

УДК: 069(091)

ББК: 85.101.1

DOI: 10.18688/aa2212-09-58

I. Bruni

“Selective memory”: A Museum and Its Past

Museums have been struggling for a long time, since their early stages in the 18th century when they were first proposed as institutions open to the public, with the necessity of preserving collected evidences of the past, while exhibiting and setting them up for educational purposes. ICOM latest Museum definition (2022) embraces the function of researching, collecting, conserving, interpreting and exhibiting the heritage for the purpose of participation, education, enjoyment, reflection and knowledge sharing. Collecting and exhibiting are inevitably acts of selection, and the motives of collection choices are to be sought in the historical context to which Museums public pertains, which includes ideological and political matters¹. In selecting objects to be displayed and explained, in designing the spaces, in choosing to adhere to certain aesthetic tastes or communication styles, Museums may shape public's view of the past:

“The contemporary museum represents only one form of all historical forms of man's specific attitude to reality which, in the course of history, has imparted him the inclination to preserve and show selected objects. Consequently, this form is not unchangeable” [30, p. 36].

Communication is essential in the formation of memory: any narrative regarding the archaeological past, to be successful needs to meet cultural, social, economic, aesthetic, and technological urges of a community, whose history is delineated either by small and ordinary objects or monumental artifacts². Thus memory has a significant role in creating society's image of the past and the present: if in individual memories, the past is preponderant over the present, in public memory, the roles are exactly reversed, and its formation undergoes the filtering of authorities, political institutions, and, in the last years, also of the media, who have been using their supremacy to decide what history to tell, what memories to keep, and sometimes, what past to take as a model. Memory in its various implications is the object of a recent research field developed in conjunction with the sudden collective perception of the need to contextualize and fix in memory the remarkable events of the first half of the 20th century. Despite first memory studies dating back to the beginning of the century, only in the 1980s the field has taken elaborate forms in the debate concerning self-awareness and the relationship with the recent and historic past³: cultural memory, social memory, and collective memory⁴. A further expand-

¹ See [26] for a general European history of collecting and its social and political implications.

² For a brief summary about recent studies about museums and their role in society, see [27, pp. 219–222].

³ The first issue of *History and Memory*, investigating the relationship between history and images of the past, dates back to 1989; for a brief history on the birth and the recent development of the discipline, see [19].

⁴ The concept of Cultural Memory, specifically, has been first defined by Jan Assmann in a volume of collected essays edited in 1988 with Tonio Hölscher, both archaeologists, to analyze “the textuality of the past”

ed consciousness of the multiplicity of memory revealed further insights in the representation of the past, including in the world of museum studies [2]. From places of mere collection and displaying, the Museums, as “memory institutions” preserving social practices and physical evidence of human experience in general, today are passing through engaging discussions all over the world. The most recent topics are mainly related to issues derived from the closest historical facts, with a view to introducing the concept of museum inclusivity: post-colonialism, acts of terrorism, violence or military-related determining the destruction of indigenous heritage, the ethics of human remains, the impact of digital media, of policymaking, of racial and gender discrimination (See [1]).

On a smaller and different scale, Italian museums are undergoing a rethinking process too, and now it becomes clear that curatorial choices and means of cultural content dissemination are at the core of a community’s perception of the past and the present. Since the Italian territory is, for known reasons, extremely abundant with archaeological evidences from small to monumental size, the relationship between Archaeological Museums and the historical events of the last two centuries is still a deeply felt topic, which can be considered as belonging to a branch of museum studies related to the European history of Classical archaeology and the antiquarian⁵.

This aspect will be here briefly dealt through the presentation of a case study, the Archaeological Civic Museum of Terracina, 100 km south of Rome (Italy), among the earliest museums following the Unification of Italy. Its story and evolution allow to assist to the emerging of certain features of local collective memory interconnected with values such as historical awareness, nostalgia, tradition, and myth, which become visible through ideological and aesthetic choices within the rooms of a museum, supporting the trends of that time, thus becoming not only a place of conservation, but also a place of memory.

Historical context and the birth of local museums

In 17th and 18th-century Italy, which at the time was divided in several smaller states, was the privileged destination of The Grand Tour, the trip undertaken by upper-class scholars, enthusiasts, and antiquarians in search for the roots and the legacy of classical antiquities. Along with the influence of the Enlightenment values and principles of the diffusion of culture and education and the crucial excavations at Herculaneum, Pompeii and Imperial Forums of Rome, a radical transformation of the local cultural establishment took place. The French occupation of Italy by Napoleon Bonaparte at the end of the 18th century, accompanied by the order on the suppression of Italian religious orders and the sale of their respective property in 1810, resulted, at first, in the necessity to preserve historical objects and buildings; secondly, in the need of creating a place to open this collections open to the public for education purposes. Thus the foundation of many of the most important museums and academies has been laid⁶. Years later, in 1849, Giuseppe Mazzini, politician and activist for the Unification of Italy throughout the period of Risorgimento, celebrated the greatness of the Rome of the imperial age, followed by the papal one, in view of a “third” Rome, equally civilizing and conquering (See [15, p. 171; 28,

which stabilizes its self image conveying a collectively shared knowledge [3, pp. 9–19]. A recent handbook on the matter: [12].

⁵ An accurate view on the History of Archaeology in Italy of the last century in [5; 9; 21].

⁶ In Italy and in the rest of central Europe: [13, pp. 74–90].

pp. 49–51)). The charm of Rome and its ruins did not suffer any setbacks even after the Unification of Italy, in 1861, of which Rome was proclaimed capital following its annexation in 1870. Indeed, the creation of a nation, starting from a set of different states sometimes even speaking different languages, required the establishment of the means of administration but above all the identification of shared values and the “creation” of a history in which all inhabitants would recognize each other. The values of the Risorgimento, supported by the nationalist ideals of the new unified state were at the time still identified in Roman imperial age stereotypes from which the new image of power derived [9, p. 834]: commemorative monuments, colossal palaces and infrastructures, the race to colonialism, the establishment or re-functionalization of ancient festivals, the creation of new national collections of antiquities open to the public. At the cost of the detriment of the integrity of the historical narrative, national identification took on the appearance of a “selective memory”, namely, with few exceptions⁷, of the (alleged) white monumentality of the Roman Empire, generally recognized as the most glorious and unifying past.

Rome as a capital city had become the centre of irradiation of new political and cultural models, under the control of the Ministry of Public Education, which detained Cultural Heritage management functions from 1861 to 1974. The General Direction of Excavations and Antiquities, later transformed into the General Direction of Antiquities and Fine Arts, was competent until the first years of the 20th century for archaeological and not-archaeological evidences, chronologically and conventionally differentiated, in a Roman-oriented scheme, by the date of 476 AD⁸.

From the Parliamentary Acts drawn up until 1902, the year of the first law on the conservation of cultural heritage, emerges the total absence of legislative measures dealing with the management, functions, and staff of the soon to be Italian civic museums, other than what directly concerned the thorny questions about export, public and private property, and the regulation of excavation activities, by other laws that transversally recurred and required the establishment of museums for the protection of the heritage. Many local museums were born after 1861 in such an emergency situation, in which the absence of a law framework that protected national and local assets risked increasing an already active art and antiques market. The protection became indispensable especially after a royal decree was promulgated in 1866, establishing the devolution of the assets belonging to suppressed religious orders and corporations to the state property, which led to the institution of civic museums in almost every large city. A national law in 1875 applied for the first time an entrance fee to museums and archaeological areas, which started a gradual process of commodification of the art: from a free place of education and heritage safeguard, in a country whose illiteracy rate in 1871 was at about 73 % [31, p. 431], the museums were considered as containers of objects, only open to who was able to pay.

The first years of the 20th century show two different perceptions of the museum institution. The first being the avant-garde of artistic movements like Futurism and the emergence of new channels for the relationship between art and the public, which led to the vision of the museum as a place of passive conservation and retrospective exaltation of a “certain” past made of “bod-

⁷ For example, the growing interest in prehistorical [17, pp. 110–112], Etruscan and Pre-Roman evidences [18].

⁸ The formation of the Italian institutions designated to the Cultural heritage protection, immediately after the Unification has been analysed through original governative documents in [24] and [14].

ies”, seen as cold as dead. Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, the founder of the Futurism movement, expressed this kind of perception in his Manifesto published on a French newspaper in 1909:

“It is from Italy that we launch our manifesto of overwhelming and incendiary violence to the world, with which we found “Futurism” today, since we want to free this country from its fetid gangrene of professors, archaeologists, ciceroni and antiquarians. For too long Italy has been a market for antique dealers. We want to free it from the countless museums that cover it all with countless cemeteries. Museums: cemeteries!... Identical, really, for the sinister promiscuity of so many bodies that do ignore each other. Museums: public dormitories where you rest forever next to hated or unknown beings! Museums: [...] Go there on a pilgrimage once a year, like you go to the Cemetery on the day of the dead... That I grant you. Go and place a gift of flowers once a year in front of the Mona Lisa, that I grant you... But I don't admit taking our sadness, our fragile courage, our morbid restlessness that museums for a daily walk. Why wanting to poison ourselves? Why wanting to rot?”⁹

On the other hand, in the same period, a second perception arose. Museums and exhibitions were the perfect seat to spread concepts of pure nationalistic propaganda of the new political establishment and its progress through the use of antiquities¹⁰. In 1911, the International Exhibition of Art was held in Rome as part of the celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the Unification of Italy, which included the first world level Archaeological Exhibition of the Roman Empire pavilion and several other pavilions presenting the Italian history of art and material culture [25]. Marble statues and monumental architectural elements were on display in the Baths of Diocletian, along with pictures, casts, and recreations of Roman monuments located throughout the Mediterranean and beyond, as a symbol of the ancient Italic power. The same historical imaginary was inherited by the Fascist regime (1922–1943) which could count on the collaboration of historians, archaeologists, artists, and architects to support its “Romanolatry”: a political culture focused on the cult and mythologization of the Roman Empire era in all its forms, which culminated in permeating not only the political institutions and the means of communication but also daily life, until it became what today can be defined a real mass phenomenon. Another significant moment of Italian history of Archaeology is represented by the Augustan Exhibition of Romanity held in 1937 to celebrate the 2000th anniversary of the birth of Augustus (See [22]) and showing the evolution of roman culture from the foundation of the city to the Emperor Constantine era. The exhibit path had obvious political implications: propaganda underlying agenda was to support regime’s message of order and greatness through the display of objects, recovered monuments, and new excavations successfully conducted. The diffusion of such images through press and newsreels was impressive for the time, becoming an inspiring model for smaller museums in the rest of Italy for the following years.

“We can realize the importance of placing a work of art in a museum, only by bearing in mind that no one is able to escape the impression that derives from it. [...] Familiar are the ancient statues created in this peninsula in a period ranging from the late Republican age to the late imperial age and exhibited in the historic buildings that mostly house the Italian Museums. This familiarity, inherited from our fathers, should not be underestimated, as “knowing how to see” is a matter of experience and education” [11, p. 229].

⁹ *Le Figaro*, 20 February 1909.

¹⁰ An insight on the relationship between 19th century nationalistic ideals and their influence on 20th century Fascist propaganda in [4].

After the Second World War, Italian museums undergo a major overhaul not only of their structures, often destroyed by bombings, but also of their traditional functions. Museums begin to be the object of new attention from states and parties; the number of conferences multiplies, renovations are planned, and institutions for new museums are deliberated. The phenomenon in Europe takes the form of a “museum fever” in the mid-1970s, even though, in exception for a few isolated cases, Italian museologists remained outside the international debate on museology of the 1970s and 80s, due to the conception of museums established in Italy which has reduced these institutions to a mere conservative role. The increase in the international tourism in the 1990s, the emergence of new cultural needs, the solicitations brought by the entertainment society and the media have in any case also imposed a transformation on the Italian museums, which is still ongoing today, from a place of conservation and aesthetic contemplation to a place of active cultural elaboration and multiple cultural activities.

Archaeological Civic Museum of Terracina and museums of Southern Lazio: a case study

The Archaeological Civic Museum of Terracina (province of Latina) lies in an area geographically belonging to southern Lazio, the region of central western Italy of which Rome is the county seat. Such proximity to the capital city defined the whole regional characteristics, and especially from the Unification of Italy to these days, the period in which the aesthetic and conceptual museological characteristics that gave rise to the study in question were taking shape.

For what concerns the museums in particular, it is primarily necessary to distinguish between national and local institutions: national museums, in a smaller number, generally have the longest tradition and derive from important state acquisitions and donations or are the ones placed at the most important archaeological areas as control centres of the State in key points. Local museums were on the contrary initially formed by the donation of small collections of antiquarian items, then increased through the contribution of state activities and institutes, and belonged to municipalities, provinces, and regions. The genesis of the local museums of Latium explains the predominant characterization in an archaeological sense¹¹, even though in the last years, by reason of economic partnership with privates, societies, and associations, local authorities have had the chance to create new types of places of memory, dedicated to topics specifically related to the territory, such as, in the province of Latina: rural life, 20th century land reclamation, the brigandage, medieval life, prehistoric, and naturalistic aspects. The comparison between the examinations of the museums of Latium carried out in the early 1980s [29] and early 2000s [23] counted in the earlier phase 51 local museums, of which 26 were civic; in the 2000s, there were 187 local museums. Terracina, as a city of a certain importance at the southern gate of the previous Papal States from the 9th to 19th century, was the second city of the coastal Lazio south of Rome to have its own Archaeological Civic Museum, in 1894. Its current exhibit design dated back to 2016 has become cause of reflection on other territorially contiguous archaeological museums. The geographical area involved in the research has been

¹¹ The trend is confirmed in national statistics compiled by the Italian National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT) in 2019: the 90% of Italian museums is local, and the 20% are archaeology-related. Latium represents the fourth region for the overall number of museums, and hosts about the 20% of Italian national museums.

delimited, for cultural and historical matters¹², to the coastal territories enclosed by the ancient Appian way to the east and the Tyrrhenian sea to the west; the southern border is represented by the Garigliano river (also the border of the region Campania), whereas the northern limit is the city of Rome, which must be considered excluded. That is, altogether, an area of about 1700 sq. km and 650.000 inhabitants distributed in 17 municipalities, among which 3 pertaining to the province of Rome and 14 to the province of Latina (instituted in 1934, until when the whole area was still included in the province of Rome). In this area, 11 Archaeological museums have been registered, mostly founded in the last 60–70 years, 7 local, 4 national. The foundation of the most ancient museums, the one in Fondi in 1877 and the one in Terracina in 1894, stems from the political history of the years immediately following the Unification of Italy, as said before, to avoid the dispersion of the cultural heritage and facilitate their conservation and management: provinces and municipalities were invited to establish museums and other places of culture such as archives and libraries. Nonetheless, the most valuable works were still requisitioned to be exhibited in the most important museums of the capital, where they can still be seen. On the basis of a comparison between the oldest and newest structures, collections, exhibition criteria the didactic equipment and the local community response, a certain coherence has been identified in 9 out of the said 11 of southern Latium Museums. The farther from the capital city, which represents for this area the closest innovation centre from which changes radiate, the stronger stays certain aesthetic characteristics. These aesthetic characteristics, self-identification factors for their communities, might be summarized in few words: Roman, white, marble, monumental. The story of the Archaeological Museum of Terracina, in its 127 years of life, five different seats and fittings accurately documented since the beginning through the extensive use of the photography, might be illustrative of Stransky's "*inclination to preserve and show selected objects*".

Terracina, known in the ancient literary as *Anxur* or *Tarracina*, appears in the history between the 6th and the 4th century B. C., especially for its position: close to the sea, along a river, which led the Romans to conquer the city, previously inhabited by a hostile population, found a colony, build the ancient Appian through it, and reinforce the harbour¹³. Archaeological remains report a notable prosperity between the late Roman Republican and the early Imperial period¹⁴, but the present appearance of the historical centre of the city bears the signs of the Medieval age and of the 18th–19th century. The Civic Museum was founded in 1894¹⁵ following the need to offer shelter to the archaeological finds especially coming from the excavations of the famous Temple of Jupiter Anxur, whose monumental terrace is still visible today, and that is still acknowledged as community's most self-representative symbol. The earliest setting (1894, Fig. 1) consisted of a few rooms of the ground floor of an 18th century building, located in the lower part of the city. The artefacts were organised according to thematic and chronological sequences, even though the lack of space and the abundance of objects on display recalls today

¹² Most of the territory was characterized by extensive marshes, drained on the initiative of Mussolini: after the 30s the Pomptine Marshes, became a fertile plain, characterized by the planning of new towns. See [6].

¹³ About the city in Pre-Roman and Roman times, with previous bibliography, see [10, pp.165–166].

¹⁴ The city was often cited by Roman authors among the cities placed along the Appian way: Strabo, *Geography*, V, 3, 6; Horace, *Satires*, I, 5, 9–26.

¹⁵ For the most recent studies about the Civic Museum of Terracina, see [8] and [16].



Fig. 1. Civic Archaeological Museum of Terracina. Room Antonelli. Istituto Nazionale di Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte, Roma. 1911–1912. Fondo Corrado Ricci, inv. 8770. ©Istituto Nazionale di Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte, Roma

the “*horror vacui*” of any 17th-century *wunderkammern* and 19th-century *antiquariums*. The items displayed consisted mostly in roman marble statues, inscriptions, architectural elements, altars, and sarcophagi; different traces of ancient material culture, such as pottery or tools, were completely absent, notwithstanding a small showcase hosting ancient votive offerings in clay and lead. Here and there, amphoras, marble reliefs, and clay pipes were put as decorative elements. Between the last years of the century and the 1930s, the collection was increased by several private donations: new rooms were opened to display modern art works by painters of the Roman Campagna and local sculptors, medieval liturgical furniture, prints, engravings, etchings, wooden bas-reliefs, medallions, stone coats of arms, but also new archaeological items and coins from the Roman period¹⁶.

In 1933, the building that included the museum rooms was chosen by the National Fascist Party as its seat, so all the artifacts had to be moved away. The rooms of another building were selected as the new seat of the Civic Museum that stood as little more than a makeshift shelter. This collection, which at the time consisted of about 1300 items, was almost entirely dispersed between 1943 and 1944, during the Second World War, due to the bombings and the consequent lootings, and the museum thus regained its original eminently archaeological facies. Many of the objects displayed in photos have unfortunately been lost, stolen, or transferred to other museums.

On the Museums International Day in 1959, the new museum was inaugurated in its third seat, in some rooms of the City Hall, just rebuilt in the historical centre after its destruction during the war, in front of the Roman forum and theatre (Fig. 2); in 1963 the museum moved

¹⁶ As reported in the first catalogue, dated to 1907 and still in the catalogue by Giuseppe Lugli [20, pp. 18–23].

again to its fourth seat, on the ground floor of a medieval tower close by (Fig. 3). A project dated 1975 proposed to extend the museum area to the other floors of the tower, so to host the prehistorical finds collection, just recovered from a human shelter from the Epigravettian age found in the city, but it was never brought to an end; in the 1990s, a new set-up was displayed (Fig. 4).



Fig. 2. Civic Archaeological Museum of Terracina. Room B. From [7, p. 369], 1960. ©Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato



Fig. 3. Civic Archaeological Museum of Terracina. Room 3. Museum's Offices Archive. Ca 1970. ©Municipality of Terracina (LT)



Fig. 4. Civic Archaeological Museum of Terracina. Room 2. Museum's Offices Archive. Ca 1998. ©Municipality of Terracina (LT)



Fig. 5. New City Museum. Room 8. 2020. ©Ilaria Bruni

In 2016, a recently renovated late 18th-century building, seat of the offices for organizing the reclamation work undertaken by Pope Pius VI, was inaugurated as the fifth seat of the Civic Museum, and most of the collection was transferred here. In this last museographic design, there is again the “white archaeology” on display (Fig. 5). Comparable choices have been made in the wider district, as described before: the nationalistic echo of the early 20th century, in some places more than in others, for the tradition or popular affection, crystallised concepts of popular identification into the Imperial Roman monumental past, which has been collected, pre-

served, studied, and displayed. This “selective memory”, the past we choose to tell, is identifiable in some categories and behaviours that can be summarized in: “the collected and preserved”, transmitting historical, social, and cultural values, worth of memory; “the hidden and scattered”, but of some economic value, expendable on the national and international underground antiques market; “the unrepresentative”, evidence of the archaeological past of little importance, such as material classes containing objects of everyday use, deemed unworthy of display or narration, stored in depots. To what extent this behaviour, bounded to a precise geographical range, represents a conditioned or unconditioned reflex, affected by current political tendencies or past ideological and propaganda phenomena, — to what degree modern communication strategies still deliberately use people’s nostalgia for a certain past — how long the nationalist fascination for slogans has been influencing cultural choices in the political establishment: it will be the object of further research, while at the same time assisting at the process of the gradual transformation of local museums into multi-purpose complexes. Not being involved in major tourist routes and having a different connotation than museums that host prestigious historical collections, they are asked now to be the organisms recording all the complex factors that have contributed to determining the current appearance of a city or an area, including the historical, artistic, urban, social, and economic components, becoming thus a pole of territorial documentation.

References

1. Apaydin V. *Critical Perspectives on Cultural Memory and Heritage. Construction, Transformation and Destruction*. UCL Press Publ., 2020. 336 p. 29 pl.
2. Arnold-de Simone S. *Mediating Memory in the Museum: Trauma, Empathy, Nostalgia*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan Publ., 2013. 256 p.
3. Assmann J. Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität. Assmann J.; Hölscher T. (eds.) *Kultur und Gedächtnis*. Frankfurt am Main, 1988, pp. 9–19 (in German).
4. Baioni M. *Risorgimento in camicia nera. Studi, istituzioni, musei nell’Italia Fascista*. Torino, Carocci Publ., 2006. 291 p. (in Italian).
5. Barbanera M. *Storia dell’archeologia classica in Italia*. Roma; Bari, Laterza Publ., 2015. 248 p. (in Italian).
6. Caprotti F. Destructive Creation: Fascist Urban Planning, Architecture and New Towns. *Journal of Historical Geography*, iss. 33(3), 2007, pp. 651–679.
7. Conticello B. Il Museo Archeologico di Terracina. *Bollettino d’Arte*, vol. XLV, IV, 1960, pp. 368–370 (in Italian).
8. Coppola M. R. *Terracina. Il museo e le collezioni*. Quasar Publ., 1989. 181 p. (in Italian).
9. De Cristofaro A. Per una storia dell’archeologia classica italiana: alcune riflessioni attorno ad un recente libro. *Archeologia Classica*, iss. LXVII, 2016, pp. 827–865 (in Italian).
10. Di Rosa A. Strutture rupestri di età romana nel territorio di Terracina (Lazio meridionale). *Babesch*, iss. 93, 2018, pp. 165–208 (in Italian).
11. Dohrn T. Il classicismo come fonte di ispirazione nella collocazione di statue. *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia*, vol. XLI, 1968–1969, pp. 229–239 (in Italian).
12. Erll A.; Nünning A. (eds.). *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*. Berlin, New York, De Gruyter Publ., 2010. 441 p.
13. Fiorio M. T. *Il museo nella storia. Dallo studiolo alla raccolta pubblica*. Milano; Torino, Pearson Italia Publ., 2018 (2011). 247 p. (in Italian).
14. Francescangeli L. *Politiche culturali e conservazione del patrimonio storico-artistico a Roma dopo l’Unità*. Roma, Viella Publ., 2014. 246 p. (in Italian).

15. Giardina A.; Vauchez A. *Il mito di Roma: da Carlo Magno a Mussolini*. Roma; Bari, Laterza Publ. 2000. 336 p. (in Italian).
16. Grossi V.; Pasquali M. I.; Malizia R. *Il Museo Civico Pio Capponi di Terracina. Storia dell'Istituto e delle sue collezioni*. Terracina, 1998. 543 p. (in Italian).
17. Guidi A. Nationalism without a Nation: The Italian Case. Diaz-Andreu M.; Champion T. (eds.). *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*. London, 1996, pp. 108–118.
18. Harari M. Etruscologia e fascismo. *Athenaeum: Studi di letteratura e Storia dell'antichità*, vol. 1–2, 2012, pp. 405–418 (in Italian).
19. Kattago S. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Memory Studies*. Ashgate Publ., 2015. 274 p.
20. Lugli G. *Comune di Terracina. Guida del Museo Civico*. Roma, Danesi Publ., 1940. 34 p., 17 pl. (in Italian).
21. Malnati L. *La passione e la polvere*. Milano, La Nave di Teseo Publ., 2021, 216 p. (in Italian).
22. Marcello F. Mussolini and the Idealisation of Empire: The Augustan Exhibition of Romanità. *Modern Italy*, iss. 16(3), 2011, pp. 223–247.
23. Mattei F.; Pascucci P.; Russo L. (eds.). *Guida ai musei e alle collezioni di Roma e del Lazio*. Roma, Palombi Publ., 2004. 232 p. (in Italian).
24. Musacchio M. *L'archivio della Direzione generale delle antichità e belle arti (1860–1890)*, Ministero per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali. Ufficio Centrale per i Beni Archivistici. Roma, 1994. 1186 p. (in Italian).
25. Palombi D. Rome 1911. L'Exposition archéologique du cinquantenaire de l'Unité italienne, *Anabases*, iss. 9, 2009, pp. 71–99 (in Italian).
26. Pearce S. M. *On Collecting: An Investigation into Collecting in the European Tradition*, London; New York, Routledge Publ., 1995. 456 p.
27. Petrov J. Cross-Purposes: Museum Display and Material Culture. *Crosscurrents*, vol. 62, iss. 2, 2012, pp. 219–234.
28. Silverio E. L'idea di Roma nel Regno d'Italia sino alla Mostra Archeologica del 1911. *Bollettino di Numismatica, Studi e Ricerche*, 2014, no. 2, pp. 47–79 (in Italian).
29. Strano C.; Coccia M. I musei locali del Lazio. *Bollettino d'arte*, Suppl. 30, 1985. 238 p. (in Italian).
30. Stránský Z. Z. Museology as a Science (a Thesis). *Museologia*, vol. 15, iss. XI, 1980, pp. 33–40.
31. Tobia B. Una cultura per la nuova Italia. Sabbatucci G.; Vidotto V. (eds.). *Storia d'Italia*, vol. 2, *Il nuovo Stato e la società civile. 1861–1887*. Roma; Bari, Laterza Publ., 1995, pp. 427–529 (in Italian).

Title. “Selective Memory”: A Museum and Its Past

Author. Bruni, Ilaria — Director. Civic Archaeological Museum. Terracina, Piazza Municipio 1, 04019 Terracina (LT), Italy. ilaria.bruni@comune.terracina.lt.it ORCID: 0000-0003-3879-227X

Abstract. “Selective memory” of the past, borrowing the definition from cognitive psychology and neuroscience, represents a phenomenon closely tied to the history of classical archaeology and the antiquarian, specifically within Italian museum studies, as a cultural-ideological result of 19th and 20th century historical events. A research recently undertaken into the current situation of museums pertaining to a subregional district of southern Latium, the region of central western Italy of which Rome is the county seat, constituted an opportunity for comparison based on the analysis of some indicators, both aesthetical and technical: museological and museographical approaches, management issues, exhibition design, and communication strategies. A common thread is a perpetuation of bygone ideological and propaganda symbols as nostalgia for the past and the reactivation of historical, political, and anthropological phenomena. As a case study the Archaeological Civic Museum of Terracina, a city 100 kilometers south of Rome, has been chosen, in consideration of its long history and the possibility to assist to the evolution of the fittings and locations from 1894, the year of foundation, until today, by dint of photos, inventories, and period letters. The central theme of criterion for selecting the archaeological material to be exhibited has been, since the beginning, the past that we choose to tell. This “selective memory” is identifiable in the different treatment reserved to single objects: some have been collected and preserved, some have been scattered, some have been perceived as unrepresentative, and thus deemed unworthy of display or narration, and stored in depots. The museum has consequently selected only certain aspects of the past of its community, which is almost entirely related to its Late Roman Republican and Imperial period, an attitude which in the literature is frequently referred to as “Romanolatry”. The cult of the “white archaeology” removes from consideration the material culture of everyday life, of prehistoric, protohistoric, late antique, medieval, and Renaissance phases, even when well documented. Is the museum a place of oblivion or a place of memory?

Keywords: classical archaeology, museum studies, antiquarian, nostalgia, propaganda, memory

Название статьи. «Избирательная память»: музей и его прошлое

Сведения об авторе. Бруни, Илария — директор. Городской археологический музей Террачины, Пьяцца Муничипио 1, 04019 Террачина (LT), Италия. ilaria.bruni@comune.terracina.lt.it ORCID: 0000-0003-3879-227X

Аннотация. «Избирательная память» о прошлом, определение которой заимствовано из когнитивной психологии и неврологии, представляет собой явление, тесно связанное с историей классической археологии, торговли и коллекционирования антиков, особенно как часть итальянской музейной науки, будучи культурно-идеологическим результатом исторических событий XIX и XX вв. Такое недавно предпринятое тематическое исследование текущего положения музеев, относящихся к субрегиональному району южной части Лацио, области центрально-западной Италии, административным центром которой является Рим, предоставило возможность для компаративного анализа по ряду эстетических и технических показателей: музеевлогический и музеографический подходы, вопросы управления, выставочный дизайн и коммуникативные стратегии. Красной нитью стало увековечивание ушедших идеологических и пропагандистских символов как ностальгия по прошлому и реактивация исторических, политических и антропологических явлений. В качестве объекта исследования был выбран Городской археологический музей Террачины, города в 100 км к югу от Рима, с учётом его длительной истории и возможности помочь в изучении развития эволюции музейных локаций и оборудования с момента основания (1894) до сегодняшнего дня благодаря большому фонду фотографий, описей и исторической корреспонденции. Центральной темой критерия отбора археологических материалов для демонстрации с самого начала было то прошлое, о котором было заведомо решено рассказать. Эту «избирательную память» можно идентифицировать по различному обращению с отдельными объектами: одни артефакты вошли в коллекцию и сохранились, другие были рассеяны, некоторые воспринимались как нерепрезентативные и, считаясь недостойными демонстрации или повествования, пылились в хранилищах. Музей последовательно отбирал только некоторые аспекты прошлого своего сообщества, почти полностью связанного с его позднеримским республиканским и имперским периодом. Такое отношение в литературе часто называют «романолатрией» (поклонением Риму). Подобный культ так называемой «белой археологии» исключает из рассмотрения материальную культуру повседневной жизни, доисторическую, протоисторическую, позднеантичную, средневековую и ренессансную фазы, даже в случае, когда они хорошо задокументированы. И встает вопрос: музей — это место забвения или место памяти?

Ключевые слова: классическая археология, музейное дело, антикварная деятельность, ностальгия, пропаганда, память