientific Francophone journal of museology”, marks a remarkable change in the landscape of scholarly and scientific journals. Publics & Musées claimed to be an interdisciplinary review whose “vocation was to bring to the attention of everyone who was interested in museology – professionals, researchers, consultants and students – the research, studies, experiences, reflections provoked by this ‘entrance’ of the public in the field of museums and museology”. With the rise of cultural
and scientific exhibitions, the audience was from that moment on put into the centre of museological research. This new journal testifies about the influence of the North-American studies, such as the importation of principles and techniques of evaluation in the studies on French museums, around Hanna Gottesdiener, a professor of psychology in Nanterre and co-director of the publication with the professor of semiotics and museology Jean Davallon. The first idea of the journal was in fact to make the French version of *ILVS Review: A Journal of Visitor Behavior* – and to follow the model invented by Chandler Screven, Director of the International Laboratory for Visitor Studies and Professor of Psychology, Department of Psychology at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. An orientation towards science museums was very clear, indicated by the presence of Bernard Schiele, Canadian correspondent of the French team. At the same time, the *City of Sciences of La Villette* got equipped with a team for the study of visitors. Afterwards, the National Museum of Natural History created a MA program in museology, with the professor Yves Girault (Muséologie: Sciences, Cultures et Sociétés).

After ten years of existence, *Publics & Musées* decided to expand, passing in their title from museums to the culture, even if the journal is always published with the support of the team in charge of the visitors of the Museums of France (*Direction des Publics*). One of the reasons for this mutation, with an ambition to become a journal of cultural studies, was fear of certain exhaustion within the field of museology. Today, the readership has been frayed, while the museological identity became a bit blurred, even though the journal published articles which became classic ones very quickly, such as the ones by Raymond Montpetit (UQAM, Montréal, Canada) about dioramas and period-rooms, what he called the “muséologie analogique”. The launching of a new collection, “Musées Mondes” (Museums Worlds), at the Documentation française – an official publishing company of the French government in charge of printing official reports and journals – initiated by Jacqueline Eidelman, who was in charge, at that moment, of the Department of the public of the Museums of France, was successful. The collection treats museology in the way in which, from that moment on, it appears in the scholarly and professional space, in reports and studies.

Publications of this collection are heterogeneous in genre, and they gather individual works of expert authors, ICOM officials as well, and of academics also: which is the case with Serge Chaumier, or François Mairesse. The

The French museology collection publishes research reports ordered by different museums, as well—such as the report requested by the Quai Branly Museum from Mélanie Roustan and Octave Debary, regarding the possible reorganization of its permanent exhibition. Proceedings of the official conferences organized by the Ministry or other public institutions, related to the preoccupations of the current cultural policies, are published as well. It was the case with the conference organized by the National Institute of Heritage in the moment of launching the project of the House of the French History, a museum of national history initiated by the President Sarkozy, which was never carried out. Finally, the collection sometimes publishes rewritten thesis, as is the one of Jean-Louis Postula, done at the University of Liège under the supervision of a Francophone Belgian museologist, André Gob.

André Gob wrote a manual, within the collection U (Armand Colin), dedicated to museology—complemented with another volume related to the museums of society and written by his assistant and student, Noémie Drouguet, member of the group for museology of the University of Liège. Afterwards, this center published an online museological journal, the Cahiers de Muséologie (Notebooks of Museology), “originated from the realization that there is, currently, a few scientific journals about museology in French”. With a tendency to publish original reflections in the field of museology, Cahiers reflects, first of all, the research areas of the “Liège’s museology”, characterized particularly by a political approach to museological reality, by problems of insertion of museums in society, by study of exhibitions and its functioning in relation to visitors, and by place that collections occupy. As it is the case with the journal of the Department of Museology of UQAM (Université de Quebec à Montréal), Muséologies, which initiated the model, crossing of theoretical and practical points of view is imposed, in the framework of the research that is equally based on the interconnection between bibliographical sources and field research.

However, the collective initiative of the Dictionary of Museology (Dictionnaire de muséologie) probably summarizes the best current state of French museology, or rather, Francophone one—because the importance of Francophone museology in the so-called “French” museology is evident. On the initiative of André Desvallées, in the context of ICOFOM, the section of ICOM dedicated to the “theoretical” reflection and to questions of education within the organization, the book was, originally, an international glossary of museological terms, adapted to the needs of work meetings, conferences and symposiums of ICOM. Participation of François Mairesse, responsible for manage-
ment of the Museum of Mariemont, in Belgium, and simultaneously recruited as a lecturer at the University of Lyon by Bernard Deloche – a professor of philosophy and himself a student of François Dagognet, an epistemologist who wrote about collections and whose reflections about museums have been very influential – enabled a new development\(^\text{18}\). Yves Bergeron (UQAM, Montréal) was also influential in the work on Dictionary. Their joint participation demonstrates the Francophone part of the team, which has no Anglophone member. The glossary has become a critical dictionary according to the approach typical of the projects of scientific disciplines that emerge from an epistemological crisis. Status of the grand dictionary, divided roughly between a section of critical notes of a sufficiently large scale, and another dedicated to brief and documentary entries, responds to the academic market, and intends to have an important influence.

\textbf{The Status and Limits of French Museology}

This overview is in the halftones, because it is difficult today to establish the potential specificity of the French museology. This was not the case at the moment when ecomuseology, or the “new museology” was invented, or at the opening of Beaubourg, during the decade from 1970 to 1980. However, the later period did not produce new institutions apt to receive an international recognition of the same scope. If the idea of the “post-Pompidou age” had success in the globalized historiography of museums in the form of recognition of the institution’s innovation and approval of its fame, later openings, the Quai Branly Museum excepted without doubt, did not mark the global museal imagination to that extent. Simultaneously, the “French Theory” entered the museological preoccupations, and had an important influence on the global museology during the last decades, given its academization within the universities. Museology is certainly part of the disciplines or sciences around the “heritage” administration and research, but it is nearly never identified as such. A striking demonstration of this status is the fact that the last overview of the Ministry of Culture of the research dedicated to heritage did not mention “museology”, in Ministry’s official journal related to research in the cultural field, \textit{Culture et Recherche}\(^\text{19}\).


\(^{19}\) “Patrimoines. Enjeux contemporains de la recherche”, \textit{Culture et Recherche} n°133 (été 2016), accessed December 12, 2016, http://www.culturecommunication.gouv.fr/Politiques-ministerielles/Recherche-Enseignement-superieur-Technologie/La-revue-Culture-et-Recherche/PATRIMOINES.-Enjeux-contemporains-de-la-recherche
However, French museology is nearly completely absent from the manuals, collections and other anthologies of texts for the didactic purposes that multiplied in the Anglophone world during these last decades. André Malraux with his *Museum without Walls* (*Musée imaginaire*), Pierre Bourdieu with his study of popular visitors (*Amour de l’art*) and Germain Bazin with his lectures at the School of Louvre are nearly the only French authors regularly quoted in these works. We could add here different texts by Georges Bataille, Maurice Blanchot, Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, Jean Baudrillard, who are also considered to be, directly or indirectly, related to museology.

The circulation of French museologists, or the ones from Quebec, Switzerland, Belgium, is evident in the academic world and in publications – which is the proof of a certain international openness, but limited by language. There, again, the influence of the pilot museographies and innovative institutions is evident, which shows that museology and museography go undoubtedly together in the international intellectual and cultural configurations. Jacques Hainard and the museological group of the Neuchâtel Museum of Ethnography and of the University became, therefore, famous, thanks to the exhibitions set in the museum and to their catalogues


that in the French case, but in the Francophone world as well, museological conceptions maintained some relations with the investments of the State in favour of new institutions, budget intended for the Culture, or professional education. It maintained the same relations, as far as possible, or even more, with the politics of the academic educational or research programs.

Finally, French participation in the collective elaboration of a museology within ICOM, however important it was, had hardly an echo inside the national borders, and hardly affected museum professionals, namely the ones from the fields of Art and History – the case of the museums of society is without any doubt different. Likewise, the place of the French museology in the initiatives for renovation of critical museology, and within the new Association of Critical Heritage Studies, which represents a testimony of the maturation of an international field of research, is quasi insignificant, even though the last congress in Montreal marked a remarkably new level of participation of the French representatives of Anthropology, Geography, and History.23
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