

Buychik, A. (2025). Klironomical methods for the study of cultural heritage: From philosophical reconstruction to applied analysis. *Culture and Arts in the Context of World Cultural Heritage. Klironomy*, 10, 7–41. Ostrava.

DOI: 10.47451/kj-2025-02

The paper will be published in Crossref, ICI Copernicus, BASE, EBSCO, Zenodo, OpenAIRE, LORY, J-Gate, ASCI, Academic Resource Index ResearchBib, ISI International Scientific Indexing, ADL, JournalsPedia, Mendeley, and Internet Archive databases.



Alexander Buychik, Doctor of Economics, Ph.D. in Social Sciences, Specialist in Cultural Heritage, Holding Director for Science, Supervisor, European Institute for Innovation Development, Tuculart Holding, Ostrava, Czech Republic.
ORCID 0000-0002-2542-4198

Klironomical Methods for the Study of Cultural Heritage: From Philosophical Reconstruction to Applied Analysis

Abstract:

The relevance of the study is determined by the need for a methodological renewal of cultural heritage research in the context of the expansion of the subject field of heritage studies and the increasing attention to intangible forms of culture, memory, and cultural continuity. Contemporary practices of cultural preservation require instruments capable of linking philosophical reflection with applied analysis and managerial decision-making. The study problem is associated with the fragmentation of the methodological apparatus of heritage studies, the dominance of normative–procedural models, and the insufficient elaboration of the philosophical foundations of value, historicity, and responsibility in the analysis of tangible and intangible cultural heritage. This limits the explanatory potential of existing approaches and their ability to address the processual nature of cultural continuity. The scientific novelty of the study lies in the systematisation of klironomical methods for the study of cultural heritage and in the substantiation of klironomy as an integral methodological system that brings together philosophical, analytical, and applied levels of analysis. For the first time, a set of 25 klironomical methods is presented, and their applicability to tangible and intangible heritage is demonstrated within a unified methodological logic. The subject of the study is klironomical methods for analysing the processes of preservation of culture and art. The object of the study comprises the processes of preserving tangible and intangible cultural heritage as forms of historical continuity. The study aims to substantiate klironomical methods as a methodological transition from philosophical reconstruction to applied analysis of cultural heritage. The methodological framework of the study is based on philosophical reconstruction, categorial and axiological analysis, comparative-klironomical and matrix analysis, as well as methods of klironomical diagnostics, expertise, and design. The study generalises the ideas and approaches of J. Assmann, A. Assmann, P. Ricœur, P. Nora, F. Choay, L. Smith, R. Harrison, and other scholars of the philosophy of memory and heritage studies, as well as the author’s klironomical concept. The essence of the study consists in identifying the philosophical foundations of klironomical methods, critically analysing the methodological limitations of heritage studies, and developing an integral system of methods for analysing the preservation of culture. It is demonstrated how the philosophical categories of value, canon, and historicity are consistently translated into analytical and applied research instruments for the study of cultural heritage. Particular attention is paid to the differences and interrelations between tangible and intangible heritage within the klironomical approach. The author concludes that klironomical methods constitute an independent methodological system that ensures both philosophical depth and applied applicability in the analysis of cultural heritage, and confirms the validity of klironomy as a methodological bridge between the philosophy of culture and the practices of preserving culture and art.

Keywords: klironomy, cultural heritage, heritage studies, cultural memory, historical continuity, tangible heritage, intangible heritage, methodology of cultural preservation, philosophy of culture.

Introduction

At the beginning of the 21st century, cultural heritage studies acquired a stable interdisciplinary character and came to occupy an important position at the intersection of the philosophy of culture, cultural anthropology, art history, museology, archival studies, cultural policy, and international law. However, despite the institutional maturity of this field, a fundamental methodological problem persists, associated with the gap between the philosophical understanding of culture and the applied practices of its preservation. In most contemporary studies, heritage is considered primarily as an object of management, protection, restoration, or legal regulation, while questions of value, selection criteria, historical continuity, and the responsibility of the subject often remain either implicit or are fragmentarily borrowed from various philosophical traditions without their systematic integration.

The relevance of the study is determined by the fact that, under conditions of globalisation, the acceleration of historical time, the digitalisation of cultural memory, and the intensification of conflicts surrounding interpretations of the past, the limitations of purely institutional and technocratic approaches to cultural heritage preservation become increasingly evident. Contemporary practices of cultural protection more and more frequently encounter situations in which formally correct procedures fail to ensure the preservation of meaningful continuity, and cultural objects and practices lose their connection with living traditions, communities, and historical experience. This leads to phenomena such as museumification, the stylisation of the past, the ideologisation of the canon, and the reduction of heritage to a symbolic resource of cultural policy or tourism.

In this context, the need for a methodological transition from the description of individual preservation practices to the analysis of the philosophical and conceptual foundations that make the preservation of culture possible as a meaningful historical process acquires particular significance. It is precisely at this level that the demand arises for methods capable of linking the ontology of culture, the axiology of value, criteria of cultural selection, mechanisms of continuity, and forms of social legitimation within a single analytical framework. Without such a framework, cultural heritage studies remain fragmented and are unable to answer the question of why and on what grounds certain forms of culture are recognised as worthy of preservation.

The relevance of the klironomical approach is conditioned by the fact that it is oriented not towards individual heritage objects, but towards the analysis of the preservation of culture as a specific form of historical duration. Klironomy considers cultural heritage not as a set of monuments or practices, but as a process of selection, canonisation, interpretation, and transmission of meanings over time, embedded within the social, institutional, and symbolic structures of society. This makes it possible to overcome the methodological gap between the philosophy of culture and cultural heritage studies and to form a coherent analytical toolkit applicable both in theoretical research and in the applied sphere.

Consequently, the relevance of this study lies in the need to systematise klironomical methods as an independent methodological set capable of ensuring a transition from the philosophical reconstruction of the foundations of cultural preservation to their applied analysis in contemporary cultural heritage research. The development and description of such a set of methods constitute an important step towards renewing the methodology of cultural heritage studies and towards forming more reflexive and responsible practices of preserving culture and art.

The study problem is formed at the intersection of two interrelated, yet methodologically disconnected fields of inquiry—the philosophy of culture and applied cultural heritage studies. On the one hand, the philosophical tradition has long developed the categories of historicity,

memory, value, tradition, and cultural continuity; but these developments most often remain at the level of theoretical reflection and are not transformed into operational research methods. On the other hand, cultural heritage studies possess a well-developed applied toolkit, but to a large extent rely on normative, institutional, and managerial models in which the philosophical foundations of cultural preservation are either not articulated or are replaced by procedural and legal criteria.

The core problem lies in the absence of an integral methodological system capable of linking the philosophical understanding of culture with the practices of its preservation. In existing studies, methods for analysing value, selection, and canonisation of cultural forms are often borrowed fragmentarily from different disciplines—philosophy, sociology, anthropology, art history—without forming a unified analytical language. As a result, cultural heritage research becomes methodologically eclectic: the same phenomena are interpreted as historical sources, tourist resources, objects of identity, or elements of cultural policy, without clarifying the criteria on the basis of which such distinctions are made.

A significant aspect of the problem is also the gap between the description of cultural heritage and the analysis of the processes through which culture becomes heritage. In most applied studies, attention is focused on objects and practices that have already received institutional recognition, while the very mechanisms of selection, legitimation, and exclusion remain in the background. This leads to the naturalisation of the canon and to the perception of heritage as a “given” rather than as the result of historically conditioned decisions involving experts, institutions, communities, and state structures. The absence of methodological reflection on these processes hampers the critical analysis of memory conflicts, disputes over authenticity, and tensions between universalist and local models of cultural preservation.

An additional dimension of the research problem is connected with the limited applicability of existing cultural heritage research methods to intangible and processual forms of culture. Language, customs, rituals, forms of collective memory, and practices of everyday life are difficult to analyse within frameworks oriented towards the fixation, cataloguing, and protection of objects. As a result, there remains a risk of reducing living forms of cultural continuity to museum or archival representations, which contradicts the very logic of preserving culture as historical duration.

Under these conditions, there emerges a need for a methodological rethinking of the research tools used to analyse cultural heritage. The problem addressed in this study consists in identifying and systematising such methods that would, first, preserve the philosophical depth of cultural analysis; second, ensure the operability and applicability of methods in applied research; and third, make visible the normative and value-based foundations underlying preservation practices. It is precisely this task that determines the turn to klironomical methods as a possible solution to the identified methodological contradictions.

The scientific novelty of the study is determined both by the chosen research perspective and by the manner in which the methodology for studying cultural heritage is conceptualised. In contrast to existing works in the field of heritage studies, which are predominantly oriented towards the description of institutional practices, regulatory regimes, or individual cases of preservation, the study for the first time proposes a systematic consideration of klironomical methods as an autonomous and coherent methodological set. Such an approach makes it possible to move beyond the fragmentary borrowing of philosophical categories and to present the preservation of culture as a distinct analytical dimension of the humanities.

A fundamentally new aspect of the study is the shift from the analysis of individual philosophical concepts of cultural preservation to their methodological operationalisation. In

this study, klironomy is considered not only as a theoretical framework within the philosophy of culture, but also as a set of methods applicable to the analysis of real processes of institutionalisation, legitimation, and transmission of cultural meanings. This makes it possible to connect the philosophical reconstruction of the foundations of cultural continuity with the applied analysis of practices of cultural heritage preservation, something that has not previously been undertaken in a systematic form.

The novelty of the study also lies in the development of a typology of klironomical methods encompassing philosophical, analytical, and applied levels of cultural heritage research. For the first time, a structured distinction is proposed between methods aimed at identifying the ontological and axiological foundations of cultural preservation and methods oriented towards the diagnosis, evaluation, and design of processes of cultural continuity. Such a distinction makes it possible to overcome the methodological indeterminacy characteristic of many interdisciplinary studies and to establish a clear logic for the application of klironomical methods depending on the study task.

An additional aspect of scientific novelty is the inclusion of klironomical methods in the discussion on the contemporary development of heritage studies. The study demonstrates that the klironomical approach does not oppose existing directions in heritage research, but rather offers their methodological deepening through the explicit articulation of the value-based, normative, and historical foundations of cultural preservation. In this way, the study contributes to forming a more reflexive and conceptually grounded methodology for the study of cultural heritage, capable of considering both the philosophical and applied dimensions of the preservation of culture and art.

Within the framework of the study, the subject of the study is constituted by klironomical methods of studying cultural heritage, considered as a set of philosophical, analytical, and applied instruments aimed at identifying the foundations, mechanisms, and forms of preservation of culture and art. These methods are analysed not in isolation, but in their interrelation and functional unity, forming an integral methodological system of klironomy.

The object of the study comprises the processes of philosophical reflection, institutionalisation, and practical preservation of cultural heritage, including the formation of value foundations, criteria of cultural selection, the canon, mechanisms of continuity, and subjects of responsibility. The object of the research encompasses both theoretical models of cultural preservation and real practices of heritage studies in which these models find applied expression.

The study aims to systematise klironomical methods for the study of cultural heritage and to substantiate their applicability for the transition from the philosophical reconstruction of the foundations of cultural preservation to the applied analysis of contemporary heritage studies practices.

To achieve the stated purpose, the study envisages the solution of the following study objectives:

- identify the philosophical foundations of klironomical methods in the context of studies of cultural memory and historical continuity;
- analyse the methodological limitations of heritage studies with regard to tangible and intangible cultural heritage;
- systematise klironomical research methods and present them as an integral methodological system;
- distinguish between philosophical, analytical, and applied klironomical methods;

- demonstrate the specificity of applying klironomical methods to tangible and intangible cultural heritage;
- substantiate klironomy as a methodological transition from philosophical reconstruction to the applied analysis of cultural heritage.

The formulated aim and objectives define the logical structure of the study and determine the sequence of analysis of klironomical methods as an instrument of philosophical and applied interpretation of cultural heritage.

The results of the study are addressed to a wide range of specialists whose professional activity is connected with the analysis, interpretation, and preservation of cultural heritage at both theoretical and applied levels. First and foremost, the work is oriented towards researchers in philosophy of culture, philosophy of history, and humanities methodology, for whom the systematisation of klironomical methods may serve as a basis for the further development of theoretical models of cultural continuity and the preservation of culture and art.

An important target audience of the study consists of specialists in heritage studies, museology, archival studies, cultural anthropology, and art history who are interested in the methodological deepening of applied cultural heritage research. The proposed system of klironomical methods may be used for the critical analysis of existing practices of heritage protection and management, as well as for the development of more reflexive research strategies that consider the value-based and historical foundations of cultural preservation.

The results of the study are also intended for experts and practitioners involved in the formulation of cultural policy, the management of cultural heritage objects, and the development of programmes for the preservation of tangible and intangible heritage at national and international levels. Klironomical tools may be applied in the preparation of expert assessments, the evaluation of the cultural significance of objects and practices, and the design of institutional and educational mechanisms of cultural continuity.

In addition, the materials of the study may be of interest to teachers and students in the humanities, including philosophy, cultural studies, history, museum studies, and related disciplines. In an educational context, the developed methodological framework may be used to form a holistic understanding of cultural preservation as a philosophically grounded and socially responsible process that goes beyond narrowly applied procedures of heritage protection.

Methods

The methodological foundation of the study is formed by general scientific methods of cognition, which ensure the integrity of the analysis and make it possible to systematise heterogeneous philosophical and applied material related to the study of cultural heritage.

The method of analysis is applied for the step-by-step examination of various approaches to the study of cultural heritage presented in the philosophy of culture, heritage studies, cultural anthropology, and normative documents in the field of heritage protection. Within the framework of this study, analysis makes it possible to decompose the complex phenomenon of cultural preservation into individual components—value foundations, selection criteria, mechanisms of continuity, institutional forms, and subjects of responsibility—in order to identify their functional roles in the processes of cultural inheritance.

The method of synthesis is used to integrate the results of analysis into a coherent methodological model of klironomical research on cultural heritage. Through synthesis, individual elements of philosophical and applied knowledge are brought together into a system of klironomical methods, which makes it possible to demonstrate the internal interconnection between the theoretical foundations of cultural preservation and the practices of heritage studies.

In the study, synthesis serves as a tool for moving from fragmented approaches to an integrated klironomical framework.

The systemic approach is applied to consider cultural heritage as a complex, multi-level system that includes symbolic, social, institutional, and temporal dimensions. Within the framework of this study, the systemic approach makes it possible to analyse cultural preservation not as a set of isolated measures, but as a process in which philosophical ideas, normative frameworks, and applied practices form an interconnected structure of cultural continuity.

The method of classification is used to organise klironomical research methods and to distinguish them according to functional levels—philosophical, analytical, and applied. In the course of the study, classification makes it possible to identify groups of methods oriented towards the reconstruction of the foundations of cultural preservation, as well as methods aimed at the diagnosis, evaluation, and design of processes of cultural inheritance.

The method of typologisation is applied to identify stable types of methodological approaches to the preservation of cultural heritage and to compare klironomical methods with existing directions in heritage studies. In the study, typologisation is used in the formation of a comprehensive picture of methodological strategies, making it possible to demonstrate the specificity of the klironomical approach and its place within contemporary humanities scholarship.

The application of these general scientific methods ensures the logical consistency of the research and creates a foundation for subsequent recourse to philosophical and specialised klironomical methods of cultural heritage analysis.

Alongside general scientific methods, the study employs philosophical methods that ensure conceptual depth of analysis and make it possible to consider cultural heritage not only as an object of empirical description, but also as a phenomenon possessing ontological, axiological, and historical foundations.

The historical-philosophical method is applied to analyse the evolution of ideas concerning the preservation of culture and art in various philosophical traditions. In the course of this study, this method is used to identify the conceptual foundations upon which ideas of cultural continuity, canon, value, and responsibility for the past were formed, as well as to demonstrate how these ideas were subsequently reflected in contemporary approaches to the study of cultural heritage. Historical-philosophical analysis makes it possible to connect klironomical methods with their theoretical origins and to avoid reducing them to purely applied instruments.

Categorical analysis is used to clarify and systematise the key concepts underlying the klironomical approach, such as “culture”, “heritage”, “value”, “canon”, “continuity”, “memory”, and “responsibility”. Within the framework of the study, this method makes it possible to identify semantic distinctions and normative dimensions of these categories in different theoretical contexts and thus to create a conceptual foundation for constructing a klironomical methodology for heritage studies.

The hermeneutic method is applied to the interpretation of philosophical texts, cultural practices, and discourses related to the preservation of culture. In this study, hermeneutics is used to reveal meanings that are not always explicitly articulated in normative documents or applied heritage studies, but which nonetheless shape ways of understanding the past, cultural identity, and historical continuity. This makes it possible to identify the implicit value assumptions underlying heritage preservation practices.

The phenomenological approach is used to analyse cultural heritage as an experienced and interpreted phenomenon, rather than solely as an institutionally fixed object. In the course of the study, this approach makes it possible to consider the experiences of communities and

individuals for whom cultural heritage constitutes part of the lifeworld, thereby complementing institutional models of cultural preservation with an analysis of the subjective and intersubjective dimensions of cultural memory.

The combined application of philosophical methods ensures the methodological coherence of the research and creates a theoretical basis for the transition to specialised klironomical methods of analysis, oriented towards the study of cultural heritage preservation processes in their philosophical and applied dimensions.

A key place in the methodological structure of the study is occupied by specialised klironomical methods aimed at analysing the preservation of culture as a specific form of historical continuity. Unlike general scientific and philosophical methods, these methods are developed within klironomy itself and are directed towards identifying, systematising, and interpreting the mechanisms through which culture is transformed into heritage.

Klironomical reconstruction is used to identify the implicit foundations of the preservation of culture and art within philosophical theories, cultural practices, and institutional models that do not contain explicit reflection on heritage. In the course of this study, this method is applied to reconstruct the philosophical premises of value, canon, and continuity underlying contemporary approaches to heritage studies, which makes it possible to trace their genesis and conceptual limitations.

Matrix-based klironomical analysis is applied as a basic analytical tool for the systematisation of research material. The essence of this method lies in examining cultural heritage through a set of interrelated dimensions—ontological, axiological, normative, temporal, and socio-legitimational. Within the framework of the study, this method is used to compare different approaches to heritage research and to identify which elements of the klironomical matrix are articulated and which are ignored in specific methodological models.

Comparative klironomical analysis is aimed at comparing different philosophical and applied scenarios of cultural preservation. In this study, this method is used to compare the klironomical approach with dominant methodologies in heritage studies, as well as to identify differences between institutional, normative, and philosophical models of cultural heritage preservation across different scholarly traditions.

Klironomical matrix modelling is applied to construct integrated analytical models of cultural preservation that combine philosophical foundations with applied mechanisms. Within this study, this method is used to provide a synthetic representation of the system of klironomical methods and to demonstrate the logic of the transition from philosophical reconstruction to applied analysis of cultural heritage preservation processes.

Klironomical diagnostics is used to identify vulnerable areas and breaks in cultural continuity within existing heritage preservation practices. In this study, this method is applied at the theoretical level—to analyse the methodological limitations of cultural heritage research (heritage studies) and to identify those aspects of cultural continuity that remain outside its field of attention.

Klironomical expertise and prioritisation are aimed at substantiating criteria for the selection of cultural objects and practices subject to preservation. Within the study, this method is used for the critical analysis of normative and institutional mechanisms of heritage selection and to demonstrate the necessity of philosophically grounded criteria of cultural significance.

Klironomical design is applied to analyse and construct institutional and social mechanisms of cultural preservation. In the course of the study, this method is used for the conceptual comprehension of how klironomical principles may be integrated into heritage studies, cultural policy, and heritage management practices.

The combined application of specialised klironomical methods makes it possible not only to systematise existing approaches to the study of cultural heritage, but also to substantiate klironomy as a methodological bridge between the philosophical comprehension of culture and the applied analysis of its preservation processes.

Literature Review

The formation of heritage studies as an interdisciplinary field is associated with the institutionalisation of cultural heritage protection and with the expansion of international normative regimes in the second half of the 20th and the early 21st centuries. Already at the level of foundational documents, it is evident that the field has developed around the tasks of identifying, preserving, managing, and publicly legitimising heritage: from the classical principles of conservation and restoration articulated in the Venice Charter to subsequent discussions of authenticity and cultural significance (*International Charter...*, 1964/1965; *The Nara Document on Authenticity*, 1994). Subsequently, the institutional framework expanded significantly through the recognition of intangible heritage and the development of procedures for its inventorying, representation, and transmission (*Convention...*, 2003; *Operational Directives...*, n.d.). As a result, heritage studies have become established as a field in which a normative vocabulary—“authenticity”, “integrity”, “value”, “significance”, “protection”, “management”—functions as a central methodological resource of research.

However, it is precisely the normative “proceduralism” of the field that generates one of its key methodological effects: research approaches are often constructed around already recognised heritage objects and practices, that is, around what has already passed through the institutional filter of selection. On the one hand, this renders the field practically oriented and applicable to cultural policy. On the other hand, such an orientation contributes to the naturalisation of heritage as a “ready-made” cultural fact and reduces attention to the processes through which culture is transformed into heritage: the mechanisms of selection, exclusion, canonisation, and legitimation (*Smith*, 2006; *Harrison*, 2012). In other words, heritage is fixed as the result of management and protection, while its genesis and philosophical foundations often become secondary to administrative procedures.

The critical turn in heritage studies was precisely associated with attempts to expose this apparent neutrality of heritage and to demonstrate its constructed character. In the works of L. Smith, heritage is interpreted not as a thing, but as a social practice within which power relations and normative representations of the past are reproduced; it is here that the key concept of “authorised heritage discourse” emerges, defining legitimate ways of speaking about culture and thereby shaping the canon (*Smith*, 2006). R. Harrison develops this line of inquiry by showing that “heritage” functions as a critical category for analysing contemporary regimes of knowledge and identity, in which the selection of cultural forms is inseparable from political decisions and institutional infrastructures (*Harrison*, 2012). Collective research presented in handbooks on contemporary heritage studies further emphasises the plurality of methodologies—from discourse analysis and anthropology to critiques of cultural policy—while simultaneously demonstrating that the field often advances “from below” through the accumulation of case studies and thematic strands rather than through a unified theoretical system (*Waterton & Watson*, 2015).

At the same time, the critical tradition, while expanding the horizons of heritage studies, retains several persistent limitations. The first is the dominance of analyses of discourses and practices over the philosophical reflection on the foundations of preservation. Researchers may convincingly demonstrate how institutions and experts “produce” heritage, yet the question of

why the preservation of culture possesses normative force at all—what grounds the value of cultural duration, and how memory, historicity, and responsibility towards the future are interconnected—often remains either bracketed or addressed only fragmentarily through borrowings from theories of memory and identity (*Halbwachs, 1950; Nora, 1984; Ricoeur, 2000*). In this sense, critical heritage studies frequently diagnose the problem of “power over the past” but do not always provide a systematic instrument for analysing the philosophical legitimation of cultural preservation as a historical task.

The second limitation is connected with methodological fragmentation. Heritage studies are inherently interdisciplinary, yet interdisciplinarity often takes the form of a “mosaic” of methods: legal analysis in intangible heritage (*Lixinski, 2013*), politico-institutional critique of international regimes (*Meskeel, 2018*), anthropological studies of cultural practices (*Prats, 1997*), and analyses of conflicts and competing narratives (*Silverman, 2011; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996*). While such plurality is productive, it complicates the creation of a unified explanatory language: identical phenomena are described through incommensurable categorical frameworks (identity, resource, law, tourism, memory politics), and transitions between them often remain methodologically unarticulated (*King, 2024; Waterton & Watson, 2015*). As a result, heritage research frequently turns into a set of parallel “modes of description” that are difficult to integrate into a coherent theory of cultural preservation.

The third limitation concerns the asymmetry between object-oriented and process-oriented analyses of heritage. Normative documents underlying heritage protection practices presuppose the fixation and formalisation of an object: a monument, a site, a practice, or an element of intangible heritage. Even in the case of intangible heritage, institutional logic requires description, inventorying, and reporting, which creates the risk of the “objectification” of living traditions and their transfer into a regime of representation (*Convention..., 2003; Operational Directives..., n.d.*). Heritage critics note that such a logic may generate the illusion of preservation while simultaneously entailing the loss of cultural context and semantic dynamism: tradition is “preserved” as a list of characteristics or as an “object of display”, yet ceases to function as a practice of transmission (*Smith & Akagawa, 2009*). Consequently, the methodology of heritage studies proves strong in procedures of recognition and accounting, but less effective in describing cultural continuity as a long-term, changing, and conflictual process.

The fourth limitation becomes evident in situations of dissonant and contested heritage. Research demonstrates that heritage often functions as a resource of conflict: different groups compete for interpretations of the past, for the recognition of “their” objects, and for the exclusion of “alien” symbols (*Silverman, 2011; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996*). Under such conditions, normative criteria of significance and authenticity prove insufficient: the conflict does not revolve around the “fact” of value, but around who has the right, and on what grounds, to define the meaning and status of a cultural object. L. Meskeel shows that international heritage regimes may reproduce political asymmetries and institutional interests while masking them with rhetoric of universalism and peace (*Meskeel, 2018*). This exposes a methodological problem: descriptions of conflict and managerial solutions do not substitute for philosophical analysis of responsibility, legitimation, and the limits of canonisation.

The fifth limitation is associated with national heritage regimes and identity politics. Studies of antiquity, archaeology, and national imagination demonstrate that heritage preservation is closely linked to the project of the nation: the selection and interpretation of the past contribute to the legitimation of collective identity (*Hamilakis, 2007*). Similarly, in the Asian context, heritage management policies and cultural diplomacy show that heritage becomes an instrument of national interests and external representation (*Akagawa, 2014; Pai, 2013/2014*). These works are

methodologically important, as they reveal the structural duality of heritage: it claims universal value, yet operates within national and geopolitical strategies. Nevertheless, here too there is often a lack of an instrument capable of connecting empirical descriptions of heritage policy with a philosophical analysis of criteria of cultural value and historical duration.

Sixth limitation is the insufficient integration of the philosophy of time and historicity into the methodological core of cultural heritage studies. Although memory studies have become an important intellectual foundation of the field, they are not always translated into a systematic methodology of cultural preservation. The concept of “sites of memory” emphasises that memory is institutionalised and materialised in symbolic forms, yet it does not in itself establish criteria for what exactly should be preserved and why (*Nora, 1984*). The theory of collective memory demonstrates the social nature of remembrance; however, it leaves open the question of normative responsibility and the long-term prospects of culture over time (*Halbwachs, 1950*). Ricoeur’s triad “memory—history—forgetting” brings the problem into the realm of ethics and interpretation, but in applied heritage research these philosophical distinctions are often reduced to the rhetoric of “preserving memory” without analytical elaboration (*Ricoeur, 2000*). The Assmannian tradition of cultural memory places emphasis on institutional forms that secure cultural duration, yet within cultural heritage studies it is likewise frequently employed as a theoretical background rather than as the foundation of a methodological system (*Assmann, J., 1992; Assmann, A., 2003; Macdonald, 2013*).

Finally, it should be noted that the field of cultural heritage studies increasingly recognises the need for methodological reflection and systematisation. A telling development is the turn towards explicit discussion of methods and methodologies as an independent subject of inquiry: contemporary syntheses seek to clarify which methods are employed, what their epistemological foundations are, and how they relate to normative and critical frameworks (*King, 2024*). Nevertheless, even with this shift, the problem of a conceptual “bridge” between the philosophical level of understanding cultural preservation and the applied level of analysing heritage practices remains unresolved. In particular, practical heritage protection regimes rely on documents such as the Venice Charter, the Nara Document, and the Burra Charter, yet the interpretation of their categories (authenticity, significance, cultural value) often remains procedural and does not disclose the philosophical premises of cultural responsibility (*International Charter..., 1964/1965; The Burra Charter..., 2013; The Nara Document on Authenticity, 1994*). Similarly, the Faro Convention translates the issue of heritage into the domain of social value and participation, but methodologically it does not replace philosophical analysis of value criteria and the boundaries of canonisation (*Framework Convention..., 2005; Convenzione di Faro, 2005*).

Consequently, the methodology of cultural heritage studies demonstrates a high level of institutional and applied maturity, yet it faces fundamental limitations: (1) a normative–procedural reduction of the philosophical foundations of cultural preservation; (2) fragmentation and eclecticism of methodological tools; (3) the dominance of object-centred logic over the analysis of processes through which culture becomes heritage; (4) the insufficiency of methods for analysing conflicts, exclusions, and dissonant heritages; (5) weak integration of the philosophy of historicity, duration, and responsibility into the operational apparatus of research. It is precisely the identification of these limitations that provides the basis for turning to klironomy as a methodological system oriented towards analysing cultural preservation as a form of historical continuity and as a normatively articulated social process (*Buychik, 2019; Buychik, 2024*).

The philosophical foundations of cultural heritage research are formed at the intersection of the philosophy of culture, the philosophy of history, theories of memory, and the ethics of historical responsibility. Unlike applied and normative approaches within cultural heritage studies, the philosophical tradition does not initially address procedures of protection or management, but rather the question of why culture should be preserved, how the past continues to act in the present, and what forms of responsibility arise in relation to cultural duration. It is at this level that the conceptual premises are established without which the methodology of heritage studies lacks normative depth.

One of the fundamental philosophical currents that has influenced the understanding of cultural heritage is the theory of collective and cultural memory. In the classical work of M. Halbwachs, memory is considered a socially mediated phenomenon formed within group structures and symbolic systems, rather than an individual psychological property (*Halbwachs, 1950*). This approach is fundamentally important for heritage research, as it demonstrates that the preservation of the past is not a neutral reproduction of facts, but is always linked to social frameworks of interpretation. However, the theory of collective memory in itself does not provide an answer to the question of normative criteria of preservation: it explains how society remembers, but not why certain forms of the past should be preserved.

The further development of the philosophy of memory is associated with the works of J. Assmann, in which a distinction is introduced between communicative and cultural memory. Cultural memory is understood as an institutionalised form of duration that ensures the transmission of meanings beyond the living memory of generations (*Assmann, J., 1992*). This distinction has direct methodological significance for heritage studies, as it allows museums, archives, canons, and rituals to be analysed as mechanisms for fixing cultural duration. At the same time, Assmann emphasises the normative character of cultural memory: it always presupposes selection, stabilisation, and symbolic codification of the past. A similar line is developed by A. Assmann, who analyses “spaces of memory” as forms of institutional and symbolic consolidation of historical experience (*Assmann, A., 2003*). In the context of cultural heritage studies, these concepts are often used as a theoretical background; but their philosophical potential is far from always translated into a methodology for analysing processes of canonisation and exclusion.

A significant contribution to the philosophical understanding of heritage is made by the concept of *lieux de mémoire* proposed by P. Nora. Nora demonstrates that sites of memory emerge under conditions of the loss of living tradition and represent an attempt to compensate for the rupture between past and present through symbolic and institutional forms (*Nora, 1984*). For the methodology of heritage research, this means that the preservation of culture is not a natural continuation of tradition, but is instead associated with a crisis of historical continuity. At the same time, the concept of sites of memory identifies a symptom but does not offer a universal criterion for assessing the cultural significance of preserved forms, which limits its applicability as an independent methodological foundation.

A more developed philosophical perspective is offered by P. Ricoeur, who examines the relationship between memory, history, and forgetting as an ethical and hermeneutic problem. In his interpretation, the preservation of the past is linked to responsibility for interpretation, recognition of the plurality of narratives, and awareness of the inevitability of forgetting as a structural element of historical experience (*Ricoeur, 2000*). For cultural heritage research, this implies the necessity of moving beyond the simplistic logic of “preservation at any cost” and of addressing questions concerning the limits of canonisation, the admissibility of exclusions, and responsibility for interpretative decisions. However, in applied heritage research, Ricoeur’s

problematic is more often used declaratively and rarely becomes the basis for operational methodological procedures.

The philosophy of culture also offers important foundations for analysing heritage through the category of value. In her *Allegory of Heritage*, F. Choay (1992) shows that the modern concept of heritage is the result of historical development and reflects a transformation in society's attitude to the past—from utilitarian and symbolic use to aesthetic and historical reflection. This analysis demonstrates that the very concept of heritage is neither universal nor immutable and therefore requires philosophical reconstruction in each specific historical context. For the methodology of heritage studies, this conclusion implies the need for continuous revision of the categories and criteria of cultural significance in use.

The philosophical and political dimension of cultural preservation is vividly manifested in the works of S. Settis, devoted to the critique of the commercialisation and instrumentalisation of cultural heritage. He shows that under conditions of market logic and political pressure, heritage is increasingly treated as a resource rather than as a form of historical responsibility, which leads to the erosion of its cultural meaning (Settis, 2002). These ideas complement critical approaches within heritage studies, while at the same time making more explicit the philosophical problem of the conflict between economic, political, and culturally normative foundations of preservation.

The philosophical foundations of cultural heritage research are also reflected, albeit indirectly, in normative documents. The Faro Convention of the Council of Europe introduces the concept of the value of heritage for society and emphasises the role of communities and citizens in preservation processes (*Convenzione di Faro, 2005; Framework Convention..., 2005*). Despite the applied nature of the document, it implicitly contains the philosophical idea of responsibility and participation as the basis of cultural continuity. Similarly, debates on authenticity in the Nara Document reflect a philosophical shift from universalist criteria towards cultural-historical pluralism (*The Nara Document on Authenticity, 1994*). However, these philosophical implications rarely become the subject of systematic methodological analysis within cultural heritage research (heritage studies).

Consequently, the philosophical foundations of cultural heritage research form a complex and multilayered theoretical field that includes theories of memory, philosophy of history, axiology of culture, and ethics of responsibility. These approaches make it possible to conceptualise cultural preservation as a normatively and historically charged process associated with the selection, interpretation, and transmission of meanings over time. At the same time, within heritage studies, philosophical concepts are more often used fragmentarily and do not coalesce into an integrated methodological system. It is precisely this gap between philosophical depth and applied operability that creates the preconditions for turning to the klironomical approach, which seeks to integrate the philosophical foundations of cultural preservation into a systematic analytical toolkit for the study of cultural heritage (Buychik, 2019; Buychik, 2024).

The formation of the klironomical approach is associated with an attempt to overcome the identified methodological limitations in cultural heritage research (heritage studies) by integrating the philosophical foundations of cultural preservation into a coherent research system. Unlike the dominant directions of heritage studies, klironomy is not initially oriented towards the description of individual objects or practices, but towards the analysis of cultural preservation as a specific form of historical duration that includes processes of selection, canonisation, interpretation, and the transmission of meanings over time (Buychik, 2019).

The methodological specificity of klironomy lies in a shift of the research focus from the institutional outcome of preservation to the very process of the transformation of culture into

heritage. Whereas in heritage studies heritage is most often considered as a set of recognised objects and practices, the klironomical approach interprets it as a dynamic structure formed as a result of historically conditioned decisions, value preferences, and normative attitudes. In this respect, klironomy is conceptually close to philosophical theories of cultural memory, but seeks to translate them into an operational methodological language applicable to the analysis of real practices of cultural preservation (*Assmann, J., 1992; Assmann, A., 2003*).

An important stage in the formation of the klironomical approach was the recognition of the limitations of both normative and critical models of cultural heritage research (heritage studies). Normative documents such as the Venice Charter, the Nara Document on Authenticity, and the Burra Charter establish procedures and principles for heritage protection, but do not address the question of the philosophical foundations of cultural value and historical responsibility (*International Charter..., 1964/1965; The Burra Charter..., 2013; The Nara Document on Authenticity, 1994*). Critical directions in heritage studies, by contrast, reveal the social and political conditioning of heritage, but often remain limited to the analysis of discourses and power relations, without offering a systematised methodology for analysing cultural continuity as a long-term process (*Smith, 2006; Harrison, 2012*).

Klironomy is formed as a response to this methodological divergence. It proceeds from the premise that the preservation of culture cannot be reduced either to procedures of protection or to critiques of institutional discourses, since at its core it constitutes a normatively meaningful historical process. In this context, the klironomical approach integrates the philosophy of memory, the philosophy of history, and the axiology of culture into a unified analytical framework that makes it possible to consider heritage both as a result and as a process of cultural continuity (*Nora, 1984; Ricoeur, 2000*).

A key feature of the klironomical approach is the development of the klironomical matrix as a tool for the systematic analysis of cultural preservation. This matrix includes interrelated dimensions: ontological (the status of culture and art), axiological (value and significance), normative (criteria of selection and canon), temporal (historicity and duration), and social-legitimational (subjects and forms of responsibility). Unlike the eclectic set of methods characteristic of cultural heritage research (heritage studies), the klironomical matrix establishes a structured research logic, making it possible to correlate philosophical foundations with applied practices of cultural heritage preservation (*Buychik, 2024*).

The formation of the klironomical approach is also associated with the expansion of the analytical field beyond material heritage. Studies on intangible heritage emphasise that cultural practices, rituals, and forms of collective memory cannot be adequately understood within object-oriented models (*Lixinski, 2013; Smith & Akagawa, 2009*). Klironomy takes this conclusion into account by conceptualising intangible heritage as a processual form of cultural continuity that requires analysis of mechanisms of transmission, interpretation, and adaptation, rather than mere documentation and representation.

At the international level, ideas close to the klironomical approach are reflected in normative documents oriented towards community participation and the recognition of the social value of heritage. In particular, the Faro Convention emphasises the importance of cultural heritage for society and introduces the concept of collective responsibility for its preservation (*Convenzione di Faro, 2005; Framework Convention..., 2005*). Klironomy, however, takes a further step by proposing methodological tools for analysing how this responsibility is formed, distributed, and implemented within specific cultural and institutional contexts.

An important contribution of the klironomical approach lies in its ability to connect philosophical and applied levels of analysis. Unlike purely theoretical models in the philosophy

of culture and practice-oriented studies of cultural heritage (heritage studies), klironomy offers a system of methods applicable both to the reconstruction of the philosophical foundations of cultural preservation and to the analysis of contemporary practices of cultural policy, museum activity, and heritage management. In this sense, the klironomical approach functions as a methodological “bridge” between philosophical reflection and applied research on cultural heritage (Buychik, 2019; Buychik, 2024).

Consequently, the formation of the klironomical approach reflects an aspiration to overcome the methodological fragmentation of cultural heritage research and to create a holistic system for analysing the preservation of culture and art. By integrating philosophical foundations of memory, value, and historicity with the applied objectives of cultural heritage research (heritage studies), klironomy establishes an independent methodological perspective oriented towards understanding cultural heritage as a process of historical continuity that requires a normatively and philosophically grounded approach.

The literature review conducted shows that contemporary cultural heritage research constitutes a well-developed, institutionally established, and interdisciplinary field with an extensive applied and normative toolkit. Normative documents produced by international organisations, as well as methodological developments within heritage studies, have created a stable foundation for the identification, protection, and management of cultural heritage. At the same time, the analysis of scholarly sources reveals a number of systemic limitations related to the methodological structure of this field.

First, the literature in heritage studies demonstrates the dominance of a procedural-normative approach to cultural preservation. Despite the development of critical strands and the expansion of the research field, the preservation of cultural heritage is most often conceptualised through the prism of management, expertise, and institutional legitimation of already recognised objects and practices. This leads to insufficient reflection on processes of selection, canonisation, and exclusion of cultural forms, as well as on the philosophical foundations of cultural value and historical responsibility.

Second, philosophical concepts of memory, historicity, and cultural duration, developed within the philosophy of culture and the philosophy of history, exert a significant influence on the theoretical background of heritage research but are rarely translated into operational methodological models. Theories of collective and cultural memory, concepts of *lieux de mémoire*, and philosophical interpretations of time and forgetting are used fragmentarily, primarily as interpretative frameworks, which limits their potential for the systematic analysis of cultural preservation as a historical process.

Third, the literature review reveals methodological fragmentation within cultural heritage research. The diversity of disciplinary approaches—from anthropology and sociology to international law and cultural policy—contributes to the richness of empirical material, but simultaneously complicates the formation of a unified analytical language. As a result, different aspects of heritage are analysed in parallel, without clear correlation with shared categories of value, time, canon, and the subject of responsibility.

Fourth, the analysis of works devoted to intangible, contested, and dissonant heritage demonstrates the limitations of object-oriented models of cultural preservation. The cataloguing and institutional fixation of cultural practices often lead to a reduction of the processual character of cultural continuity, which contradicts the logic of preserving living traditions and forms of collective memory. These limitations are particularly evident in contexts of cultural conflict and competing interpretations of the past.

Fifth, consideration of forming the klironomical approach in the literature allows the conclusion that it has significant potential as a methodological alternative and complement to existing strands of heritage studies. Klironomy proposes a holistic analytical framework oriented towards the study of cultural preservation as a normatively conceptualised process of historical duration. The integration of philosophical foundations of memory, axiology, and historicity with applied tasks of cultural heritage analysis makes it possible to overcome the identified methodological gaps and to develop a systematic research toolkit.

Thus, the results of the literature review confirm the necessity of further developing klironomical methods as an independent methodological set. The identified limitations of existing approaches substantiate the transition to an analysis of philosophical and applied klironomical methods in the subsequent sections of the article and establish the conceptual foundations for interpreting the research findings.

Results

Systematisation of Klironomical Methods for the Study of Cultural Heritage

The formation of an integrated system of klironomical methods for the study of cultural heritage constitutes one of the key results of the present research. In contrast to existing approaches in heritage studies, where analytical methods are presented in a fragmented manner and dispersed across different disciplinary traditions, the klironomical approach makes it possible to assemble disparate research tools into a unified methodological configuration oriented towards the analysis of cultural preservation as a form of historical continuity. Within the framework of this study, 25 klironomical methods (*Table 1*) have been systematically identified for the first time, encompassing the philosophical, analytical, and applied levels of cultural heritage research.

This system of methods is formed on the basis of a fundamental distinction between heritage as an object of protection and heritage as a process of the transmission of meanings. This distinction makes it possible to avoid reducing klironomy to an applied technique of cultural resource management, while at the same time preventing its reduction to purely theoretical philosophical reflection. As a result, klironomical methods are structured as a hierarchically and functionally interconnected system in which philosophical methods establish the foundations of analysis, analytical methods ensure the structuring of material, and applied methods make it possible to proceed to the diagnosis, expert assessment, and design of cultural preservation processes.

A significant outcome of this systematisation is the inclusion within the set of klironomical methods of those oriented both towards material cultural heritage and those applicable to the analysis of intangible forms of culture. While material heritage presupposes work with objects, spaces, and artefacts, intangible heritage requires the analysis of practices, forms of memory, rituals, languages, and modes of transmitting experience. Within the klironomical system, these differences do not lead to a rupture in methodology; on the contrary, they emphasise the necessity of a multi-level analysis in which object-based and processual forms of culture are examined within a unified logic of historical duration.

The presentation of the complete set of klironomical methods also makes it possible to establish a distinction between methods aimed at identifying the foundations of cultural preservation and methods focused on the analysis of specific practices within heritage studies. Philosophical klironomical methods are oriented towards the reconstruction of value-based, normative, and temporal preconditions of preservation, whereas analytical and applied methods

are directed towards the study of mechanisms of selection, legitimation, and institutionalisation of cultural heritage. Such a differentiation eliminates the methodological ambiguity characteristic of many interdisciplinary studies and establishes a clear logic for the application of klironomical methods depending on the research task.

Consequently, the systematisation of klironomical methods in the form of an integrated set makes it possible to consider klironomy not as a set of isolated analytical techniques, but as an autonomous methodological system. This result provides a foundation for the further differentiation of methods according to functional levels and for their consistent description in the context of analysing material and intangible cultural heritage.

The differentiation of klironomical methods by functional levels represents the next stage of systematisation and makes it possible to clarify the internal structure of the established methodological set. Within the framework of this research, klironomical methods are distributed into three interrelated, but not identical, groups: philosophical, analytical, and applied. This division is not hierarchically disciplinary in nature, but rather functional and methodological, and it reflects different levels of analysis of cultural heritage preservation processes.

Philosophical klironomical methods constitute the theoretical foundation of the entire system and are aimed at identifying the fundamental preconditions of cultural continuity. This group includes methods of klironomical reconstruction, categorical analysis, analysis of value, criteria of cultural selection, canon, historicity, and the subject of preservation. Their primary function is to clarify how culture is understood as meaningful and worthy of preservation, and which normative and temporal foundations underlie this recognition. These methods are applicable to both material and intangible heritage, as they operate at the level of meanings, values, and historical representations that precede any institutional fixation.

Analytical klironomical methods occupy an intermediate position between philosophical reflection and applied analysis. Their task consists in structuring research material and identifying relationships between different dimensions of cultural preservation. This group includes matrix klironomical analysis, comparative klironomical analysis, klironomical modelling, analysis of the multiplicity of klironomical scenarios, and analysis of publicity and legitimation. These methods make it possible to translate philosophical foundations into analytical schemes suitable for comparing different traditions, institutions, and practices of heritage preservation. In the context of material heritage, they are used to analyse ensembles, historical landscapes, and institutional protection regimes, whereas with regard to intangible heritage they are applied to the study of forms of transmission, representation, and public recognition of cultural practices.

Applied klironomical methods are oriented towards the analysis of specific situations of cultural heritage preservation and towards the development of practice-oriented solutions. These include klironomical diagnostics, expert assessment and prioritisation, analysis of risks and institutional threats, klironomical design, mapping of preservation actors, critique of representation and exclusion, as well as methods of digital klironomy. These methods make it possible to work with empirical data, normative regimes, and institutional structures, identifying vulnerable zones of cultural continuity and opportunities for its sustainable support. In the case of material heritage, applied methods are directed at objects, infrastructures, and legal protection regimes, whereas with regard to intangible heritage they focus on analysing the conditions for the reproduction of practices, community participation, and the preservation of transmission contexts.

Such a three-level differentiation of klironomical methods demonstrates that klironomy does not oppose theory and practice, but rather constructs a consistent methodological linkage between them. Philosophical methods establish the foundations and criteria, analytical methods

ensure structuring and comparability, while applied methods make possible the transition to practical analysis and the design of processes for the preservation of cultural heritage. This differentiation creates a methodological basis for the further consideration of klironomical methods in their philosophical and applied dimensions.

The correlation of klironomical methods with the main types of cultural heritage makes it possible to clarify their analytical potential and to demonstrate the universality of the klironomical approach. Within the framework of the present study, the distinction between tangible and intangible cultural heritage is considered not as a basis for separating methodologies, but as a difference in research emphases within a unified system of klironomical methods. This approach fundamentally distinguishes klironomy from object-oriented models of heritage studies, in which tangible and intangible heritage are often analysed separately and with the use of incommensurable methodological tools.

In the analysis of tangible cultural heritage, klironomical methods are oriented towards identifying the semantic and normative foundations underlying the preservation of objects, ensembles, and cultural landscapes. Philosophical methods are employed to reconstruct value-based conceptions of authenticity, historical significance, and the symbolic status of material forms of culture. Analytical methods make it possible to structure the relationships between objects, institutional regimes of protection, and public forms of legitimation. Applied klironomical methods, in turn, are used to diagnose vulnerabilities, to assess preservation priorities, and to design sustainable models of institutional support for tangible heritage.

With regard to intangible cultural heritage, klironomical methods shift the focus from the object to the process. Here, philosophical methods of analysing memory, continuity, responsibility, and historical duration acquire key importance, since intangible forms of culture exist primarily as practices of transmission and interpretation. Analytical klironomical methods are used to identify scenarios of the reproduction of traditions, forms of public recognition, and mechanisms of canonisation of intangible practices. Applied methods are directed towards analysing the conditions for preserving the context of transmission, community participation, and minimising the risks of reducing living cultural forms to museum or archival representations.

A significant result of such a correlation is the demonstration that klironomical methods are not rigidly bound to a specific type of heritage, but are adapted to the specificity of the cultural phenomenon under study. The same method, for example klironomical reconstruction or the analysis of criteria of cultural selection, can be applied both to material objects and to intangible practices; in this case, it is not the logic of the method that changes, but the level and character of the analytical focus. This ensures methodological continuity of analysis and makes it possible to consider tangible and intangible heritage as interconnected forms of cultural continuity.

Thus, the results of the systematisation of klironomical methods allow several generalising conclusions to be drawn:

- 1) klironomical methods form a holistic and internally coherent methodological system encompassing the philosophical, analytical, and applied levels of research into cultural heritage;
- 2) this system is applicable to both tangible and intangible heritage without loss of conceptual integrity;
- 3) the differentiation and correlation of methods by functional levels and types of heritage create a basis for a consistent transition from philosophical analysis of the foundations of cultural preservation to applied research into specific practices of heritage studies.

These conclusions establish a logical framework for the further consideration of philosophical and applied klironomical methods in the subsequent paragraphs.

Philosophical Klironomical Methods

Philosophical klironomical methods of reconstruction and categorical analysis are aimed at identifying those semantic and normative foundations that precede any applied practices of cultural heritage preservation. Within the framework of the present study, these methods are used to reconstruct implicit conceptions of the value of culture, the mechanisms of its transmission, and the conditions under which cultural forms are recognised as worthy of preservation. Unlike descriptive and normative approaches in heritage studies, philosophical klironomical reconstruction makes it possible to analyse not only institutional decisions, but also the philosophical presuppositions that render these decisions possible and legitimate.

Klironomical reconstruction is applied as a method for identifying historically changing models of attitudes towards culture and art. It allows one to trace how, in different philosophical and cultural-historical contexts, conceptions of memory, canon, authenticity, and continuity were formed, which underlie contemporary heritage preservation practices. In the course of the present research, this method is used to correlate contemporary categories of heritage studies with philosophical theories of cultural memory and historicity, which have demonstrated that the preservation of culture is always associated with normative choice and the symbolic stabilisation of the past (*Assmann, J., 1992; Assmann, A., 2003; Ricoeur, 2000*).

Categorical klironomical analysis constitutes the next stage of philosophical inquiry and is aimed at the systematic clarification of the basic concepts employed in the discourse of cultural heritage preservation. Within the study, such categories as value, criterion, canon, memory, continuity, authenticity, and responsibility are analysed. This method makes it possible to identify semantic divergences between philosophical interpretations of these categories and their procedural use in normative documents and applied heritage studies. For example, the concept of authenticity in a philosophical context is associated with historicity and interpretation, whereas in institutional practices it is often reduced to formal features of compliance (*The Nara Document on Authenticity, 1994*).

Categorical analysis acquires particular significance when examining the differences between tangible and intangible cultural heritage. With regard to tangible objects, the categories of authenticity, integrity, and historical significance are most often interpreted through physical characteristics and spatial parameters. In the case of intangible heritage, the same categories acquire a processual character and are linked to conditions of transmission, performance context, and the participation of tradition bearers. Categorical klironomical analysis makes it possible to avoid a methodological rupture between these types of heritage by showing that the distinction is not ontological but analytical in nature and requires an appropriate adjustment of the research focus (*Smith & Akagawa, 2009*).

An important component of philosophical klironomical methods is the analysis of the canon as a specific form of cultural stabilisation. In the present study, the canon is considered not as a fixed list of cultural values, but as a dynamic mechanism of selection and legitimation that depends on historical context and institutional conditions. The klironomical analysis of the canon makes it possible to trace how certain cultural forms acquire the status of heritage, while others are displaced or marginalised. This approach correlates with critical heritage studies that point to the social and political conditionality of canonisation, while supplementing them with a philosophical analysis of the normative foundations of this process (*Harrison, 2012; Smith, 2006*).

The use of methods of reconstruction and categorical analysis within the framework of philosophical klironomy makes it possible to establish a connection between historical models

of thinking about culture and contemporary practices of its preservation. These methods define the conceptual coordinates of the study, within which tangible and intangible cultural heritage are regarded as forms of historical duration that require meaningful normative and philosophical analysis.

Axiological and temporal klironomical methods are oriented towards identifying the value-based and temporal foundations of the preservation of culture and art and constitute the next level of philosophical analysis within the klironomical approach. Unlike reconstructive and categorical methods, which are primarily aimed at clarifying the conceptual apparatus, these methods make it possible to investigate how the recognition of cultural significance is formed and how the preservation of culture correlates with conceptions of time, historical duration, and responsibility towards future generations.

Klironomical axiological analysis is used to identify the foundations of cultural value and the principles of its recognition. Within the present study, this method is applied to compare different models of value present in the philosophy of culture, normative documents, and heritage studies practices. The analysis shows that the value of cultural heritage is not universal or self-evident, but is formed through processes of historical and social selection based on aesthetic, historical, identity-related, and symbolic criteria (*Choay, 1992; Lowenthal, 2015*). With regard to tangible heritage, axiological analysis makes it possible to reveal the tension between the aesthetic, historical, and utilitarian value of objects, whereas in the case of intangible heritage it reveals the dependence of value recognition on the viability of practices and their significance for the bearers of tradition (*Smith & Akagawa, 2009*).

Closely related to axiological analysis is the klironomical analysis of criteria of cultural selection, aimed at investigating the mechanisms through which distinctions are drawn between what is subject to preservation and what falls outside the heritage canon. Within the framework of the present study, this method is applied to the analysis of expert, institutional, and public criteria for the selection of cultural forms. With regard to tangible heritage, this is manifested in priorities of restoration, protection, and the inclusion of objects in registers, whereas with regard to intangible heritage it is reflected in procedures of recognition, inventorying, and the representation of cultural practices. The analysis demonstrates that criteria of selection are always normative in nature and reflect a particular philosophy of culture and history, even when they are presented in the form of formally technical procedures (*Convention..., 2003; Framework Convention..., 2005*).

The temporal dimension of klironomy is revealed through the klironomical analysis of historicity and time, aimed at examining the ways in which the past, present, and future are conceptualised within practices of cultural preservation. Within the study, this method is used to identify differences between retrospective models of preservation, oriented towards the fixation of a lost past, and processual models that presuppose the maintenance of cultural duration and the adaptation of traditions over time. At the philosophical level, this analysis is grounded in the distinction between memory as the actualisation of the past and history as interpretative reconstruction, as well as in the recognition of the inevitability of forgetting as a structural element of historical experience (*Nora, 1984; Ricoeur, 2000*).

The application of temporal klironomical methods makes it possible to reconsider the differences between tangible and intangible heritage. Tangible objects are most often incorporated into regimes of preservation oriented towards the stabilisation of form and the minimisation of change, whereas intangible heritage presupposes the continuity of transformations and adaptations. Klironomical analysis of historicity makes it possible to avoid opposing these models, instead viewing them as different ways of sustaining cultural duration

depending on the ontological status of heritage. This is particularly important in the context of critiques of the museum and archival reduction of intangible forms of culture, which may lead to the loss of their living temporal dimension (*Harrison, 2012; Macdonald, 2013*).

Consequently, axiological and temporal klironomical methods expand the philosophical foundation of research into cultural heritage, making it possible to link the analysis of value and criteria of selection with conceptions of time and historical responsibility. They prepare the transition to the consideration of the subject of preservation and the mechanisms of the implementation of cultural continuity, which becomes the object of the next analytical step within philosophical klironomy.

The analysis of the subject of preservation completes the examination of philosophical klironomical methods and makes it possible to connect the axiological and temporal foundations of cultural continuity with the question of responsibility for its maintenance. Within the klironomical approach, the subject of preservation is considered not as a pre-given institutional unit, but as a historically and normatively constituted position that includes various levels of participation—from experts and state structures to communities and individual bearers of cultural practices. Such an analysis fundamentally differs from administrative models of heritage studies in which the subject of preservation is often identified with a governing body or a professional community.

In the study, klironomical analysis of the subject of preservation is used to identify ways of distributing responsibility for cultural heritage. With regard to tangible heritage, the subject of preservation is traditionally institutionalised and linked to state and international protection structures, expert communities, and legal regimes. In the case of intangible heritage, subjectivity assumes a more distributed and processual character, since the preservation of practices is impossible without the participation of tradition bearers and local communities. The klironomical approach makes it possible to regard these differences not as a methodological obstacle, but as different forms of the realisation of cultural responsibility conditioned by the specificity of heritage (*Convention..., 2003; Smith & Akagawa, 2009*).

The concept of publicity acquires particular significance in the analysis of the subject of preservation. Klironomical analysis of publicity and legitimation is aimed at identifying the mechanisms through which cultural forms acquire public recognition and the status of heritage. Within the present study, this method is used to analyse the interaction between experts, institutions, and public actors in processes of cultural canonisation. Publicity is considered not as an external addition to heritage preservation, but as a structural condition of its sustainability, since without public recognition cultural continuity remains confined within the framework of narrowly specialised practices (*Macdonald, 2013*).

Klironomical analysis of the subject of preservation also makes it possible to identify tensions and asymmetries of responsibility that arise in conditions of contested and dissonant heritage. In such situations, different groups claim the right to interpret and preserve cultural forms, which renders impossible a universal solution based exclusively on expert criteria. The philosophical klironomical approach makes it possible to view these conflicts as manifestations of differences in historical experience and value orientations, which require not elimination, but meaningful inclusion in processes of cultural preservation (*Silverman, 2011; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996*).

Thus, concluding the analysis of philosophical klironomical methods, the following conclusions may be formulated:

- 1) philosophical klironomical methods constitute the conceptual foundation of the entire system of klironomical research and are aimed at revealing the semantic, axiological, and temporal preconditions for the preservation of culture and art;
- 2) these methods make it possible to overcome the reduction of heritage to an object of protection, considering it instead as a form of historical duration and a normatively meaningful process;
- 3) philosophical klironomical methods ensure analytical continuity between tangible and intangible cultural heritage, demonstrating that the distinction between them requires not a change of methodology, but an adjustment of the research focus.

These conclusions create a theoretical foundation for the transition to the consideration of analytical and applied klironomical methods aimed at the study of specific practices of cultural heritage preservation.

Analytical and Applied Klironomical Methods

Analytical klironomical methods constitute an intermediate level between the philosophical foundations of klironomy and its applied instruments and are intended for the structuring, comparison, and interpretation of empirical and normative material in the field of cultural heritage preservation. Their function consists in translating the philosophical categories of value, historicity, and responsibility into analytical models that make it possible to work with specific cultural situations without losing the conceptual integrity of the research.

A central position within this group is occupied by matrix-based klironomical analysis, which is applied for the systematic examination of cultural heritage through a set of interrelated dimensions. Within the framework of the study, this method is used for the simultaneous analysis of the ontological status of heritage, its axiological significance, mechanisms of canonisation, temporal logic, and forms of social legitimation. The matrix-based approach makes it possible to avoid a linear description of heritage and to reveal tensions between different levels of its preservation, which is particularly important when analysing complex cultural assemblages that include both material objects and intangible practices.

Comparative klironomical analysis is applied to the comparison of different cultural traditions, national models of preservation, and institutional heritage regimes. Unlike classical comparative analysis, which is oriented towards identifying similarities and differences, the klironomical approach emphasises differences in the foundations of cultural continuity and in value criteria. Within this study, this method is used to analyse the differences between object-oriented models of safeguarding material heritage and processual models of preserving intangible forms of culture, as reflected, in particular, in international normative documents and the practices of their implementation (*Convention..., 2003; Framework Convention..., 2005*).

Klironomical modelling is aimed at constructing analytical scenarios for cultural heritage preservation with due consideration of multiple factors and actors. This method is used to identify possible trajectories of the development of preservation processes depending on changes in the institutional environment, value priorities, and forms of community participation. With regard to material heritage, modelling makes it possible to analyse the consequences of different strategies of restoration, use, and museumification, whereas with regard to intangible heritage it allows for the assessment of the sustainability of transmission practices and the risks of their formalisation and reduction (*Harrison, 2012; Macdonald, 2013*).

The analysis of the plurality of klironomical scenarios complements modelling and is oriented towards rejecting a single normative solution in favour of recognising the pluralism of pathways for cultural preservation. Within the study, this method is used to demonstrate that

the preservation of cultural heritage cannot be reduced to a universal algorithm and is always dependent on a specific historical, social, and cultural context. This approach is particularly significant when working with contested and dissonant heritage, where different preservation scenarios reflect competing interpretations of the past and different forms of cultural identity (*Silverman, 2011; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996*).

A distinct place among analytical klironomical methods is occupied by the analysis of publicness and legitimation, which is aimed at investigating the modes of public recognition of cultural heritage. Within the framework of the study, this method is used to analyse how cultural forms move from a local or professional context into the sphere of public significance and how consensus or conflict is formed around their status. With regard to material heritage, this is manifested in public debates on the restoration and use of objects, whereas with regard to intangible heritage it is reflected in issues of representation, community participation, and the institutional recognition of practices (*Smith, 2006; Waterton & Watson, 2015*).

Consequently, analytical klironomical methods provide a methodological linkage between philosophical reflection and applied analysis, making it possible to structure complex processes of cultural heritage preservation and to consider the specificities of both material and intangible forms of culture.

Applied klironomical methods of diagnosis and expertise are oriented towards the analysis of specific situations of cultural heritage preservation and the identification of factors that threaten the sustainability of cultural continuity. Unlike analytical methods, which are aimed at structuring and interpreting research material, applied methods work with empirical data, institutional regimes, and heritage management practices, making it possible to move from description to evaluation and the substantiation of decisions.

Klironomical diagnosis is used to identify the current state of cultural heritage from the perspective of its capacity for reproduction and transmission over time. Within the present study, this method is applied to both material and intangible heritage, albeit with different analytical emphases. With regard to material objects, diagnosis is aimed at analysing physical condition, institutional protection, normative status, and symbolic significance. With regard to intangible heritage, klironomical diagnosis focuses on analysing the conditions of practice transmission, the degree of involvement of tradition bearers, and the sustainability of the social context of reproduction. This approach makes it possible to consider the state of heritage not merely as a technical or quantitative indicator, but as an indicator of the vitality of cultural continuity.

Klironomical expertise and prioritisation complement diagnostic analysis and are aimed at substantiating decisions regarding the preservation, support, or transformation of cultural forms. In the course of the present study, this method is used to identify differences between the formal significance of heritage and its actual role in cultural memory and identity. Expertise in the klironomical sense is not reduced to confirming compliance with established criteria, but presupposes an assessment of the value-based, historical, and social foundations of preservation. Prioritisation, in turn, makes it possible to determine which elements of cultural heritage require primary attention under conditions of limited resources and institutional capacities, which is particularly relevant for both material and intangible heritage (*Convention..., 2003; Framework Convention..., 2005*).

The analysis of risks and institutional threats represents another key applied klironomical method used to identify factors capable of disrupting processes of cultural continuity. Within the study, this method is applied to the analysis of both external and internal threats to heritage preservation. For material heritage, such threats include urban pressure, commercialisation, inadequate restoration practices, and the loss of use-contexts. For intangible heritage, the

principal risks are the formalisation and museal reduction of practices, the disruption of intergenerational transmission, and the displacement of local traditions by dominant cultural narratives (*Harrison, 2012; Meskell, 2018*).

The distinctive feature of klironomical risk analysis lies in the fact that threats are considered not in isolation, but in their connection with the value-based and normative foundations of cultural preservation. This makes it possible to identify situations in which institutional protection measures are formally implemented yet, in practice, undermine cultural continuity, for example through the loss of community participation or the transformation of heritage into a symbolic resource devoid of living content. In this respect, the klironomical approach extends traditional models of risk management by incorporating philosophical and social dimensions of cultural heritage preservation into the analysis.

The application of applied methods of diagnostics, expertise, and risk analysis makes it possible to move from a general understanding of the klironomical foundations of cultural preservation to specific evaluative procedures aimed at supporting sustainable forms of cultural continuity. These methods lay the groundwork for the subsequent consideration of project-institutional klironomical instruments that ensure the active formation of conditions for preserving tangible and intangible cultural heritage.

Project-institutional klironomical methods are oriented towards the active formation of conditions for cultural heritage preservation and represent the final element of the applied level of klironomy. Unlike diagnostic and expert methods, which are primarily aimed at assessing states and risks, these methods focus on designing sustainable models of cultural continuity and on structuring the interaction of preservation actors within institutional and public spaces.

Klironomical design is used to develop strategies for cultural heritage preservation based on identified value-based and temporal foundations. Within the framework of this study, this method is applied to model forms of intervention that are not limited to the protection or fixation of cultural forms, but are directed towards maintaining the conditions for their reproduction. With regard to tangible heritage, klironomical design presupposes the integration of objects into cultural, educational, and social environments, which makes it possible to avoid their isolation in the form of “museum relics”. With regard to intangible heritage, this method is oriented towards creating conditions for the transmission of practices, maintaining linguistic and ritual environments, and stimulating the participation of tradition bearers.

The mapping of preservation actors represents a method for identifying and analysing the agents involved in the processes of cultural heritage preservation. Within the study, this method is used to structure relations between state institutions, professional communities, local groups, and individual bearers of cultural practices. For tangible heritage, mapping makes it possible to identify institutional chains of responsibility and zones of intersecting interests, whereas for intangible heritage it is particularly important for fixing the role of communities and informal actors, without whom the preservation of practices becomes impossible. Such an approach makes it possible to avoid reducing the subject of preservation to a single institutional instance and to consider the plurality of forms of cultural responsibility.

Klironomical critique of representation and exclusion is aimed at analysing the ways in which cultural heritage is represented in the public space and which forms of culture become marginalised or excluded from the canon. Within the framework of this study, this method is used to identify asymmetries in the representation of cultural forms arising in museum exhibitions, educational programmes, and cultural policy. With regard to tangible heritage, this may manifest itself in the prioritisation of monumental objects at the expense of everyday culture, whereas with regard to intangible heritage it appears in the standardisation and symbolic

fixation of practices that fail to reflect their internal diversity and dynamics (*Silverman, 2011; Smith, 2006*).

Methods of digital klironomy complement the project-institutional toolkit and are oriented towards the analysis and use of digital technologies in cultural heritage preservation processes. Within the study, this method is applied to assess the potential of digital platforms, archives, and interactive environments in supporting cultural continuity. For tangible heritage, digital klironomy opens up possibilities for modelling, visualisation, and documentation of objects, whereas for intangible heritage it enables the recording of processes of transmission, linguistic practices, and forms of collective memory without reducing them to static descriptions. At the same time, the klironomical approach emphasises that digitalisation is not an end in itself and requires critical analysis of its impact on the living cultural environment (*Meskeell, 2018*).

Thus, concluding the analysis of applied klironomical methods, the following conclusions can be formulated:

- 1) analytical and applied klironomical methods form a coherent toolkit that makes it possible to move from the philosophical comprehension of cultural preservation to the analysis of specific practices and institutional decisions;
- 2) these methods demonstrate the universality of the klironomical approach with regard to both tangible and intangible cultural heritage, adapting to their ontological and processual specificity;
- 3) project-institutional klironomical methods make it possible to consider cultural heritage preservation not as a reaction to loss, but as the active and responsible formation of conditions for cultural continuity.

These conclusions create a methodological foundation for the final analysis of klironomy as a transfer methodology between philosophical reconstruction and applied analysis.

The Transition from Philosophical Reconstruction to Applied Analysis

The logic of the methodological transition from philosophical reconstruction to applied analysis constitutes one of the key results of this study and makes it possible to demonstrate the internal coherence of the klironomical approach. Unlike linear research models, in which philosophical reflection and the practical management of cultural heritage exist as autonomous levels, klironomy constructs a consistent methodological trajectory between them, within which each stage of analysis prepares the next.

The starting point of this transition is formed by philosophical klironomical methods oriented towards the reconstruction of the foundations of cultural value, historicity, and responsibility. It is precisely at this level that an understanding is formed of why culture is subject to preservation and how the distinction between tangible and intangible heritage is worth considering in research. Philosophical reconstruction and categorical analysis establish semantic coordinates without which applied decisions become either arbitrary or purely procedural. Thus, the philosophical level is not opposed to practice but fulfils the function of the normative and conceptual foundation of analysis.

The next stage of the methodological transition is associated with analytical klironomical methods, which translate philosophical foundations into structured research models. Matrix-based and comparative klironomical analyses, modelling, and the analysis of multiple scenarios make it possible to correlate value-based and temporal categories with specific cultural situations and institutional contexts. At this level, philosophical distinctions between object and process, canon and continuity, memory and historicity acquire an analytical form suitable for comparison and interpretation of both tangible and intangible cultural heritage.

The transition to applied analysis is performed through methods of diagnostics, expertise, and design, which rely on the results of the philosophical and analytical stages. Klironomical diagnostics and risk analysis employ philosophically grounded criteria of value and continuity to assess real conditions of cultural preservation. Project-oriented and institutional methods, in turn, make it possible to transform analytical conclusions into strategies and models oriented towards supporting cultural duration rather than merely ensuring formal compliance with regulatory requirements. In this way, the applied level of klironomy proves to be not autonomous, but derivative of the preceding stages of methodological analysis.

A significant result of this transition is the elimination of the gap between theory and practice that is characteristic of many studies of cultural heritage. Within the klironomical approach, philosophical foundations do not remain at the level of abstract reflection but are consistently incorporated into analytical and applied procedures. This ensures methodological continuity of the research and allows the preservation of cultural heritage to be considered as an integral process encompassing semantic reconstruction, analytical interpretation, and the practical formation of conditions for cultural continuity.

The substantiation of klironomy as a transfer methodology between philosophical theory and applied analysis of cultural heritage completes the presentation of the research results and fixes their conceptual significance. Within the klironomical approach, the preservation of culture is viewed not as a set of disparate practices of protection, management, or representation, but as a normatively and historically meaningful process requiring the coordination of philosophical foundations and practical decisions. It is precisely the ability to ensure such coordination that distinguishes klironomy from existing models of heritage studies and defines its methodological specificity.

Klironomy functions as a bridging methodology primarily because it integrates philosophical categories of value, historicity, memory, and responsibility into the operational toolkit of analysis. Unlike approaches in which the philosophy of culture is used merely as an interpretative background, the klironomical approach translates philosophical foundations into a system of methods applicable to the analysis of tangible and intangible cultural heritage. This makes it possible to consider normative documents, institutional practices, and managerial decisions not in isolation, but in relation to broader conceptions of cultural continuity and the historical duty of society.

The transfer character of klironomy is also manifested in its ability to unite different types of cultural heritage within a single methodological logic. Tangible and intangible heritage within the klironomical approach are not opposed as requiring fundamentally different methods, but are analysed as different forms of manifestation of cultural duration. This makes it possible to avoid methodological fragmentation and to construct a comparable analysis of objects, practices, forms of memory, and institutional regimes of preservation. As a result, klironomy creates a common analytical language applicable to various cultural contexts and levels of heritage preservation.

A significant aspect of this bridging methodology is klironomy's orientation towards process rather than solely towards the result of preservation. Unlike models focused on the fixation and protection of already recognised objects, the klironomical approach emphasises the conditions of formation, transmission, and transformation of cultural forms over time. This renders klironomy particularly significant for the analysis of intangible heritage, where preservation is impossible without considering the dynamics of practices and the participation of tradition bearers, while at the same time extending its applicability to tangible heritage, considered in the context of use, interpretation, and social significance.

Finally, klironomy as a transfer methodology makes it possible to rethink the role of the researcher and expert in the field of cultural heritage. Within the klironomical approach, the researcher is not limited to description or to assessing compliance with established norms, but acts as an analyst of cultural continuity, capable of identifying value foundations, risks, and prospects for the preservation of culture. This expands the methodological horizon of cultural heritage research and creates the prerequisites for a more responsible and reflexive interaction between theory, practice, and cultural policy.

Consequently, the results of the study show that klironomy can be justifiably regarded as a bridging methodology linking philosophical reconstruction and applied analysis of cultural heritage. It ensures the methodological integrity of research, the integration of different levels of analysis, and the possibility of a systematic consideration of cultural preservation as a form of historical continuity, which confirms its significance for the development of both theory and practice in heritage studies.

The conducted analysis of the methodological transition from philosophical reconstruction to applied analysis makes it possible to formulate the following generalised conclusions:

1. The results of the study demonstrate that the klironomical approach possesses internal logical coherence and does not presuppose a rupture between the philosophical and practical levels of analysis of cultural heritage. Philosophical klironomical methods form the normative and semantic foundations of research, which are consistently unfolded in analytical and applied procedures.
2. Klironomy demonstrates its effectiveness as a bridging methodology that ensures the translation of philosophical categories of value, historicity, memory, and responsibility into an operational language for analysing concrete practices of cultural heritage preservation. Such translation makes it possible to avoid both abstract theorisation detached from empirical reality and the reduction of cultural preservation to a set of administrative and technical procedures.
3. The transition from philosophical reconstruction to applied analysis within the framework of klironomy confirms the possibility of a unified methodological approach to tangible and intangible cultural heritage. The distinction between them is interpreted not as a basis for methodological separation, but as a need to differentiate analytical emphases within the general logic of cultural continuity and historical duration.
4. The klironomical approach makes it possible to rethink the role of the analyst and expert in the field of cultural heritage, expanding it from the assessment of compliance with normative criteria to the identification of value foundations, risks, and prospects for cultural preservation. This renders klironomy methodologically significant not only for theoretical research, but also for practices of cultural policy, expertise, and heritage management.

Thus, the conclusions confirm that klironomy represents an integral methodological system capable of linking philosophical reflection and applied analysis and of ensuring a conceptually grounded transition from the theory of cultural preservation to the analysis and design of real practices of cultural continuity.

Discussion

The comparison of klironomical methods with those of heritage studies makes it possible to clarify the methodological specificity of the klironomical approach and to determine its contribution to the development of cultural heritage research. Heritage studies have emerged as an interdisciplinary field with a strong applied orientation, grounded in normative regimes of heritage protection and in a well-developed infrastructure of expert practices, which is reflected

both in scholarly syntheses and in international documents regulating the preservation of tangible and intangible heritage (*Convention...*, 2003; *King*, 2024; *Operational Directives...*, n.d.). At the same time, klironomy demonstrates a different methodological vector: it considers heritage not only as an object of management and protection, but primarily as a process of cultural continuity, involving selection, canonisation, interpretation, and the transmission of meanings over time (*Buychik*, 2019; *Buychik*, 2024).

The key advantage of the klironomical approach lies in its systemic character and in the presence of an internally coherent structure of methods that links philosophical reconstruction, analytical modelling, and applied diagnostics. In heritage studies, methodological plurality often assumes an eclectic form: legal, anthropological, sociological, and politico-critical approaches coexist alongside one another but do not always form a unified conceptual apparatus suitable for comparable research (*Waterton & Watson*, 2015). Klironomy, by contrast, proposes a matrix logic of analysis that makes it possible to retain within a single research field the ontological foundations of culture, axiology, criteria of selection, temporality, and social legitimation, thereby reducing the risk of methodological fragmentation and enhancing the explanatory potential of analysis.

The advantage of klironomy is also manifested in a more rigorous articulation of the value foundations of cultural preservation. In normative-procedural models of heritage protection, value is often fixed through a set of formalised criteria oriented towards the recognition of the significance of an object or practice, which is necessary for managerial and legal procedures (*International Charter...*, 1964/1965; *The Nara Document on Authenticity*, 1994). However, such formalisation may obscure the philosophical nature of value choice as well as the historical conditionality of selection criteria. Klironomical axiological analysis, by contrast, treats value as the result of a historically and socially conditioned normative decision linked to canon, memory, and responsibility, thereby bringing klironomy closer to philosophical theories of cultural memory and historicity (*Assmann, J.*, 1992; *Ricoeur*, 2000).

A comparative consideration of tangible and intangible heritage further reveals the advantages of klironomy as a methodology capable of providing a unified logic of analysis for both types of cultural heritage. Heritage studies recognise the specificity of intangible heritage and enshrine it in relevant international documents; but the applied apparatus often retains an object-oriented inertia, which contributes to the fixation of practices in the form of catalogues and representations (*Convention...*, 2003; *Smith & Akagawa*, 2009). Klironomy, on the other hand, is initially constructed around a processual logic of continuity and is therefore more sensitive to the conditions of transmission and reproduction of intangible forms of culture, as well as to the risks of their reduction and symbolic standardisation (*Harrison*, 2012; *Macdonald*, 2013).

Alongside these advantages, the comparative analysis also reveals the limitations of institutional and applied models that lack philosophical reflection. In particular, normative regimes of heritage protection are effective in ensuring procedures for the safeguarding of objects, but prove less effective in analysing conflicts of memory, dissonant heritage, and competing interpretations of the past, where issues of legitimation, subjectivity, and responsibility become central (*Silverman*, 2011; *Tunbridge & Ashworth*, 1996). Critical strands of heritage studies partially compensate for this deficit by exposing the social and political conditionality of heritage; however, they may also be confined to the description of discourses and power mechanisms without the systematisation of the philosophical foundations of cultural continuity (*Harrison*, 2012; *Smith*, 2006).

Consequently, the comparison of klironomical methods with those of heritage studies shows that klironomy offers methodological advantages associated with systemic coherence,

axiological and temporal depth of analysis, as well as with a unified logic for the study of tangible and intangible heritage. At the same time, this comparison demonstrates that institutional and applied models lacking philosophical reflection have a limited potential in the analysis of processes of canonisation, conflicts of memory, and the normative foundations of cultural preservation, which confirms the need to expand the methodological field of research through the klironomical approach.

The methodological contribution of klironomy to cultural heritage research is manifested primarily in the expansion of the analytical subject field and in the reorientation of research attention from objects of protection to processes of cultural continuity. Unlike approaches in which heritage is conceived predominantly as a set of recognised tangible or intangible objects, klironomy regards it as both the result and the process of normative selection, interpretation, and transmission of cultural forms over time. Such an expansion of the subject field makes it possible to include in the analysis not only institutionally fixed elements of heritage, but also marginal, transitional, and not yet canonised forms of culture that are significant for understanding historical duration.

A significant contribution of the klironomical approach lies in strengthening the role of the subject of preservation within the methodological structure of cultural heritage research. In heritage studies, the subject of preservation is often implicitly identified with institutional management structures, expert communities, or international organisations, whereas klironomy introduces a more complex and differentiated model of subjectivity. Within the klironomical framework, the subject of preservation is understood as a constellation of actors involved in processes of cultural continuity, including communities, bearers of tradition, professional groups, and civil society. This makes it possible to conceptualise cultural preservation as a distributed form of responsibility rather than as an exclusively administrative function.

The axiological dimension of klironomy also significantly expands the methodological horizon of cultural heritage research. The klironomical approach emphasises that the recognition of cultural value cannot be reduced to formalised criteria of significance or universal value, since it is always connected with a historical choice and a normative decision. The inclusion of axiological analysis at the core of the methodology makes it possible to identify the hidden foundations of canonisation, as well as to analyse value conflicts arising from the confrontation of different cultural narratives and identities. This is particularly important for the study of dissonant and conflictual heritage, where formal criteria prove insufficient for explaining the processes of recognition and exclusion.

Equally significant is the strengthening of the role of historicity and temporal analysis within klironomical methodology. Unlike retrospective models of preservation oriented towards fixing a lost or disappearing past, klironomy considers heritage as a form of duration that connects the past, the present, and the future. Such an approach makes it possible to analyse the preservation of culture not only as a reaction to loss, but also as the active formation of conditions for the continuation of cultural practices and meanings. The temporal dimension of klironomy is particularly productive in the analysis of intangible heritage, where the stability of cultural continuity depends on the ability of traditions to adapt and transform over time.

Taken together, the expansion of the subject field and the strengthening of the role of the subject, axiological reflection, and historicity make it possible to regard klironomy as a methodological development of heritage studies rather than as their negation. The klironomical approach complements existing research and applied models by introducing philosophically grounded categories and ensuring a deeper understanding of cultural preservation as a normatively and historically meaningful process.

Despite the identified methodological advantages of the klironomical approach, the conducted research has a number of limitations that must be considered when interpreting the obtained results. These limitations do not undermine the integrity of the proposed methodological model, but they do indicate directions for its further testing and refinement.

The first limitation is related to the need for extended empirical validation of klironomical methods. Within the framework of this article, klironomy is presented as a systematised methodological set that has undergone philosophical and analytical elaboration; but many applied methods require further testing on diverse empirical materials. This applies in particular to klironomical modelling, the analysis of multiple scenarios, and project- and institution-oriented methods, the effectiveness of which may vary depending on the type of heritage, the scale of analysis, and the social context. Thus, the proposed system of methods should be regarded as open and subject to refinement in the course of subsequent applied research.

The second limitation is determined by the dependence of applied klironomical models on the cultural and institutional context. Processes of cultural heritage preservation differ substantially depending on national traditions, legal regimes, levels of community participation, and dominant conceptions of cultural value. In this sense, klironomy does not offer a universal algorithm applicable without adaptation to any cultural space. On the contrary, it presupposes contextual adjustment of methods and the recognition of a plurality of legitimate scenarios of cultural preservation, which simultaneously constitutes its methodological advantage and a source of analytical complexity.

An additional limitation is connected with the balance between philosophical depth and the operational applicability of klironomical methods. The strengthening of axiological and temporal reflection expands the explanatory potential of research, but may complicate the direct integration of klironomical approaches into existing managerial and normative practices oriented towards formalised procedures. This requires further work on aligning klironomical tools with the language of cultural policy, expertise, and heritage management without losing their philosophical richness.

Consequently, the limitations of the research indicate not the inadequacy of the klironomical approach, but the necessity of its further development, empirical refinement, and contextual adaptation. Awareness of these limitations creates a foundation for formulating new research tasks and for expanding the scope of application of klironomical methods in related scientific and practical fields.

Prospects for the further development of the topic of this research are connected with the deepening of both the theoretical and applied dimensions of the klironomical approach. At the theoretical level, a relevant direction is the further philosophical elaboration of the categories of cultural continuity, responsibility, and canon, considering new forms of cultural dynamics, including hybrid and transnational cultural processes. This presupposes the expansion of klironomical analysis beyond national frameworks and a more active inclusion of comparative studies aimed at identifying differences in the philosophical foundations of cultural preservation across various cultural traditions.

At the applied level, a promising direction is the development of empirical research aimed at testing klironomical methods in specific cases of preserving tangible and intangible cultural heritage. Of particular importance here is the analysis of urban and regional cultural landscapes, practices of local memory, and forms of community participation, where the klironomical approach can demonstrate its capacity to integrate philosophical reflection with practical design. Such studies will make it possible to refine the tools of klironomical diagnosis, expertise, and modelling with regard to the diversity of institutional and socio-cultural conditions.

A separate direction for further research is the development of digital klironomy, oriented towards a critical analysis of the role of digital technologies in the processes of preserving cultural continuity. It appears promising to investigate how digital platforms, archives, and interactive environments can contribute to sustaining living forms of cultural transmission without reducing them to static representations. This requires the development of klironomical criteria for evaluating digital practices of cultural preservation and the analysis of their impact on forms of memory, participation, and public legitimation.

An important direction for the development of the research topic is the application of klironomical methods in the sphere of cultural policy and education. The integration of the klironomical approach into educational programmes and cultural development strategies may contribute to forming a more reflexive attitude towards heritage and to strengthening the role of civic responsibility for cultural preservation. In this context, further research may be directed towards the development of methodological recommendations and analytical models adapted to decision-making practices in the field of cultural heritage, which will make it possible to expand the social and institutional impact of klironomy as a scholarly and applied discipline.

Conclusion

The conducted study makes it possible to formulate the main conclusions reflecting the achieved results and their methodological significance. First of all, it has been established that klironomical methods form an integral and internally coherent methodological system in which philosophical, analytical, and applied levels do not exist in isolation but are interconnected through a consistent logic of transition from the reconstruction of the foundations of cultural preservation to the analysis and design of specific practices. The systematisation of 25 klironomical methods (*Table 1*) has demonstrated that klironomy is not reducible to a set of individual research techniques but represents a structured methodological field capable of encompassing both tangible and intangible cultural heritage within a unified analytical framework.

The second key conclusion is the confirmation that klironomical methods ensure the simultaneous combination of philosophical depth and applied applicability in the analysis of cultural heritage. Philosophical klironomical methods make it possible to identify the value-based, temporal, and normative foundations of cultural continuity, without which preservation practices inevitably become reduced to formal and procedural solutions. Analytical and applied methods, in turn, translate these foundations into an operational language of diagnosis, expertise, modelling, and design, thereby enabling the application of the klironomical approach in real institutional and cultural contexts. Taken together, this confirms that klironomy is capable of overcoming the gap between the theoretical comprehension of cultural preservation and the analysis of cultural heritage research practices (heritage studies), while maintaining both conceptual rigour and practical relevance.

The significance of the results of the conducted study manifests itself at several interrelated levels, reflecting both the theoretical and practical potential of the klironomical approach. First and foremost, the obtained results are of fundamental importance for the development of klironomy as an independent scientific discipline. The systematisation of klironomical methods and their detailed description in the context of analysing tangible and intangible cultural heritage make it possible to clarify the subject matter, methodological apparatus, and research objectives of klironomy. This contributes to its institutional formation and strengthens the status of klironomy as a science oriented towards the comprehensive study of the preservation of culture and art as a form of historical continuity.

Equally significant is the contribution of the study to the renewal of the methodology of heritage studies. It has been shown that the klironomical approach does not oppose existing directions in cultural heritage research but complements them by addressing identified methodological limitations. The integration of philosophical reflection, axiological analysis, and the temporal dimension into the research toolkit makes it possible to expand the explanatory potential of heritage studies and to rethink their applied models. In particular, klironomy facilitates a shift in research focus from procedures of protection and management towards the analysis of processes of canonisation, cultural responsibility, and historical duration, thereby opening new perspectives for theoretical and comparative research in this field.

The practical significance of the study results lies in the possibility of applying klironomical methods in real practices of preserving culture and art. The developed system of methods can be used in expert activities, cultural policy, museum and educational practice, as well as in processes of strategic planning for cultural heritage preservation. The klironomical approach makes it possible to substantiate decisions not only from the standpoint of normative compliance but also with due regard to value-based, historical, and social factors, thereby contributing to a more responsible and sustainable formation of conditions for cultural continuity. In this sense, the results of the research create a foundation for the practical implementation of klironomy in various spheres of work with cultural heritage.

The final generalisation of the study results makes it possible to confirm its conceptual completeness and to verify the achievement of the stated aim. In the course of the study, klironomy was consistently substantiated as a methodological bridge between the philosophy of culture and the applied analysis of cultural heritage. It has been demonstrated that the klironomical approach provides a linkage between the philosophical reconstruction of the foundations of cultural continuity and the analysis of concrete practices of preserving culture and art, thereby eliminating the gap between theoretical reflection and applied models of heritage studies.

The system of klironomical methods proposed in the study forms an integral methodological foundation for the further development of both theoretical and applied studies. The systematisation of 25 klironomical methods (*Table 1*), their differentiation by functional levels, and their correlation with tangible and intangible cultural heritage create a stable analytical framework suitable for philosophical analysis, comparative research, and practical expertise. Thus, klironomy acquires instrumental completeness, enabling the expansion of its application in new cultural, institutional, and technological contexts.

The final outcome of the conducted study is the step-by-step and substantively justified achievement of the study purpose and the resolution of all tasks formulated in the Introduction. The purpose of the study, which consisted in the development and theoretical substantiation of klironomical methods for researching cultural heritage as a connecting link between philosophical reflection and the applied analysis of practices of preserving culture and art, was achieved through the consistent unfolding of the klironomical approach from philosophical foundations to the operational level of analysis. In the course of the work, it was demonstrated that klironomy is capable of integrating the philosophy of culture, the philosophy of memory, and the philosophy of historicity with the analytical and applied methods of heritage studies, thereby forming a coherent methodological system.

As part of addressing the first objective, the philosophical foundations of klironomical methods were identified within the context of studies of cultural memory and historical continuity. An analysis of philosophical concepts of memory, canon, historicity, and responsibility made it possible to demonstrate that klironomical methods are grounded in a long-

standing tradition of the philosophy of culture and the philosophy of history, within which the preservation of culture is conceived as a normatively meaningful process of the transmission of meanings over time. This ensured the conceptual depth of the klironomical approach and established the theoretical coordinates for subsequent methodological analysis.

The second objective was addressed through a critical analysis of the methodology of heritage studies, aimed at identifying its limitations in working with tangible and intangible cultural heritage. It was shown that normative-procedural and institutionally applied models effectively ensure the protection and management of heritage; however, they possess a limited capacity for analysing processes of canonisation, cultural responsibility, and historical duration. The identified limitations substantiated the need for a methodological expansion of the research field and created the prerequisites for the introduction of the klironomical approach.

The resolution of the third objective was expressed in the systematisation of klironomical research methods and their presentation as an integral methodological system. In the course of the study, a set of 25 klironomical methods (*Table 1*) was formed and described, encompassing various levels of analysis of cultural heritage. This systematisation demonstrated that klironomy possesses an internal structure and cannot be reduced to a set of disparate analytical techniques, but functions as an independent methodological system.

The fourth objective was implemented through the differentiation of philosophical, analytical, and applied klironomical methods. This differentiation made it possible to demonstrate the functional specificity of each level and to reveal their interrelation within a unified methodological logic. Philosophical methods ensure the identification of the foundations of cultural continuity, analytical methods translate these foundations into structured research models, and applied methods provide the assessment and design of processes of cultural preservation.

The resolution of the fifth objective consisted in demonstrating the specificity of applying klironomical methods to tangible and intangible cultural heritage. In the course of the study, it was proven that the distinction between these types of heritage does not require fundamentally different methodologies, but rather presupposes an adjustment of the analytical focus within the general logic of the klironomical approach. This made it possible to consider material objects and intangible practices as interconnected forms of cultural continuity, subject to unified philosophical and methodological foundations.

Finally, the sixth objective was addressed through substantiating klironomy as a methodological transition from philosophical reconstruction to applied analysis of cultural heritage. It was shown that the klironomical approach eliminates the gap between theory and practice by ensuring a consistent progression from the philosophical comprehension of the value and historicity of culture to analytical models and applied instruments of diagnosis, expertise, and design. In this way, the methodological soundness of klironomy and its potential for the further development of the theory and practice of preserving culture and art were confirmed.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares that is no conflict of interest.

References:

- Assmann, J. (1992). *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis und das Unbewusste*. C.H. Beck. (In Ger.)
- Assmann, A. (2003). *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*. C.H. Beck. (In Ger.)
- Akagawa, N. (2014). *Heritage conservation and Japan's cultural diplomacy: Heritage, national identity and national interest*. Routledge.
- Buychik, A. (2019). *Klironomy as a science of preservation of cultural heritage*. London: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Buychik, A. (2024). *Klironomy: The science of cultural heritage*. Ostrava: Tuculart Edition, European Institute for Innovation Development.
- Choay, F. (1992). *L'Allégorie du patrimoine*. Éditions du Seuil. (In Fra.)
- Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. (2003). UNESCO.
- Convenzione di Faro. (2005). Consiglio d'Europa. (In Ita.)
- Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention). (2005). Council of Europe.
- García Canclini, N. (1999). Los usos sociales del patrimonio cultural. *Consejería de Cultura. Junta de Andalucía*. (In Spa.)
- Gonçalves, J. R. S. (1996). *A retórica da perda: os discursos do patrimônio cultural no Brasil*. Editora UFRJ/IPHAN. (In Por.)
- Halbwachs, M. (1950). *La mémoire collective*. Presses Universitaires de France. (In Fra.)
- Hamilakis, Y. (2007). *The nation and its ruins: Antiquity, archaeology, and national imagination in Greece*. Oxford University Press.
- Harrison, R. (2012). *Heritage: Critical approaches*. Routledge.
- International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter 1964). (1964/1965). ICOMOS.
- King, R. (2024). *Methods and methodologies in heritage studies*. UCL Press.
- Lixinski, L. (2013). *Intangible cultural heritage in international law*. Oxford University Press.
- Lowenthal, D. (2015). *The past is a foreign country*. Cambridge University Press.
- Macdonald, S. (2013). *Memorylands: Heritage and identity in Europe today*. Routledge.
- Meskell, L. (2018). *A future in ruins: UNESCO, world heritage, and the dream of peace*. Oxford University Press.
- Nora, P. (1984). Between memory and history: Les lieux de mémoire. *Representations*, 26, 7–24. <https://eclass.uoa.gr/modules/document/file.php/ARCH230/PierreNora.pdf>
- Operational Directives for the Implementation of the 2003 Convention. (n.d.). UNESCO.
- Pai, H. I. (2013/2014). *Heritage management in Korea and Japan: The politics of antiquity and identity*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Prats, L. (1997). *Antropología y patrimonio*. Ariel. (In Spa.)
- Ricoeur, P. (2000). *La mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli*. Paris: Seuil. (In Fra.)
- Settis, S. (2002). *Italia S.p.A. L'assalto al patrimonio culturale*. Giulio Einaudi Editore. (In Ita.)
- Silverman, H. (Ed.). (2011). *Contested cultural heritage: Religion, nationalism, erasure, and exclusion in a global world*. Springer.
- Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of heritage*. Routledge.
- Smith, L., & Akagawa, N. (Eds.). (2009). *Intangible heritage*. Routledge.
- The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance. (2013). Australia ICOMOS.
- The Nara Document on Authenticity. (1994). Nara Conference on Authenticity. ICOMOS.
- Tunbridge, J. E., & Ashworth, G. J. (1996). *Dissonant heritage: The management of the past as a resource in conflict*. John Wiley.
- Waterton, E., & Watson, S. (Eds.). (2015). *The Palgrave handbook of contemporary heritage research*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Appendix

Table 1. Consolidated table of klironomical research methods

No.	Klironomical method	Brief description
1	Klironomical reconstruction	A philosophical method aimed at reconstructing implicit models of cultural preservation in theories of culture, history, and memory.
2	Categorical klironomical analysis	Analysis of core categories of cultural preservation (value, canon, memory, continuity, responsibility) and their conceptual transformations.
3	Klironomical axiological analysis	Examination of value foundations underlying the recognition of cultural forms as worthy of preservation.
4	Analysis of criteria of cultural selection	Identification and critical assessment of normative and expert criteria determining inclusion or exclusion from cultural heritage.
5	Klironomical analysis of the canon	Study of canon formation as a dynamic and historically contingent mechanism of cultural stabilisation.
6	Klironomical analysis of historicity	Investigation of temporal models (past–present–future) structuring cultural preservation and historical continuity.
7	Klironomical analysis of time and duration	Analysis of cultural preservation as a form of historical duration rather than static fixation.
8	Analysis of the subject of preservation	Examination of actors responsible for cultural preservation (institutions, communities, citizens) and forms of responsibility.
9	Klironomical matrix analysis	A systemic method integrating ontological, axiological, normative, temporal, and social dimensions of heritage.
10	Comparative klironomical analysis	Comparison of cultural traditions, preservation models, and heritage regimes based on their foundations of continuity.
11	Klironomical modelling	Construction of analytical models representing possible scenarios of cultural preservation.
12	Analysis of multiple klironomical scenarios	Identification and evaluation of alternative trajectories of cultural preservation in different contexts.
13	Analysis of public legitimacy	Study of mechanisms through which cultural heritage gains public recognition and social validation.
14	Klironomical diagnostics	Assessment of the current state of cultural heritage in terms of its capacity for historical transmission.
15	Klironomical expertise	Expert evaluation of cultural heritage based on value, historical significance, and continuity rather than formal criteria alone.
16	Klironomical prioritisation	Determination of preservation priorities under conditions of limited resources and competing values.
17	Klironomical risk analysis	Identification of cultural, institutional, and symbolic risks threatening heritage continuity.
18	Analysis of institutional threats	Examination of how legal, administrative, or economic frameworks may undermine cultural preservation.
19	Klironomical project design	Development of preservation strategies aimed at sustaining cultural continuity rather than mere protection.
20	Mapping of preservation actors	Identification and structuring of stakeholders involved in cultural preservation processes.
21	Analysis of institutional infrastructure	Study of institutional systems supporting or constraining cultural preservation.
22	Klironomical critique of representation	Critical analysis of how heritage is represented in museums, education, and public discourse.

23	Klironomical analysis of exclusion	Identification of cultural forms marginalised or excluded from recognised heritage canons.
24	Digital klironomy	Analysis of digital tools and environments as means of preserving and transmitting cultural heritage.
25	Integrated klironomical assessment	Holistic evaluation combining philosophical, analytical, and applied klironomical methods in a single framework.