VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

ŽYGINTAS BŪČYS

ANTIQUITIES AND SOCIETY: COMMUNICATING HERITAGE IN THE 19th CENTURY LITHUANIA

Summary of Doctoral Dissertation
Humanities, Communication and Information (06 H)

Vilnius, 2012

The doctoral dissertation was prepared at Vilnius University in 2008–2012

Scientific supervisor:
Doc. Dr. Nastazija Keršytė (Vilnius University, Humanities, Communication and Information – 06 H)

The dissertation will be defended at the Council of Scientific Field of Communication and Information of Vilnius University:

Chairman:
Prof. Dr. Arvydas Pacevičius (Vilnius University, Humanities, Communication and Information – 06 H)

Members:
Dr. Vytautas Berenis (Lithuanian Culture Research Institute, Humanities, History – 05 H)
Doc. Dr. Alma Braziūnienė (Vilnius University, Humanities, Communication and Information – 06 H)
Dr. Reda Griškaitė (The Lithuanian Institute of History, Humanities, History – 05 H)
Doc. Dr. Rimvydas Laužikas (Vilnius University, Humanities, Communication and Information – 06 H)

Opponents:
Prof. Dr. Aušra Navickienė (Vilnius University, Humanities, Communication and Information – 06 H)
Dr. Jolanta Širkaitė (Lithuanian Culture Research Institute, Humanities, Art Criticism – 03 H)

The dissertation will be defended at the public meeting of the Council of Scientific Field of Communication and Information of Vilnius University at 2 p. m. on December 21, 2012 at Vilnius University, the Faculty of Communication, 204 auditorium of Prof. A. Glosienė. Address: Saulėtekio Avenue 9, building I, LT-10222 Vilnius, Lithuania.
Ph.: +370 5 2366 109

The summary of the doctoral dissertation was sent to the relevant institutions on November 21, 2012
The copy of the doctoral dissertation is available at the Library of Vilnius University

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

ŽYGINTAS BŪČYS

SENIENOS IR VISUOMENĖ: PAVELDO KOMUNIKACIJA XIX A. LIETUVOJE

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka
Humanitariniai mokslai, komunikacija ir informacija (06 H)

Vilnius, 2012

Disertacija rengta 2008–2012 metais Vilniaus universitete

Mokslinis vadovas:
doc. dr. Nastazija Keršytė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, komunikacija ir informacija – 06 H)

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Komunikacijos ir informacijos mokslo krypties taryboje:

Pirmininkas:
prof. dr. Arvydas Pacevičius (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, komunikacija ir informacija – 06 H)

Nariai:
dr. Vytautas Berenis (Lietuvos kultūros tyrimų institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)
dr. Reda Griškaitė (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)
doc. dr. Alma Braziūnienė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, komunikacija ir informacija – 06 H)
doc. dr. Rimvydas Laužikas (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, komunikacija ir informacija – 06 H)

Oponentai:
prof. dr. Aušra Navickienė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, komunikacija ir informacija – 06 H)
dr. Jolanta Širkaitė (Lietuvos kultūros tyrimų institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, menotyra – 03 H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Vilniaus universiteto Komunikacijos ir informacijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2012 m. gruodžio 21 d. 14 val. Vilniaus universiteto Komunikacijos fakultete, prof. A. Glosienės (204) auditorijoje.
Adresas: Saulėtekio al. 9, I rūmai, LT-10222 Vilnius, Lietuva. Tel.: +370 5 2366 109

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2012 m. lapkričio 21 d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje.

INTRODUCTION

The problem of the research. One cannot imagine the human world without objects. Some objects are intended for daily use, while others for aesthetic appreciation. Objects may be regarded as precious items, or as ugly and worthless trinkets. Objects surround us and no action or event can take place without them. In addition, objects may be perceived as certain storage of information, knowledge and various meanings; they manifest themselves as symbols, they evoke emotions and recollections. Using objects, man both creates and perceives the world.

In this object-oriented world, the man with the background in the Western thought tradition has been accustomed to distinguish certain objects from others and gather them, i.e., to collect them. Compiling a collection is a conscious preservation of objects for the future. Whereas private collections are intended for one‘s dearest and heirs, public collections are designed for future generations. Any one object has no worth on its own; consequently, compiling a collection is much more than mere preservation of “silent” objects. Paraphrasing Swiss museologist Martin Schärer, we could maintain that compiling a collection is primarily the preservation of objects with values that have been assigned to them. Of the entire realm of things that encompass our life, man collects only those few objects which, due to certain specific features associated with them and meanings attached to them, are regarded as valuable. A collection is not a conglomeration of random items; rather, it always based on the goal of the compiler and the expression of his/her personality. Yet the objects themselves as well as their meanings may be viewed and perceived differently depending on the observer.

As a European phenomenon, collecting reached its peak in the second half of the 18th century. Lithuania was also part of this process. The 19th century Lithuania was witness to the compilation of both private and public collections, as well as the formation of the antiquities market. Discussions devoted to heritage objects appeared in the press, scholars and collectors alike were sharing information. Thanks to public initiative, by the end of 1855, the first public Antiquities museum had been established, which provided the basis for systematic collection of the region‘s heritage and focused the society on the conscious appreciation of its historical past. In our explorations of the collecting boom in

the 19th century Lithuania, we are concerned not only with the discussion of its scope, but, first and foremost, the analysis of collecting as a means that shaped the society's self-perception of heritage protection, thereby highlighting the cultural or symbolic meanings that were attached to the compiled objects of the past.

In the collections of the 19th century, the objects of historical and cultural heritage, taken individually, performed only the function of a sign or symbol. Taken as a whole, they cast light on the worldview of their compilers, and recounted their ideological narratives. Conscious involvement of the society in the accumulation of objects of the past as part of people's cultural identity and tradition encouraged them to get to know and to interpret this heritage, thereby expressing the feeling of sharedness in the construction and cherishing of the collective memory while creating a common identity. The collective memory of the society as well as cultural and national identity is not given *a priori*; nor is it an established meaning or specific trait. Rather, these are ever-changing and self-renewing mental constructs that derive from history and the interpreting and reinterpreting one's cultural heritage. This is a unique cultural perception of every epoch or generation, the ultimate designation of which is to "create" a portrayal of its past, history and identity.

The objective of this research is to determine how and what specific images of its past and identity the 19th century Lithuanian society was creating through the interpretation of the cultural heritage it was accumulating; what changes these mental constructs had undergone over time, and what meanings were attached to the items of the cultural heritage in question.

Research object – collections compiled in the 19th century Lithuania and conscious perspective of the society on the heritage objects as well as the manifestations of the relevant heritage.

The aim of the research – on the basis of the analysis of the collections compiled in Lithuania and their manifestations, to generalise the perspectives of the society on the historical and cultural heritage, to reconstruct its perceptions and associated meanings.

In pursuit of this aim, the following **tasks** are posited:

- To discuss cultural and political conditions as well as a broader geopolitical context which determined the communication of the collections of the heritage in the 19th century Lithuania;
- To provide a discussion of the main notions used by the 19th century Lithuanian society to define heritage objects and collections;
- To examine the tendencies of foregrounding collecting and heritage in the Lithuanian society in the 19th century as well as their impact on the formation of the perceptions of heritage protection;
- By juxtaposing the nature of the relevant collections with the opinions voiced by collectors of the period, to analyse the collective perception of heritage by the society of the time as well as the semantic aspects of the manifestation of the relevant heritage;
- By analysing the case of the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities, to discuss the collective memory and images of identity as perceived by the 19th century Lithuanian society;
- To examine the notion of "the other" heritage and its dissemination in the 19th century Lithuania.

Research methods and notions used. The present research is focused on the perception and interpretation of heritage by the 19th century Lithuanian society, i.e., conscious reflections of its representatives on the content, nature, and meaning of heritage objects and the associated manifestation and dissemination of heritage in the society. Therefore, the analysis pursued in this research relies upon the methodological and theoretical considerations typical of social history. The present research is based on a combination of the analytical descriptive, the historical comparative, and the interpretative methods.

In order to identify the general concepts of heritage prevailing in the Lithuanian society of the time, the research is primarily concerned with the views of the nobility as it was the dominating part of the society from the socio-cultural perspective which formed the collective notions of heritage. Due to this reason, as well as due to the lack of relevant resources, the present research is not concerned with how heritage was perceived and comprehended by the peasantry, the largest part of the society of the time

which was excluded from the political, social, and cultural life. Nor is this research concerned with the perspectives on heritage by ethno-confessional communities.

In the 19th century, Lithuania did not exist as a political or administrative entity. In the late 18th century, after the Partitions of the Commonwealth of the Both Nations, the territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania which became part of the Russian Empire were divided into provinces. Due to the fact that this administrative division was undergoing change in the Russian Empire in the 19th century, in the present research Lithuania is perceived as the territory of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

Heritage objects discussed in the dissertation correspond only to that part of the currently employed broad definition of the heritage content, which encompasses material and non-material, tangible and intangible objects as well as other values of the past that are deemed meaningful from the socio-cultural perspective. The present research is limited to the narrower part of heritage, i.e., only culturally meaningful tangible material objects pertinent to the man‘s environment and activities, which constituted the basis of the private and public collections compiled by the 19th century society. These are *antiquities*, as they were referred to at the time and which in the present-day museology are referred to as *museum objects*. A museum object does not become one by virtue of merely being stored in a museum or another heritage protection institution. An object of the past becomes a museum object only when, during the process of musealisation, as an item of heritage (past), the object is endowed with certain values and meanings, thanks to which it also becomes a communicative object, thereby transferring the knowledge of the past to the present.

In the present research, the notion *heritage communication* is understood and interpreted in the broadest sense of the notion *communication*. The definition suggested by US museum scientist Duncan Cameron is deemed to be the most appropriate in the present context. In 1968, on the basis of the communication model proposed by Claude E. Shannon and Warren Weaver, Cameron was the first to put forward the definition of museum communication as composed of the sender of information (museum/collector), the source of information (collected and exhibited real things (objects) and the meanings they convey), and the recipient of information (visitor/observer). The present examination of the notions of the 19th century Lithuanian society does not aim at a

discussion of all possible polysemantic aspects of the communication process. Usually in the centre of attention are meanings of communication created and conveyed by the sender of information, i.e., an analysis of the *musealisation* process. A musealisation process is understood as a process in which the object, while losing its primary functional role, is extracted from its place *in situ* in order to be examined and to become a source of cognition. In our case, this is an analysis of the objects of the past selected the 19th century Lithuanian society and the meanings they were supplied with.

Novelty of the research. The issue addressed in the present research – heritage communication in the context of a given time period and its impact on the formation of the self-perception of heritage protection by the society – has not yet been subject to any specific systematic analysis. The present doctoral thesis significantly expands the existing historiography which abounds in explorations devoted to the compilation of heritage collections, pieces of research examining the history of private collections and museums, the activities they were involved and the particulars of the collections stored in them. It is believed that the new aspects, which form the subject matter of the present dissertation, will supplement both issues of heritage protection and the development of the museum science in the 19th century Lithuania as well as, more generally, the range of problems addressed in museology. In addition, the new insights formulated in this dissertation, may be useful in addressing broader issues of the cultural history of the 19th century Lithuania, as seen through the regularities of national and historical formation, which until now have only been incidentally incorporated in research devoted to the social self-perception of heritage protection.

Relevance of the research. It is believed that the present research is relevant in light of the the contemporary world, more specifically, its challenges to and impact on one‘s cultural and national identity. As the social perception of heritage changes as a result of reinterpreting or “demythologising“objects of the past that used to be held in esteem by the 19th century society, thereby attaching meanings to the formerly “silent” objects of the past or present, new images of the contemporary national history and identity are being constructed. Therefore, the issue addressed in the present dissertation and findings are relevant in an analysis of how the collections compiled by the 19th century Lithuania, their topicalisation and dissemination have influenced the formation

of the modern Lithuanian national and historical self-perception in the second half of the 19th–early 20th century and what links it bears with the present-day postmodern national self-perception. The findings of the present research may also have further implications in attempting to determine the changes that took place in the social self-perception of heritage protection in the 19th – 21st centuries and what influence the interpretations of the 19th century heritage objects as well as the historical narratives formed on their basis have on the general understanding of images of the past by the present-day society. The present dissertation helps address all these questions although, naturally, further research is needed in order to provide exhaustive answers.

Defensive statements. 1. In the 19th century, the mental changes experienced by the Lithuanian society in topicalising the perception of heritage as well as the cognition of their meanings formed the social perception of heritage protection. 2. Old, personal objects pertaining to daily life or having practical use – *antiquities* – became a significant object of the common memory and perception of identity as well as an essential characteristic in educating patriotism of the 19th century Lithuanian society. 3. To refer to collectable heritage objects, the 19th century Lithuanian society used few different notions. The changes of these definitions and their inner content reflected the development of heritage conception. 4. For the 19th century Lithuanian society, the Museum of Antiquities founded in Vilnius in 1855 became the institution responsible for constructing, legitimation, and codification of the relevant and common heritage meanings. 5. The constructed historical memory of the 19th century Lithuanian society was based on the images of the historical and cultural tradition of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. 6. In the 19th century, the topicalised images of the pre-Christian Lithuanian mythology became one of the constituent elements in the formation of national identity. 7. Public exhibition of the *other* heritage of the geographically distant and extinct cultures of the remote past at the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities encouraged the region‘s society to get involved in general activities aimed at the further formation of the museum and, more generally, taking due care of heritage.

The structure of the dissertation conforms to the nature of the issues investigated. The dissertation is composed of the Introduction, four Parts, which are further divided into sections, Conclusions, Sources, and Bibliography.

I. THE FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE HERITAGE SELF-PERCEPTION BY THE 19th CENTURY LITHUANIAN SOCIETY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE POLICIES PURSUED BY THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE

The first Part provides an analysis of the overall political and cultural context of the 19th century Lithuania, which in one or another way determined and influenced the formation and development of the social self-perception of heritage protection. A general musealisation process is emphasised in the discussion of the topicalisation of the monuments of the past, the accumulation of collections, their institutionalisation and trends in the development of the institutions positing ensuring heritage protection as their goal. The characteristic conditions of cultural activities, the society‘s prevailing opinions about culture, and, more specifically, the society‘s attitude toward cultural and historical values in the 19th century are examined. In order to place the development of political and cultural conditions in a broader geopolitical and cultural context, the discussion encompasses the entire imperial Russia, i.e., not only the so-called Northwestern region, but also the Baltic provinces (Latvia and Estonia). In order to discuss the similarities and differences of this development, the comparison is drawn with the neighbouring regions, in which the phenomenon of accumulation, protection, and dissemination of cultural heritage in Eastern and Central European countries is discussed. An analysis and reconstruction of the formation and development of the self- perception of heritage protection by the 19th century Lithuanian society is also concerned with the prevailing notions of heritage objects and their meanings, which largely determined the nature of the self-perception of heritage protection. Taking the above aspects into the consideration, the formation of the self-perception by the 19th century Lithuanian society is divided into three chronological phases, an exhaustive analysis of which is provided in the three sections of this Part.

The first section of this Part is entitled ***Topicalising activities in the field of regional studies: the first three decades of the 19th century***. It provides an analysis of the inception of the heritage self-perception in Lithuanian society in the first decades of the 19th century. The discussion of the characteristic political and cultural trends of the time as well as the prevailing attitudes toward heritage objects enables one to conclude

that in the early 19th century, the significance and meaning of cultural heritage had not yet been fully realised in Lithuania, nor were they expressed in the establishment of the relevant heritage preservation institution: a museum or a scholarly society, while the closure of Vilnius University in 1832 prevented it from becoming the centre of heritage preservation, topicalisation, and dissemination. In general, throughout this period, despite occasional instances, the perception of *antiquities* as the region‘s historical and cultural heritage was yet at its inception, while initiatives originating within the walls of Vilnius University started to be implemented as late as the 1850s.

The second section of this Part is entitled ***Antiquarianism and its institutionalisation: the period between the two uprisings*** and is concerned with the trends of the self-perception of heritage protection in Lithuania characteristic of the period from the 1840s to 1870s. After the uprising of 1830–1831, similarly to the interest in the heritage of historical Lithuania, social cultural activities start to be resumed as late as the 1850s. By this stage, however, they are no longer subject to relative cultural autonomy, but rather to the stricter local control of Russian administration. In the mid-19th century, the society‘s interest in *antiquities* attained a new feature, that of democracy. *Antiquities* and a new, yet hardly experienced, passion for collecting overwhelmed various social strata: from dukes and counts to petty noblemen, thereby becoming a peculiar fashion of the time. During this period, Lithuania witnessed the formation of the market of the *region‘s antiquities* and the rise of the *antiquarianism* movement, as an outcome of regional studies. The latter is a phenomenon characterised by a specific relation to the past and its objects, a conscious goal not only to accumulate, preserve, and appreciate objects of the past, but rather to get to know them by classifying and attributing them, by gathering additional information with the ultimate objective to use these objects in reconstructing the past.

The mid-19th century witnesses a remarkable change in the social view on *antiquities* as the latter were increasingly actively integrated into the cultural turnover of the region. This produced an idea that the accumulation of the *region‘s antiquities* and their popularisation in the private sphere was to be taken over to the far broader public, social and, consequently, scholarly domain. The efforts of the educated circles of the region to give impetus to heritage protection and scholarly activities came to be fulfilled

in 1855 by establishing a public scholarly and cultural institution, the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities. Generalising, it may be stated that the museum immediately gained popularity and garnered ample visitors attention. Over one decade of its operation, the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities and its affiliate, the Provisional Archaeological Committee, became the most prominent albeit the only scholarly and cultural institution not only in Vilnius, but across entire Lithuania, which served to connect the intelligentsia of the time in common scholarly and educational pursuits.

The third section of this Part is entitled ***The manifestation of heritage between the underground and propaganda in the post-uprising period***. It is concerned with the social and state initiatives in the sphere of heritage protection of the relevant period and the prevailing trends of heritage preservation following the 1863–1864 uprising in Lithuania.

In the early years following the uprising, the larger part of the intelligentsia was eliminated from any public cultural activities. Many representatives were accused of having collaborated in the uprising and were expelled to the peripheries of the Russian Empire, others emigrated from the country, while the operation of the market of regional antiquities was banned. The authority to set up further official dissemination of the region‘s heritage, to run or initiate museum activities was taken away from the local community and delegated to Russian officials, who viewed museums as a tool for disseminating the imperial ideology and education. Nevertheless, alongside the newly set up official state institutions devoted to heritage protection, the private sphere witnessed occasional individual efforts to promote the attention to the region‘s monuments. In the 1890s, primarily in emigration, in the underground, and as yet illegal, informal social associations started to be formed. These focused their activities on the protection of the region‘s heritage. Associations operated in close collaboration with national movements of Russia‘s Northwestern region. Thus, in the second half of the 19th century, the self-perception of heritage protection in Lithuania was subject to obstacles from two polar perspectives: heritage as an imperial propaganda means as opposed to heritage as a manifestation of social identity.

Generalising the development of the perception of heritage protection in the 19th century Lithuania as presented in this Part, it may be maintained that heritage self-

perception was largely influenced by the policies of the Russian Empire. Given the conditions of a more liberal policy, cultural activities of the local community became more active, while *regional antiquities* promoted attention to the region‘s heritage, collective memory, and patriotism. The self-perception of heritage protection in the 19th century Lithuania may be conditionally divided into three chronological periods: the inception of perceiving and topicalising objects of regional heritage as tokens of collective memory and symbols of identity (1803–1824); the antiquarianism movement (the 1850s–1865); and the dissemination of the region‘s antiquities as reflected through heritage meanings in the context of the official imperial policy (1865–1907).

II. CHANGES IN MUSEOLOGICAL CONCEPTS IN THE 19th CENTURY LITHUANIA

This Part is concerned with the terms used by the 19th century Lithuanian society to refer to the accumulated cultural and historical objects as well as their collections. The discussion encompasses the origin of these concepts, their perception in the relevant period, meaning, and usage.

The first section of this Part ***Defining heritage: between an “antiquity” and a “monument”*** provides an analysis of the meanings expressed through the following concepts: *antiquities* (Lith. *senienos*, Pl. *starożytności*, *antyki* Rus. *древности*) and *monuments* (Lith. *paminklai,* Pl. *pamiątki*, *pomniki* or *zabytki*, Rus. *памятники*). In the first half of the 19th century, Lithuanian society used the term *antiquities* synonymously with *monuments* referring to the same cultural and historical heritage. This is reflected through the yet unrefined and rather vague definitions. Heritage was perceived not so much as an object of the past accumulated in one‘s collections, but rather as a piece of evidence manifesting meaningful and valuable heritage of the region, motherland, or nation to the society of the time. The term *antiquities* with reference to historical heritage originated as an outcome of the formation of antiquarianism and the science of archaeology. Although it was used in the Lithuanian language, the term was not popular and was frequently substituted for the term *heritage* (Lith. *palikimas*) or *antiquity remains* (Lith. *senovės liekanos*). Starting from the second half of the 19th century, the

dividing line between the terms *antiquities* and *monuments* became increasingly apparent: the term *monuments* was used to refer to immovable cultural heritage objects, while *antiquities* was used to refer to objects pertaining to archaeology, antique history, and culture. However, at the same time, the notion of heritage, particularly in the late 19th–early 20th century, comes to embrace the new meanings of heritage pertaining to local ethnography as well as spiritual and oral culture.

The second section of this Part ***"Collection" vs "Museum"*** provides a comparative analysis of the notions of *museum* (Lith. *muziejus*, Pl. *muzeum*, Rus. *музеум* or *музей*) and *collection* (Lith. *rinkinys* or *kabinetas*, Pl. *zbiór* or *gabinet*, Rus. *собрание* or *кабинет*) in the 19th century. These notions were used by the educated Lithuanian society as early as the beginning of the 19th century to refer to the place in which observable natural or human-made objects are collected and represented. Unlike *collection,* which were associated with a private collection, the formation of which was based on the idea of the collector and the manifestation of his/her personality, *museum* was perceived as a public and institutionalised manifestation of a public collection organised in accordance with certain scientific criteria. In order to provide a broader discussion of the differences between these notional categories and, consequently, of the first museum of Lithuania, this section examines a collection compiled by Dionizas Poška, one of the most prominent figures in the Lithuanian national revival movement in the first half of the 19th century. Poška's Bardžių manor estate and its collection of *antiquities* was well known and frequently visited by representatives of the society of the time, albeit largely due to a peculiar arbour, referred to as Baublys, which was constructed on the stem of a huge felled oak tree within the borders of the estate. Considering the case of the collection accumulated by Poška more broadly, it may be maintained that both the 19th century and the present-day meaning of the notion of *museum* do not comprise the essential elements characterising of the museum as a public institution. However, as one of the first private collections pertaining exclusively to the realm of regional antiquities, it contributed to the promotion of the heritage of this type as well as to the popularization of its significance in the society.

III. CONSCIENCE IN HERITAGE PROTECTION IN THE 19th CENTURY LITHUANIA: CONSTRUCTING COLLECTIVE MEMORY AND IDENTITY

In Europe, the 19th century is the period of the *awakening of nations* and of the time of the formation of national states. Consequently, national history and heritage of any specific nation, the interpretation of the past and cherishing of traditions become one of the fundamental elements that help the newly born national society perceive itself as a unique ethnic community or nation, different from neighbouring societies. These elements underscoring the historical uniqueness prepared the ground for the formation of images of national self-perception and stipulated the inherent feeling of sharedness.

In Lithuania, the antiquarianism that originated in the first half of the 19th century contributed to the topicalisation of objects of the past, thereby attaining the characteristics of the regional studies movement. This phenomenon largely influenced the interpretations of the past formed within the society and, more generally, the society‘s perception of being a nation. Efforts to shape common identities, personal symbols, and memory tokens were bound to be accompanied with the need to actualize, codify, and legitimate the entire meaningful complex of *antiquities* – objects of the past – for it is not an individual factor, its emergence, or disappearance that is important, but rather a network of such factors and meanings that are created, maintained, and communicated to new generations. In the middle of the 19th century, Lithuanian society witnessed the establishment of the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities, which was to become the institution responsible for the comprehensive interpretation and legitimation of the topical meanings of *antiquities*. Therefore, this Part is concerned with the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities as a founding element of common heritage meanings, prevailing historical images, and, ultimately, a common identity. The discussion is focused on the meanings attached to the accumulated heritage objects and on the narratives of Lithuania‘s past as expressed through these objects.

The first section of this Part is entitled ***Regional antiquities in museum narratives***. It provides an analysis of the nature of the historical heritage of the region as accumulated in the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities. For Lithuanian society, the most significant and topical portrayal of Lithuania was featured through the museum’s

exposition. On the basis of the exhibited objects and content analysis, four major museum's narratives of Lithuanian history may be distinguished. These are as follows: pre-Christian Lithuania as portrayed through archaeological findings and purportedly mythological objects; the historical narrative of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania manifest through the historic monuments of the region; the "pantheon of heroes of the nation" presented through the portraits and memorabilia of the most prominent figures of the time; and the aura of nobiliary self-respect and patriotism that encompassed all these museum's narratives. The historical narrative of the museum did not rely on any pre-determined plot, or a thematic or chronological plane; rather, the exhibited objects dictated and provided accounts of their own histories, thereby compiling a common narrative, a history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The exhibited heritage was familiar and dear to the region's society, for these were objects which the society could identify itself with as part of *its own* cultural memory or part of its daily environment. It may be maintained that it was by means of the region's *antiquities* that topical, meaningful and unifying narratives of common history were being constructed at the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities, of which the most significant was the narrative of the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. To exhibit heritage that was meaningful to the society thereby preserving its recollections was not only a token of respect to the nation's past, but also a contribution to ensuring the livelihood of the nation in the future.

The second section of this Part is entitled ***Objects of Lithuanian mythology and national identity*** and provides an analysis of the mythology-related heritage accumulated in the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities. One of the major reasons for the exceptional interest of the mid-19th century Lithuanian society in mythology is the quest for the unique national identity and the inception of the formation of the national self-perception. It was only mythology and archaeology, its prerequisite, that could provide answers to the nation's questions about its origins and property. To substantiate and illustrate these answers material objects, *statues* that were worshipped by the nation's ancestors, were a must. The Vilnius Museum of Antiquities became the place for collecting, interpreting and raising social awareness of findings pertaining to the realm of "ancient Lithuanian gods". When encountered by accident and unidentified, figurines were ascribed to pre-Christian Lithuanian deities, thereby justifying their presentation to

the public in the exposition of the Museum of Antiquities. Ultimately, the narrative of *our* ancestral origin of customs intertwined with mythological meanings was created. Despite the dubious accounts of the origin of these figurines and unsubstantiated interpretations, it may be maintained that it was the figurines that contributed largely to the discovery and reconstruction of the entire cultural layer, the myth of the origin of the nation on which its present existence and identity rest upon.

IV. THE "OTHER" HERITAGE, DISTANT IN TIME AND SPACE, IN THE CONTEXT OF MUSEUMS OF THE 19th CENTURY LITHUANIA

The definition and the perception of identity of specific cultures, communities, social groups, institutions and, more generally, any social cultural phenomenon seems to consist of two contrasting elements, i.e., *own* – all that can be recognized and is referred to as something common, near and close to what we call our own identity, values, attitudes, tradition, and *other* – all that is perceived as different or opposite to *own*. The need to perceive oneself through the relationship with the *other*, to delineate and define in cultural terms what is *we* and what is *they* is common in various communities. Collecting the heritage of the *other* culture in European tradition has been exhaustively analysed by British museologist Susan Pearce. According to Pearce, collections in which the accumulated material represents what European self-perception refers to as the *other* in various manifestations, serves to maintain the classical European values. The definition of such European uniqueness, otherness and exceptionality was formulated not only through rejecting, defying, or neglecting the *other* heritage and treating its values as *alien*, but also through efforts to get to know and explain the *other* by incorporating it into the space of European analysis, perceiving the *other* as a geographically remote exotics or a certain extinct *other* that is remote in time. The discussion and analysis of the present Part are aimed at establishing what heritage in Lithuania was perceived as *other* or *alien* to the Lithuanian identity of the time, what changes this perception has undergone, and through what meanings and why the *other* heritage was topicalised in public space.

The first section of this Part, ***Antique heritage in the 19th century Lithuania*** provides an analysis of the perception by the 19th century Lithuanian society and the dissemination of the material Antique heritage as a manifestation of a remote, extinct *other* culture. The analysis is based on the reconstruction of the "historical memory" of three antique vases, which were donated to the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities in 1860. The objective of the analysis is to establish the cultural context of the 19th century Lithuanian society and, more specifically, the place of the antique world in it. In this light, Count Adam Günther' collection of antiquities accumulated in the first half of the 19th century is examined as a typical collection of a Lithuanian collector of the time, thereby reflecting the general attitude of the relevant society to antique heritage and its perception and interpretation. Unlike tendencies to "revive" Classical Antiquity that were prevailing in the beginning of the 19th century, in the mid-19th century the positivist historical view "secludes" antique heritage in the museum. During that period, the prevailing perception of Classical Antiquity in Lithuania is symbolically manifest in the "promotion postcard" of the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities – a lithograph of the museum's exposition, printed in the "Vilnius Album" by Jan Kazimierz Wilczyński. The lithograph depicts the hall of the museum – the former Aula of Vilnius University, which was decorated in the spirit of Classical Antiquity by Franciszek Smuglewicz in the early 19th century. In the centre of the hall sits Count Eustachy Tyszkiewicz, the founder of the museum and its *spiritus movens*. Behind him, on the second plane, one can see a gypsum copy of the statue of a Slavonic God Sventovit. In one part of the hall, on the tables and in vitrines are archaeological monuments of the region, further away – a sarcophagus of an Egyptian mummy. In the first plane of the other half of the hall are chain mail from the times of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, somewhat further away – weaponry and military ammunition with the symbolic of the former state. On the walls, next to the portraits of Antique thinkers painted by Franciszek Smuglewicz, are portraits of the notable Lithuanian figures, historical and military flags of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The antique vases are placed on the table, next to the chain mail of a Lithuanian warrior. The vases are featured as an object of history and that of the museum, and seem to symbolise the common European origins and common culture, a feeling that is enhanced

by the interior design as well as overall harmony imbuing this temple of science and knowledge.

The second section of this Part entitled ***Oriental collections in the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities*** provides an analysis of a collection of Oriental material objects accumulated throughout 1860s–1870s, which serve as a manifestation of geographically remote *other* cultures. At the core of the analysis is the question of what meanings and cultural provisions Lithuanian scholarly society sought to attribute to this collections, its items as well as why Oriental Studies constituted an important part of the Lithuanian society of the time. Aspects under consideration include an examination of how Oriental objects were perceived by the 19th century Lithuanian society: whether the interest was only limited to observing rare and unusual objects and appreciating their aesthetics and performance. Upon the completion of this analysis, it may be maintained that, starting from the mid-19th century, in Lithuania, Oriental collections were topicalised and incorporated in the sphere of vision of both collectors and the Museum of Antiquities. These collections were no longer perceived, interpreted, or presented to the public solely as *oddities*, *rarities* and *exotic objects* as perceived by the 18th century collectors. At the same time, increasing attention was drawn to the scientific significance of these Oriental objects, as research resources for the newly-forming science of ethnography. The Oriental objects acquired by Count Tyszkiewicz in Kronstadt in 1862 formed the first public Oriental collection in Lithuania thereby representing, albeit in a very limited way, the ethnography of Oriental nations. For this reason, it is not accidental that the same year, on the basis of this collection and an Egyptian collection donated by Count Michał Tyszkiewicz, the Ethnography Department was established.

The exposition of the Oriental collection in the halls of the museum and a publication of its list is the first temporary thematic exhibition and its catalogue in the history of Lithuanian museology. A publication of the list of donors also attracted public attention to Kronstadt's residents who had donated Oriental items to the museum. First and foremost, these activities enhanced the prestige of the museum in the eyes of the public, and secondly, the demonstration and acknowledgement of the generosity of known and unknown compatriots could help encourage members of the public to contribute to the compilation of the museum and to the formation of its collections.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The 19th century in Lithuania is the age of the formation of the public that took keen interest in its heritage. The society of the time experienced dramatic mental changes that stipulated the self-perception of the people‘s heritage. Identification, classification, and interpretation of antiquities helped conceptualise their perception while the understanding of their content was refined.

2. The 19th century in Lithuania is the age of objects’ liberation from non-being, i.e., the return of objects from the unappreciated past to the present memory of sociocultural values. Unvalued, forgotten and covered in dust, forgotten in remote corners of one‘s private property, seemingly unspecific objects of the past – *antiquities* – were now imbued with meaning and were actively integrated into the general sociocultural life. Serving both the aesthetic function and the function of cultural expression, *regional antiquities* became an integral part of public memory and the perception of identity, objects of self-identification and patriotism.

3. An analysis of the musealisation process of the objects of the past as well as an examination of the nature of heritage protection institutions in the region given the policies implemented by Russian Empire, reveals several trends of the formation and development of heritage self-perception. These may be presented as three chronological stages:

- The beginning of the formation of the perception of the objects of the past as different from the daily routine and rather, as memorabilia and identity symbols representing the collective memory of the nation (1803–1832). During this period, thanks to the activities initiated by Vilnius University and related affiliations in the field of regional studies, *antiquities* were distinguished as a potential resource for the cognition of the history and culture of the region. The society started to appreciate objects and, more broadly, it began to cherish cultural and historical memory.
- The antiquarianism movement (1850s–1865). The 1850 witnessed democratisation of heritage collecting. Within the Lithuanian society of the time, there are clearly identifiable members of the public who are keenly interested in the objects of the past, the so-called *antiquities lovers*. The trend

grew into a broad-ranging antiquarianism movement, which contributed to the formation of the *antiquities market*. The movement itself was also stipulated by Romanticism ideas spread through literature, historical articles published in periodicals, and early scholarly studies of Lithuanian history, of which a multi-volume history of Lithuania by Teodor Narbutt is arguably the most influential impetus. The apogee of this movement and its institutionalised manifestation is the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities founded in 1855.

- The dissemination of and the control over heritage meanings under the official imperial policy (1865–1907). After the 1863–1864 uprising the authorities of the Russian Empire took over the functions of topicalisation, collection, and dissemination of the heritage. The previously insignificant heritage objects were reinterpreted and topicalised by the authorities. Consequently, the antiquities of the region became an integral part of the propaganda of the imperial ideology. However, in the second half of this period, alongside state heritage protection institutions, the private sphere formed as an alternative fostering those meanings of the regional heritage that were topical to the Lithuanian society of the time. Starting from the 1890s, primarily in emigration, in the underground, and illegally, informal social circles taking care of the region‘s heritage started to be formed, which acted in close cooperation with national movements in this region of Northwestern Russia. This period is concluded in 1907, a date that almost coincides with the chronological boundaries of the 19th century. It is in 1907 that the meanings and interpretations of the heritage that had been topical exclusively in the closed social circles are legitimated. This gives rise to societies popularising science and culture and accumulating the nation‘s heritage.

4. To refer to collectable heritage objects, the 19th century Lithuanian society employed the term *monuments* (Lith. *paminklai*) synonymously with the term *antiquities* (Lith. *senienos*). Heritage was perceived not only as an object of the past accumulated in one‘s collections, but rather as a piece of evidence manifesting the society of the time meaningful and valuable legacy of the region, motherland, or nation. The term *antiquities* with reference to historical heritage originated as an outcome of the formation

of antiquarianism and the science of archaeology. Unlike the Polish language, in Lithuanian the term *antiquities* was not popular and the term *legacy* was frequently used instead. This meaning of legacy was exclusively associated with the nation‘s heritage. Starting from the second half of the 19th century, the dividing line between the terms *antiquities* and *monuments* became increasingly apparent: the term *monuments* was used to refer to immovable cultural heritage objects, while *antiquities* was used to refer to objects pertaining to archaeology, antique history, and culture. However, at the same time and particularly in the late 19th–early 20th century, the notion of heritage comes to embrace the new meanings of heritage pertaining to local ethnography as well as spiritual and oral culture.

5. The 19th century Lithuanian society used the terms *museum* and *collection* to refer to the place in which natural or man-made objects are accumulated and represented and which are available for the public. Unlike *collection,* which were associated with a private collection, the formation of which was based on the idea of the collector and the expression of his/her personality, *museum* was perceived as a public and institutionalised manifestation of a collective (public) collection organised in accordance with certain scientific criteria. Scholarly offices that operated in Vilnius University starting from the second half of the 18th century were referred to as *museums*; however, objects accumulated in them were only used as research and equipment tools. These items were not heritage objects, they did to provide narratives of the formerly existing reality; consequently, university offices-museums were not perceived as museums in the sense of institutions storing and preserving heritage. Historiography books frequently refer to the *antiquities* collection accumulated by Dionizas Poška in the first half of the 19th century as the first public museum in Lithuania even though it was not perceived as such by the 19th century Lithuanian society. According to the traditional concept of the museum, Poška‘s collection does not possess the essential elements characteristic of the museum as a public institution. Nevertheless, as one of the first private collections comprising exclusively *Lithuanian antiquities*, Poška‘s collection had contributed to the popularisation of the heritage of this kind and to the topicalisation of its significance in the 19th century Lithuanian society. It is only in 1855 that the first public institution, the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities, the purpose of which was to protect and manifest the

region‘s heritage, was founded. It is here, in the Museum of Antiquities, that the topicalisation, construction as well as certain codification and legitimation of the meanings of Lithuanian antiquities took place, thereby creating collective identities as well as the paradigms of significant symbols and memorabilia.

6. The constructed historical memory of the 19th century Lithuanian society was based on the images of the historical and cultural tradition of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Attaching meanings to objects of the past, whether it be the material legacy of the ancestors of a specific family, kin, or the legacy manifest through the excavated archaeological findings, the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities accumulated images of the past shared across Lithuania and consequently, shared by its society. On the basis of the nature and content of the exhibited objects, the following museum narratives of Lithuanian history may be distinguished. These are as follows: pre-Christian Lithuania as portrayed through archaeological findings and purportedly mythological objects; the historical narrative of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania manifest through historic monuments of the region; the “pantheon of heroes of the nation” presented through the portraits and memorabilia of the most prominent figures of the time; and the aura of nobiliary self-respect and patriotism that encompassed all these museum narratives. The exhibited heritage was familiar and dear to the region‘s society, for these were objects which the society could identify itself with as part of *its own* cultural memory or part of its daily environment. All this had constructed the common historical and cultural identity, which ensured both the continuity of tradition and, more generally, the livelihood of the nation in the future.

7. The images of pre-Christian Lithuania features through exhibiting statues of *ancient Lithuanian gods* occupied an exceptional place in the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities. One of the main reasons for unprecedented interest of the mid-19th century Lithuanian intelligentsia to the region‘s mythology is the quest for its own identity, the inception of the formation of national self-perception. It was only mythology and archaeology, its prerequisite, that could provide answers to the nation‘s questions about its origins and property. To substantiate and illustrate these answers, material objects, *statues* that were worshipped by the nation‘s ancestors, were a must. When encountered by accident and unidentified, figurines were ascribed to pre-Christian Lithuanian deities,

thereby justifying their presentation to the public in the exposition of the Museum of Antiquities. Ultimately, the narrative of *our* ancestral origin of customs intertwined with mythological meanings was created. The Lithuanian mythological heritage became a common basis unifying the legacy of both peasantry and nobility. Therefore, the attention to the *antiquities* of Lithuanian mythology and their interpretation (despite the fact that the majority of these findings are considered to be unfounded and have been consequently provided with a variety of other meanings) as well as the function of mythology itself became one of the constituent elements in the formation of Lithuanian national identity.

8. In addition, the collective conscience of the 19th century Lithuanian society accumulated the *other* heritage of remote and now extinct countries that was essentially different from the Lithuanian historical identity. This other heritage was accumulated and publicly exhibited in the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities (1855–1865). This *other* heritage was perceived not only as an object for esthetic appreciation or satisfying one's inquisitiveness, but also as a research resource for the newly formed science of ethnography. Emphasizing and highlighting the donors of the collections of the *other* heritage – compatriots who pursued scholarly interests away from their motherland – the region's society was encouraged to involve in activities the ultimate goal of which was the compilation of the region's museum as well as cherishing and protection of one's heritage.

9. By distinguishing antiquities from the everyday environment and by endowing them with the status of heritage that was significant both to the land and the nation, imaginable symbolic links with ancestors were bound and efficient paradigms of cultural memory were created in the 19th century Lithuanian society. These paradigms grounded the collective socio-cultural identity, raised self-esteem of people interested in history and heritage, increased their sense of solidarity, and prompted purposeful development of heritage protection ideas.

SENIENOS IR VISUOMENĖ: PAVELDO KOMUNIKACIJA XIX A. LIETUVOJE

Santrauka

Tyrimo problema. Kolekcionavimas kaip reiškinys Europoje ypač išpopuliarėjo nuo XVIII a. II pusės. Šis procesas neaplenkė ir Lietuvos, kur XIX a. radosi privatūs ir vieši rinkiniai, formavosi antikvarinė rinka, o spaudoje apie paveldo objektus, jų rinkinius gyvai diskutavo, dalinosi informacija ir mokslininkai, ir kolekcininkai. Visuomenės dalyvavimas, kaupiant praeities objektus kaip kultūrinės savasties ir tradicijos dalį, tuo pačiu skatino pažinti ir interpretuoti šį paveldą, tokiu būdu išreiškiant bendrumo jausmą, konstruojant ir puoselėjant kolektyvinę atmintį, kuriant bendrą tapatybę. Disertacijoje siekiama išsiaiškinti, kaip ir kokius konkrečius savos praeities ir savos tapatybės vaizdinius kūrė XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenė, interpretuodama kaupiamą kultūros paveldą, kaip šie mentaliniai konceptai keitėsi, kokios reikšmės buvo suteikiamos paveldo objektams. Tuo pačiu tiriamas ir to meto visuomenės paveldosauginės savimonės formavimasis ir raida.

Tyrimo objektas – XIX a. Lietuvoje kaupti paveldo rinkiniai, paveldo objektų generuotos reikšmės ir įsisąmonintas visuomenės požiūris į paveldo objektus.

Darbo tikslas – remiantis XIX a. Lietuvoje kolekcionuotų rinkinių ir jų suvokimo analize, apibendrinti to meto visuomenės požiūrį į istorijos ir kultūros paveldą bei rekonstruoti jo sampratą ir reikšmes.

Šiam tikslui pasiekti keliami tokie **uždaviniai**:

- aptarti kultūrines ir politines sąlygas bei platesnį geopolitinį kontekstą, lėmusį paveldo rinkinių komunikaciją XIX a. Lietuvoje;
- aptarti pagrindines sąvokas, vartotas XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenės paveldo objektams bei jų rinkiniams apibrėžti;
- ištirti kolekcionavimo ir paveldo aktualinimo tendencijas XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenėje ir jų įtaką paveldosauginės savimonės formavimuisi;
- gretinant kolekcionuotų rinkinių pobūdį su išreikštomis kolekcininkų nuostatomis, išanalizuoti to meto visuomenės kolektyvinę paveldo sampratą ir semantinius paveldo raiškos aspektus;

- analizuojant Vilniaus senienų muziejaus atvejį, aptarti konstruojamą kolektyvinę atmintį ir tapatybės vaizdinius XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenėje;
- išnagrinėti „kito“ paveldo suvoktis ir sklaidą XIX a. Lietuvoje.

Darbo metodologija, metodai, sąvokos

Darbe nagrinėjamas XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenės požiūris į paveldą ir jo interpretacijos, t. y. jos atstovų įsisąmonintos refleksijos paveldo objektų turinio, pobūdžio, reikšmės aspektais bei su tuo susijusi paveldo sklaida visuomenėje, todėl ir darbo analizė remiasi socialinei istorijai būdingais metodologiniais ir teoriniais principais. Darbe derinami analitinis aprašomasis, istorinis lyginamasis ir interpretacinis metodai.

Siekiant išsiaiškinti to meto Lietuvos visuomenėje vyraujančias bendras paveldo sampratas, darbe daugiausiai analizuojamas bajorijos, kaip tuo metu sociokultūriškai dominavusios ir kolektyvines paveldo suvoktis formavusios visuomenės dalies, požiūris. Dėl šios priežasties, o taip pat dėl atitinkamų šaltinių trūkumo darbe nėra aptariama ir nagrinėjama iš XIX a. aktyvaus politinio, visuomeninio ir kultūrinio gyvenimo eliminuotos skaitlingiausios visuomenės dalies – valstietijos – bei to meto Lietuvoje gyvenusių etnokonfesinių bendruomenių paveldo recepcija. Taip pat disertacijoje plačiau neaptariamas (išskyrus pavienius atvejus) kitų visuomenės socialinių grupių, kaip antai, ne iš bajorijos luomo kilusių dvasininkų, gydytojų, valstybės tarnautojų ir kt., paveldo supratimas. Žinoma, tai nereiškia, kad paveldo reikšmingumas buvo visai nesuvokiamas etnokonfesinėse bendruomenėse ar kituose nekilminguose socialiniuose sluoksniuose, ypač jei jų atstovai turėjo galimybių įgyti atitinkamą išsilavinimą ir sukaupti finansų, būtinų paveldo kolekcionavimui. Tačiau šių sluoksnių atstovų santykis su paveldu, kolekcininkiškos ambicijos, XIX a. visuomenėje vyravusį viešąjį paveldo diskursą paveikė nežymiai.

XIX amžiuje Lietuvos kaip politinio ar administracinio vieneto nebuvo. XVIII a. pabaigoje, po Abiejų Tautų Respublikos padalijimų, į Rusijos imperijos sudėtį patekusios Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės žemės buvo suskirstytos į gubernijas. Šis administracinis suskirstymas Rusijos imperijoje XIX amžiuje keitėsi, todėl darbe Lietuva suprantama kaip buvusios Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės teritorija, apimanti ne tik dabartines etninės Lietuvos žemes.

Darbe aptariami ir analizuojami paveldo objektai atitinka tik dalį šiandien plačiai suprantamo *paveldo* apibrėžties turinio, kuris apima materialias ir nematerialias, kilnojamąsias ir nekilnojamąsias bei kitas sociokultūriškai reikšmingas praeities vertybes. Tyrime apsiribota siauresne paveldo dalimi, t.y. tik kilnojamaisiais žmogaus veiklos ir jo aplinkos materialiais objektais, turinčiais kultūrinę vertę, kurie ir sudarė XIX a. visuomenės kaupiamų privačių ir visuomeninių rinkinių pagrindą. To meto terminu tai yra vadinamosios *senienos*, kurioms šiuolaikinėje muzeologijoje taikomas *muziejinio objekto* terminas. Muziejinis objektas tokiu tampa ne dėl to, kad jis yra saugomas muziejuje ar kitoje paveldo institucijoje. Praeities objektas tampa muziejiniu objektu tik tada, kai jam kaip paveldo (praeities) objektui muzealizacijos proceso metu suteikiamos vienokios ar kitokios vertės ir reikšmės, kurių dėka toks objektas tampa dar ir komunikacijos šaltiniu, perteikiančiu praeities žinias dabarčiai.

Darbe sąvoka *paveldo komunikacija* suprantama ir interpretuojama pačia bendriausia *komunikacijos* sąvokos prasme. Mums priimtiniausias pasirodė JAV muzeologo Duncano Camerono apibrėžimas. Šis autorius, pasiremdamas Claude E. Shannono ir Warreno Weaverio komunikacijos modeliu bei papildydamas jį savo mintimis, pirmasis pateikė *muziejinės komunikacijos* apibrėžimą, kurį sudaro informacijos siuntėjas (muziejus / kolekcininkas), informacijos šaltinis (kaupiami ir eksponuojami realūs daiktai (objektai) ir jų perteikiamos reikšmės) ir informacijos gavėjas (lankytojas / žiūrovas). Darbe, analizuojant XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenės paveldo suvoktis, nesiekiama aptarti visų įmanomų daugiaprasmių komunikacijos proceso aspektų. Didžiausias dėmesys skiriamas informacijos siuntėjo kuriamoms ir perteikiamoms paveldo objekto reikšmėms, t. y. objekto *muzealizacijos* proceso tyrimui. Muzealizacijos procesas – tai procesas, kurio metu objektas yra sąmoningai „išimamas“ iš savo įprastinės pirmykštės buvimo vietos, taip prarasdamas ir savo pirminį funkcinį vaidmenį, tam, kad būtų ištirtas ir taptų pažinimo šaltiniu. Mūsų tyrimo atveju tai yra XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenės iš egzistuojančios realybės išskirtų praeities objektų ir jiems suteiktų reikšmių analizė.

Tyrimo naujumas. Darbo problematika – paveldo komunikacija istoriniame konkretaus laikotarpio, t. y. XIX a. kontekste ir jos įtaka formuojant visuomenės tautinę ir kultūrinę tapatybę – iki šiol sistemiškai tirta nebuvo. Disertacija esmingai papildo

gausią kultūros paveldo kolekcionavimo, konkrečių privačių rinkinių ir muziejų istorijos, veiklos ir juose sukauptų rinkinių specifikos klausimams nušviesti skirtų darbų istoriografiją. Tuo pačiu disertacijoje tiriami nauji paveldo komunikacijos, paveldosauginės savimonės formavimosi aspektai praplečia ir pačią XIX a. Lietuvos paveldosaugos ir muziejininkystės tyrimų problematiką. Disertacijoje suformuluotos naujos įžvalgos gali būti naudingos ir platesniu aspektu tiriant XIX a. Lietuvos kultūros istorijos, visuomenės tapatybės formavimosi dėsningumų klausimus, kuriuos nagrinėjant iki šiol paveldosauginio sąmoningumo tyrimai būdavo įtraukiami tik fragmentiškai.

Tyrimo aktualumas. Manome, kad tyrimas yra aktualus šiuolaikinio pasaulio iššūkių ir poveikio kultūrinei ir tautinei tapatybei kontekste. Kintant visuomenės suvokimui ir požiūriui į paveldą, reinterpretuojant ar „demitologizuojant“ XIX a. visuomenės vertintus praeities objektus, suteikiant reikšmes iki tol „nebyliems“ praeities ar nūdienos daiktams, kuriami nauji šiuolaikinės tautos istorijos ir tapatybės vaizdiniai. Tad darbe nagrinėjama problema ir atlikto tyrimo rezultatai yra esmingi svarstant, kaip XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenės sukaupti rinkiniai, jų aktualinimas ir sklaida paveikė moderniosios lietuvių tautinės ir istorinės savimonės formavimąsi XIX a. antrojoje pusėje – XX a. pradžioje ir kaip tai siejasi su šiandienos postmodernia tautine savimone. Mūsų tyrimo išvados taip pat gali būti vertingos, siekiant išryškinti, kaip nuo XIX a. iki XXI a. pakinta visuomenės paveldosauginė savimonė ir kokią įtaką XIX a. paveldo objektų interpretacijos bei jų pagalba kurti istoriniai naratyvai daro praeities vaizdinių supratimui šiuolaikinėje visuomenėje. Šios disertacijos pagrindu visus pastaruosius klausimus galima kelti ir svarstyti, nors, be abejo, siekiant į juos atsakyti dar reiktų atlikti papildomus tyrimus.

Ginamieji teiginiai. 1. XIX amžiuje Lietuvos visuomenėje vykę mentaliniai pokyčiai, aktualinant paveldo suvokimą bei jų reikšmių pažinimą, suformavo visuomenės paveldosauginę savimonę. 2. XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenei senoviniai daiktai ar namuose kaupiami asmeniniai kasdienės aplinkos ir praktinės paskirties daiktai, šeimos relikvijos – *senienos* – tapo svarbūs bendros atminties ir tapatybės suvokties bei patriotizmo ugdymo objektais. 3. Kolekcionuojami paveldo objektai XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenės buvo įvardinami keliais terminais. Šių paveldą apibrėžiančių sąvokų ir joms suteikiamo turinio kaita atspindėjo to meto paveldo sampratos raidą. 4. XIX a. Lietuvos

visuomenei aktualių ir bendrų paveldo reikšmių konstravimo, įteisinimo ir sunorminimo institucija tapo 1855 m. Vilniuje įkurtas Senienų muziejus. 5. XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenės konstruojamos istorinės atminties pagrindą sudarė Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės istorinės ir kultūrinės tradicijos vaizdiniai. 6. XIX a. aktualizuoti ikikrikščioniškosios Lietuvos mitologijos vaizdiniai tapo vienu iš sudėtinių elementų, formuojančių tautinę tapatybę. 7. Vilniaus senienų muziejuje kaupto *kito* geografiškai tolimų tautų bei kažkada praeityje egzistavusių kultūrų paveldo viešas eksponavimas skatino krašto visuomenę aktyviai įsitraukti į bendrą muziejaus kūrimo ir paveldo puoselėjimo veiklą.

Darbo struktūra atitinka nagrinėjamų klausimų pobūdį. Darbą sudaro įvadas, keturios dalys, kurios skaidomos į smulkesnius poskyrius, išvados, šaltinių, literatūros ir santrumpų sąrašai bei disertacijos tema parengtų publikacijų sąrašas.

Įvade apibrėžta tiriamoji problema, tyrimo objektas, darbo tikslas ir uždaviniai, nusakyta tyrimo metodologija ir metodai, įvertintas darbo naujumas ir aktualumas, pateikti ginamieji teiginiai, apžvelgti darbe naudoti šaltiniai ir tyrimai.

Pirmame skyriuje ***XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenės paveldosauginės savimonės formavimasis ir raida Rusijos imperijos politikos kontekste*** analizuojamas politinis ir bendrakultūrinis kontekstas XIX a. Lietuvoje, veikęs visuomenės paveldosauginės savimonės formavimąsi. Išryškinamas bendras paveldo muzealizacijos procesas, aptariant praeities paminklų aktualinimo, rinkinių kaupimo, jų institucionalizavimo ir institucijų, besirūpinančių paveldo globa, raidos tendencijas. Analizuojant XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenės paveldosauginės savimonės formavimąsi ir raidą, išskiriami trys skirtingi etapai ir aptariami tuomet dominavę paveldosauginio samoningumo bruožai.

Antrame skyriuje ***Muzeologinių sąvokų kaita XIX a. Lietuvoje*** aptariamos pagrindinės XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenės vartotos sąvokos kolekcionuojamiems kultūros ir istorijos objektams bei jų rinkiniams apibrėžti. Aptariama šių sąvokų kilmė bei analizuojamas jų suvokimas, reikšmės ir vartosena tuo metu.

Trečiame skyriuje ***Paveldosauginis sąmoningumas XIX a. Lietuvoje: kolektyvinės atminties ir tapatybės konstravimas***, analizuojant Vilniaus senienų muziejuje kaupiamą ir reprezentuojamą krašto kultūrinį ir istorinį paveldą,

rekonstruojamos XIX a. visuomenės kurtos kolektyvinės atminties reikšmės ir jų pagalba konstruojami muziejiniai istorijos naratyvai bei kultūrinės tapatybės vaizdiniai.

Ketvirtame skyriuje ***Laike ir erdvėje nutolęs „kitas“ paveldas XIX a. Lietuvos muziejiniuose kontekstuose*** analizuojama, koks paveldas XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenės buvo suvokiamos kaip *kitas* ar *svetimas* paveldas, kaip keitėsi ir ar keitėsi šis suvokimas bei kokiomis prasmėmis ir kodėl *kitas* paveldas buvo aktualinamas viešojoje erdvėje.

IŠVADOS

1. XIX amžius Lietuvoje – tai paveldo visuomenės susiformavimo amžius, kai visuomenėje įvyko esminiai mentaliniai pokyčiai, ugdę paveldosauginę žmonių savimonę. Identifikuojant, klasifikuojant ir interpretuojant *senienas*, buvo konceptualizuotas jų suvokimas ir išgrynintas turinio supratimas.

2. XIX amžius Lietuvoje – tai daiktų išsivadavimo iš nebūties amžius, t.y. daiktų sugrįžimas iš neįvertintos praeities į įdabartintą visuomenės sociokultūrinių vertybių atmintį. Beverčiai, užmiršti, privačioje namų užkaborių erdvėje tūnantys niekuo neišsiskiriantys praeities daiktai – *senienos*, sureikšmintos ir įprasmintos, aktyviai įsiliejo į bendrą sociokultūrinį gyvenimą. Atlikdamos ne tik ir ne tiek estetinio pasigėrėjimo funkcijas, *krašto senienos* tapo svarbiais visuomenės bendros atminties ir tapatybės suvokties, savęs identifikavimo bei patriotizmo ugdymo objektais.

3. Išanalizavus praeities objektų muzealizacijos procesą ir jo pobūdį krašte vykdomos Rusijos imperijos politikos kontekste, išryškėjo tam tikros XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenės paveldosauginės savimonės formavimosi ir raidos tendencijos, kurias sąlyginai galima išskirti į tris chronologinius etapus:

- Praeities objektų kaip kolektyvinės atminties ženklų ir tapatybės simbolių suvokimo ir jų išskyrimo iš kasdienės aplinkos formavimosi pradžia (1803–1832 m.). Šiame etape dėl Vilniaus universitete ir jo aplinkoje užgimusių kraštotyrinės veiklos iniciatyvų *senienos* buvo išskirtos kaip potencialus krašto istorijos ir kultūros pažinimo šaltinis. Tuo pačiu visuomenėje pradėjo rastis praeities objektų kaip vertybės ir visai visuomenei bendro kultūrinės ir istorinės atminties ženklo suvokimo užuomazgos.

- Antikvarizmo sąjūdžio etapas (XIX a. 5-as deš.–1865 m.). Nuo XIX a. 5-ojo deš. būdingas paveldo kolekcionavimo demokratėjimas. To meto Lietuvos visuomenėje susiformuoja aktyvi, krašto praeities objektais besidominti visuomenės dalis – *senienų mylėtojai* –, išsiskleidusi į platų antikvarizmo sąjūdį, susikūrė krašto *senienų* antikvarinė rinka. Šio sąjūdžio radimąsi skatino literatūroje besireiškiančios Romantizmo idėjos, periodikoje publikuojami krašto istorijai skirti straipsniai ir polemika, o tuo pačiu pasirodžiusios ir pirmosios Lietuvos istorijai skirtos mokslinės studijos, iš kurių bene paveikiausias visuomenėje buvo Teodoro Narbuto *Lietuvių tautos istorijos* daugiatomis. Šio sąjūdžio apogėjumi, institucionalizuota jo išraiška tapo pirmojo muziejaus – Vilniaus senienų muziejaus įkūrimas 1855 m.
- Oficialiosios imperinės politikos konstruojamų ir kontroliuojamų paveldo reikšmių sklaidos etapas (1865–1907 m.). Po 1863–1864 m. sukilimo Rusijos imperijos valdžia krašto paveldo aktualinimo, kaupimo ir sklaidos funkcijas perėmė į savo rankas. Reinterpretuojant praeities objektus, suteikiant jiems kitas reikšmes bei įprasminant iki tol visuomenei nereikšmingus paveldo objektus ir juos aktualinant, *krašto senienos* tapo oficialiosios imperinės ideologijos propagandos dalimi. Tačiau greta šių oficialiai propaguojamų krašto paveldo reikšmių, antroje šio laikotarpio pusėje kaip tam tikra alternatyva, privačioje erdvėje buvo puoselėjamos kitos, krašto visuomenei aktualios paveldo reikšmės. O nuo XIX a. 9-ojo dešimtmečio, iš pradžių emigracijoje ir pogrindyje pradeda formuotis krašto paveldu besirūpinantys neformalūs visuomenės sambūriai, glaudžiai susiję su tautiniais judėjimais šiame Rusijos Šiaurės Vakarų krašte. Šį etapą užbaigia su chronologinėmis XIX a. ribomis beveik sutampanti data – 1907 m. Būtent tais metais pradedamos legalizuoti iki tol tik uždaruose visuomenės sluoksniuose aktualintos paveldo interpretacijų reikšmės – įsikuria visuomeninės paveldą kaupiančios ir populiarinančios mokslo bei meno draugijos.

4. XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenė kolekcionuojamiems kultūros ir istorijos paveldo objektams apibrėžti lygiaverčiai vartojo sąvokas *paminklai* ir *senienos*. Pats paveldas buvo suvokiamas ne tik kaip bet kokie rinkiniuose kaupiami praeities objektai, bet

daugiau, kaip reikšmingo ir vertingo to meto visuomenei krašto, tėvynės ar tautos istorinio palikimo liudijimas. Paveldo įvardinimas *senienomis*, atsiradęs kaip antikvarizmo ir archeologijos mokslo formavimosi išdava, lietuvių tautinėje kultūrinėje tradicijoje bei kalbinėje vartosenoje, skirtingai nei lenkiškoje, nebuvo populiarus, čia dominavo *palikimo* apibrėžtis. Ši *palikimo* sąvoka išskirtinai buvo siejama su tautos paveldu, jos materialiuoju istoriniu palikimu. Tačiau tuo pačiu *palikimo* samprata, ypač XIX a. pabaigoje – XX a. pradžioje, jau apima ir naujas, vietinio etnografinio, dvasinės ir žodinės kultūros paveldo reikšmes. Nuo XIX a. antrosios pusės vis aiškesnė tapo ir apibrėžimų *senienos* bei *paminklai* takoskyra. *Paminklo* sąvoka taikoma dažniau įvardinant nekilnojamojo kultūros paveldo objektus, o *senienomis* apibrėžiami archeologijos, senovės istorijos ir kultūros objektai.

5. XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenė vartojo *muziejaus* ir *rinkinio* (arba *kabineto*) sąvokas apibrėžti vietai, kurioje kaupiami, saugomi ir reprezentuojami žmogaus ar gamtos sukurti objektai ir kuriuos galima viešai apžiūrėti. *Rinkinys* ir *kabinetas* buvo siejami su privačia kolekcija ir ją formuojančio asmens raiška. *Muziejus* buvo suvokiamas kaip viešas visuomeninis ir institucionalizuotas paveldo objektų rinkinys, tvarkomas pagal tam tikrus mokslinius kriterijus. Vilniaus universitete nuo XVIII a. antrosios pusės veikė mokslo kabinetai tuo metu vadinti *muziejais*, tačiau juose kaupti daiktai atliko tik mokslo tyrimo priemonės ir mokslinės įrangos funkcijas. Šie daiktai nebuvo paveldo objektai, nebylojo apie kažkada buvusią realybę, tad ir universiteto kabinetai-muziejai nebuvo suvokiami muziejaus – paveldo saugyklos prasme. XIX a. pirmojoje pusėje Dionizo Poškos Baublyje kauptas *senienų* rinkinys istoriografijoje dažnai įvardinamas kaip pirmasis viešas muziejus Lietuvoje, tačiau XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenė jo tokiu nelaikė. Šis rinkinys tradicinės *muziejaus* sampratos prasme neatitinka esminių kriterijų, charakterizuojančių muziejų kaip visuomeninę instituciją. Tačiau būdamas vienas pirmųjų privačių, išskirtinai *lietuviškų senienų* rinkinių, prisidėjo populiarinant šios rūšies paveldą bei aktualinant jo svarbą ir reikšmę visuomenėje XIX a. pirmoje pusėje. Tad tik 1855 m. Vilniuje įkurtas Senienų muziejus tapo pirmąja viešа visuomenine institucija – muziejumi –, besirūpinančia krašto paveldo globa ir sklaida. Būtent čia, Senienų muziejuje, vyko paveldo objektų reikšmių konstravimas ir savotiškas

šių reikšmių sunorminimas, įteisinimas bei aktualinimas, kuriant kolektyvinės tapatybės bei visuomenei reikšmingų simbolių ir atminties ženklų paradigmas.

6. XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenės konstruojamos istorinės atminties pagrindą sudarė Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės istorinės ir kultūrinės tradicijos vaizdiniai. Sureikšminant ir įprasminant praeities objektus – konkrečios šeimos ar giminės tėvų ir protėvių materialinį palikimą bei iškasamus archeologinius radinius – Vilniaus senienų muziejuje buvo kuriami krašto visuomenei aktualūs Lietuvos praeities vaizdiniai. Remiantis eksponuotų objektų pobūdžio ir suvokimo analize, galime išskirti pagrindinius Lietuvos istorijos muziejinius naratyvus. Tai, pirma, ikikrikščioniškosios Lietuvos vaizdinys, kurtas archeologinių radinių ir tariamai mitologinių objektų pagalba. Antra, Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės istorijos pasakojimas, išreikštas krašto istorijos paminklais ir iškiliausių „tautos herojų panteonas“, pristatytas portretais ir memorialiniais daiktais. Visų šių muziejinių naratyvų vienijanti jungtis ir pagrindas – bajoriškosios savigarbos ir patriotiškumo samprata. Eksponuojamas paveldas krašto visuomenei buvo atpažįstamas ir artimas, nes tai buvo daiktai, su kuriais visuomenė galėjo tapatintis kaip su *savos* kultūrinės atminties ar aplinkos dalimi. Visa tai kūrė bendrą istorinę ir kultūrinę visuomenės tapatybę, kuri užtikrino tradicijos tąsą ir buvo tautos gyvavimo ateityje užtikrinimo garantas.

7. Vilniaus senienų muziejuje kuriamų muziejinių Lietuvos istorijos naratyvų erdvėje išskirtinę vietą užėmė ikikrikščioniškosios Lietuvos mitologijos vaizdiniai, kurie buvo perteikti eksponuojant menamus *senųjų lietuvių dievų stabus*. Viena pagrindinių išskirtinio Lietuvos inteligentijos dėmesio krašto mitologijai XIX a. viduryje priežasčių – savosios tautinės tapatybės paieškos ir tautinės savimonės formavimosi užuomazgos. Tik mitologija kartu su talkinusia jai archeologija galėjo atsakyti į tautos kilmės, savasties klausimus, kuriuos pagrįsti ir iliustruoti buvo būtini materialūs objektai – protėvių garbinti *stabai*. Atsitiktinai surastas ir neatpažintas skulptūrėles tapatinant su ikikrikščioniškosios lietuvių religijos dievybėmis ir taip pateisinant jų išstatymą viešam apžiūrėjimui Senienų muziejaus ekspozicijoje, buvo kuriamas *mūsų* protėvių kilmės, papročių ir mitologijos reikšmėmis perpintas pasakojimas. Lietuvių mitologijos paveldas tapo bendru valstietiškąją ir bajoriškąją kultūrą apjungiančiu pamatu. Tad šis dėmesys Lietuvos mitologijos *senienoms*, jų interpretacijos (nepaisant to, kad dauguma jų

šiandieną laikomos nepagrįstomis, o patys objektai yra įgavę visai kitas reikšmes) bei pačios mitologijos rekonstrukcija tapo vienu iš sudėtinių elementų, formuojant tautinę tapatybę.

8. XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenės kolektyvinėje sąmonėje buvo aktualintas ir įprasmintas nuo to meto lietuviškosios kultūrinės tapatybės esmingai besiskiriantis geografiškai tolimų tautų bei kažkada praeityje egzistavusių kultūrų *kitas* paveldas, kuris kauptas ir viešai eksponuotas Vilniaus senienų muziejuje. To meto Lietuvos visuomenėje *kitas* paveldas buvo suvokiamas ne tik kaip estetinio pasigrožėjimo ar smalsumo tenkinimo objektas, bet ir kaip besiformuojančio etnografijos mokslo tyrimo šaltinis. Atkreipiant dėmesį į šio *kito* paveldo rinkinio dovanotojus – toli nuo tėvynės mokslo labui besidarbuojančius *tautiečius* – krašto visuomenė buvo skatinama pati aktyviai įsitraukti į bendrą krašto muziejaus kūrimo ir paveldo puoselėjimo veiklą.

9. XIX a. Lietuvos visuomenė, išskirdama senienas iš kasdienės aplinkos ir suteikdama joms reikšmingo kraštui ir tautai paveldo statusą, taip išreiškė įsivaizduojamą simbolinį ryšį su protėviais ir kūrė svarias kultūrinės atminties paradigmas, kurios grindė bendrą sociokultūrinę tapatybę, kėlė istorijai ir jos paveldui neabejingų žmonių savivertę, didino jų solidarumo jausmą ir skatino kryptingą paveldosauginės minties raidą.

Articles on the subject of dissertation
Mokslo straipsniai disertacijos tema

- The collection of Oriental art at the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities in 1862–1865, *Acta Orientalia Vilnensia*, 2012, t. 11, Nr. 2 (2010), p. 117–131. ISSN 1648–2662. (EBSCO).
- Antikinių vazų „istorinė atmintis“: kolekcionavimo aspektas XIX a. Lietuvoje, *Bibliotheca Lituana I*, 2012, (įteikta spaudai).
- Vilniaus archeologijos komisijos 1856–1858 m. posėdžių protokolai, *Bibliotheca Lituana I*, 2012, (įteikta spaudai).

I would like to sincerely thank Dr. Reda Griškaitė and Prof. Dr. Arvydas Pacevičius for their assistance in preparing the dissertation.

Už pagalbą rengiant disertaciją nuoširdžiai dėkoju dr. Redai Griškaitei ir prof. dr. Arvydui Pacevičiui.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Žygintas Būčys was born on January 18, 1968, in Biržai. In 1986-1992, he studied in the Faculty of History, Vilnius University, which he completed with a diploma in history. Since 1992, he has worked in the National Museum of Lithuania. He headed the History Department in 1992-1998, and has been appointed Deputy Director for Museum Affairs in 1998. He is actively involved in the organisation of permanent exhibitions of the National Museum of Lithuania and keeping them up-to-date. He has supervised over 20 exhibitions. The most significant of the exhibitions organised under his supervision and reflecting the 19th century Lithuanian history and culture are as follows: *Lithuania's Heraldry* (2000), *Freemasons in Lithuania in the 18th-19th centuries* (2002), *Napoleon and Lithuania* (2002), *The History of the Vilnius Museum of Antiquities* (2004), *Old Vilnius* (2009), *Lithuania in the 19th century* (2010). In addition, he runs a number of other activities in the National Museum of Lithuania.

Since 2002 Būčys has conducted a Museum Studies course to graduate students in the Faculty of Communication, Vilnius University. In the period 2006–2011 he was lecturer in the international maintenance qualification project of the Association of Lithuanian Museums *Competences and Skills Development for Museum Specialists of the 21st century*. In 1998–2010 he delivered a series of lectures in Applied Museum Studies to museum specialists at the Centre for Professional Improvement of Lithuanian Cultural Workers.

Būčys' scholarly activities include 14 publications in Lithuanian and foreign periodicals and over 20 popular articles devoted to heritage, cultural history and museology. He has produced two scholarly catalogues: *Seraya Szapszal's Karaim Collection* (2003) and *Freemasons in Lithuania: late 18th – early 19th century* (2009). He has contributed to the creation of five catalogues of exhibitions and collections of the National Museum of Lithuania. He is a scholarly editor of the *Bendrosios muzeologijos metmenys* (2007), the first Lithuanian translation of a book in museology, originally written by Friedrich Waidacher (*Handbuch der Allgemeinen Museologie*). Būčys is an active participant of national and international scientific conferences devoted to museology and cultural history.

E-mail: zygintas.bucys@lnm.lt

APIE AUTORIŲ

Žygintas Būčys gimė 1968 m. sausio 18 d. Biržuose. 1986–1992 m. studijavo Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos fakultete ir įgijo istorijos specialybės diplomą. Nuo 1992 m. dirba Lietuvos nacionaliniame muziejuje. 1992–1998 m. muziejaus Istorijos skyriaus vedėjas, nuo 1998 m. muziejaus direktoriaus pavaduotojas muziejininkystei. Nuolatos dalyvauja rengiant parodas ir atnaujinant nuolatines Lietuvos nacionalinio muziejaus ekspozicijas. Yra kuravęs daugiau kaip 20 parodų, iš kurių reikšmingesnės, atspindinčios XIX a. Lietuvos istoriją ir kultūrą: *Lietuvos heraldika* (2000), *Laisvieji mūrininkai Lietuvoje XVIII–XIX a.* (2002), *Napoleonas ir Lietuva* (2002), *Vilniaus senienų muziejaus istorija* (2004), *Senasis Vilnius* (2009), *Lietuva XIX amžiuje* (2010). Vykdo kitas muziejines veiklas Lietuvos nacionaliniame muziejuje.

Nuo 2002 m. Vilniaus universiteto Komunikacijos fakulteto magistrantūros studijų studentams skaito Muziejininkystės kursą. 2006–2011 m. Lietuvos muziejų asociacijos tarptautinio muziejininkų kvalifikacijos kėlimo projekto *XXI amžiaus muziejininkų kompetencijos ir gebėjimų ugdymas* lektorius. 1998–2010 m. skaitytos Taikomosios muziejininkystės paskaitos muziejininkams Lietuvos kultūros darbuotojų tobulinimosi centre.

Paskelbė 14 mokslinių publikacijų Lietuvos ir užsienio leidiniuose bei daugiau kaip 20 mokslo populiarinimo straipsnių paveldo, kultūros istorijos ir muziejininkystės temomis. Parengė du mokslinius katalogus: *Serajos Šapšalo karaimikos rinkinys* (2003) ir *Masonai Lietuvoje: XVIII a. pabaiga – XIX a. pradžia* (2009). Bendradarbiavo sudarant penkis Lietuvos nacionalinio muziejaus parodų ir rinkinių katalogus. Pirmosios į lietuvių kalbą išverstos muzeologijai skirtos Friedrich Waidacher knygos *Bendrosios muzeologijos metmenys* (2007) mokslinis redaktorius. Nuolatos dalyvauja nacionalinėse ir tarptautinėse mokslinėse konferencijose muziejininkystės ir kultūros istorijos klausimais.

El. paštas: zygintas.bucys@lnm.lt