



## **Museology and ethnography in Italy: an historical perspective**

Maria Anna Bertolino

Department of Foreign Languages, Literatures and Modern Cultures, University of Turin.

### **Abstract**

'L'Itala gente dalle molte vite' ('The many lives of Italian people'): with these words by the poet Giosuè Carducci, Lamberto Loria summed up his project to collect the material evidence of Italian culture. This report aims to trace the ideology that accompanied the birth of ethnographical museums in Italy from the late nineteenth century to the present day. It will focus mainly on the period that follows Pigorini's efforts, as outlined in Maria Gabriella Lerario's report. The will of the founders of Italian ethnography to develop the collection of objects belonging to the rural world of the peninsula can be traced back to the First Congress of Italian Ethnography held in Rome in 1911 that accompanied the International Exhibition on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of Italian unification.

However, the dream of a national museum was interrupted during the Interwar period. Indeed, the Museo Nazionale delle Arti e Tradizioni Popolari was only installed in the 1950s thanks to the arrangement of the collection of objects gathered by Loria four decades earlier and the desire to put on display the multiple facets of Italian national identity and its regional and local specificities. This interest in the regional differences was maintained in the 1970s, when there was an unexpected social phenomenon: the establishment of local ethnographic museums created by local associations of volunteers helped by academic anthropologists and, in recent years, also by Italian law.

In the last 50 years some anthropologists like Alberto Mario Cirese and Pietro Clemente, have developed theories related to the exhibition of ethnographic objects and have provided an anthropologic analysis of this phenomenon, which was very different in the North of Italy compared to the South. The report ends with some examples of Italian ethnographical practice related to museums, which show the evolution of museographic theories in this field and the influence of new multimedia tools.

## Introduction

Italian ethnography and the institution of museum, developed since the eighteenth century, have maintained close ties. They both arose from the collector's desire to collect objects of distant countries that became part of the Cabinet of curiosities as so-called *mirabilia*. The collection of curiosities seems to have preceded the development of knowledge about the collections. In the nineteenth century, the emerging discipline of anthropology, influenced by the positivist paradigm developed methods of collecting objects, such as taxonomies and evolutionary approach, so the museum became 'the place to see the main phases of human development represented and documented' (Lattanzi 1994: 83). Objects and human remains from around the world were collected during the expeditions of travellers since the sixteenth century. Those objects contributed to the development of natural history museums in the Americas and in Europe, therefore anthropology was linked to the development of the museum: the subject gave legitimacy to scientific study of human cultures by positioning anthropology as a natural science based on an experimental method.

The so-called 'museum period' (Jacknis 1985: 117) of anthropology is related to the figure of Franz Boas (1858-1942), who worked at the American Museum of Natural History of New York with a new method of collection, and built dioramas where the object was no longer considered in isolation but its presence used to recreate the living part of the culture of non- Western peoples. It was developed to attract a wider public not only composed of researchers but also the middle-class and students of all levels (Jacknis 1985: 129-130).<sup>1</sup>

Otherwise, in Italy the relationship between anthropology and the museum developed later because of the study of Folklore<sup>2</sup>, which mainly took into account the immaterial aspects of culture such as poetry, popular narratives or popular song and music. This was especially true under the Italian process of cultural unification after 1860 in which these elements, despite their distinctive characteristics that differentiate them from region to region, were seen in their unity as a means to reconstruct the socio-historical plots and common roots of Italian inhabitants. In the eighteenth century particular attention was paid to the *antiquitates vulgaris* (vernacular antiquities), ie the concepts and practices of the people considered as *consuetudines non laudabiles* or *errores* (unpraiseworthy habits or mistakes) (Cirese 1985: X). In this early period, the interest of Italian folklorists focused on oral traditions, such as the production of songs and the popular narration, and not on material culture. Besides this interest, in the late nineteenth century, physical anthropology studies became relevant. This gave life to museums such as the Regio Museo Nazionale Preistorico ed Etnografico in Rome founded by Luigi Pigorini (1842-1925) in 1875, the museum Cesare Lombroso (1835-1909), established in 1876 in Turin, and the first university museum of anthropology in Europe founded in Florence in 1869 by Paolo Mantegazza (1831-1910) to document the evolution of humans and the development of civilization. However, in all these collections human remains or ethnological materials from other countries were partly present to be compared with prehistoric collections.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, ethnography in Italy shifted, as can be seen in the greater interest devoted to the material cultural aspects of Italian society, the focal point of the *Museo Etnografico Siciliano*, directed by the physician Giuseppe Pitré (1841-1916) in 1910 in Palermo. The most significant event was the creation in 1907 of a section of Italian ethnography in the museum of Florence by the folklorist Lamberto Loria (1855-1913) and the physical

anthropologist Aldobrandino Mochi (1874-1931), both protagonists of the future constitution of the Italian Society of Ethnography. Here the objects collected in Italy were compared with the ethnological collections. In addition, the debate in the early twentieth century highlighted the status of the ethnographic museum in relation to others as a political and social voice of a strong national identity (Puccini 1985). Inspired by Paolo Mantegazza's study titled *Gli oggetti metamorfici* (1902), Aldobrandino Mochi recognized the importance of the philological reconstruction of the object (in line with the tradition of the nineteenth century museology), seen as a valuable source of information in the social and psychological life of peoples of which anthropology had to provide an interpretation. Objects of Italian popular tradition were seen in the same perspective as those so-called exotic culture (and considered as archaic) and they came to be considered as documents for the reconstruction of the past (Mochi & Loria 1906).

In those years, there was a desire to develop programmed research on material culture: Italian anthropologists felt that what had been done in the century before for intangible expressions of culture such as songs and poetries should also be done now for material aspects. The idea that Objects could be used to show how the differences of Italian people from the North to the South developed throughout the centuries but also to discover a Unity in the diversity as the basis on which to build the Nation. So in the 1911 an ethnographic exhibition was organised by Lamberto Loria during the International Exposition of Rome that celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of Italian unification.

The exhibition was the first step of a bigger project: the establishment of a national museum of ethnography. After five years of research a huge collection of objects had been amassed; Loria had expressed his intention to collect all of the most characteristic objects belonging to rural populations such as cloths, tools, instruments, furnishings and fittings, artefacts because:

the objects used and manufactured by ordinary people must be collected and studied as the mental products of the folk activity (Loria Mochi, 1906: p. 17).

In addition to the activity of collecting objects for the museum, the material life of traditional rural society was examined with careful observation in fieldwork by using instruments such as photography. Social life and ritual aspects were left outside the picture. This ethnographic approach was conceived as a safeguard operation *antelitteram* because the protagonists knew they had to work quickly to save the testimony of an endangered world:

the analysis of our people should attract us more than any other ethnographic issue, because it is a more familiar subject and of a practical utility. We should collect from everywhere what remains of the documents related to the typical local folk reality, if we do not want to risk having only altered remnants (Loria Mochi, 1906: p. 14).

The exhibition was inaugurated in April and it had all the characteristics of an Open-air museum, indeed it was described as such in contemporary accounts. Several reconstructions of sites and places of work and of local crafts, traditional houses, clothes and tools were shown to create an Italian identity and therefore a united people. However, they also demonstrated the regional differences of the *Belpaese* as in the verses of the Italian poet Giosué Carducci 'L'Italia gente dalle molte vite' ('The many lives of Italian people').<sup>3</sup>

The intention of the organisers was to allow each inhabitant of Italy to find a small piece of his own land in Rome. This was to promote a sense of belonging in the hearts of the people. The climate of the exhibition was strongly imbued with symbolic patriotism. In addition, the

readability of the exhibition made it the most visited event within the International Exhibition (Puccini, 2005: 156). However, the purpose was scientific research as can be seen in the display's way of following an evolutionary logic that presented the material as an archaic social form. The First Congress that took place in October laid the foundation for a reflection on the status of research in Italian ethnography, as well as its representation in museums.<sup>4</sup>

Loria's programme gave the museum a central role in the nascent discipline of Italian ethnography allowing it to become a tool for understanding of the cultural history of the nation as a whole. Discussions took place as to the structure of the exhibition: there were those who defended the organisation according to geographical areas where the object testified the specificity of local culture whilst others argued for a comparative display as the better method to show the continuity of cultural aspects.

Mochi became a spokesperson for the museum's educational role, while Francesco Baldasseroni (1878-1923), a historian collaborator of Loria, introduced some questions of modern museology, such as the reflection on the loss of vitality of the object and its fossilization when removed from its original context and placed in a museum. The museological organization into categories of objects, allowed the historian to dynamically analyse them, comparing the morphologic features and functions. However, the establishment of a national museum, whose purpose was to expose the material culture of a unified Italian people, to be an imaginary unifying narrative about the nation and the summary of all regional museums, was halted by the death of Loria in 1931. The museum was eventually to be opened in the 1950s.

### **Anthropology in the modern museum**

The four decades that separate the two events were full of political, social and cultural changes. The ideology of Fascism had used ethnology to contribute to the promotion of its populist rhetoric and staged an archaic and pure peasant world. The museum was born after this period, in 1956 at the initiative of Paolo Toschi (1893-1974), already editor of the collection inherited from Loria, of which he had catalogued years earlier.

The denomination 'ethnographic museum' was changed to Museo Nazionale delle Arti e Tradizioni Popolari, because the term ethnography did not comply with scientific criteria that had inspired the Museum's organisation, where only the material related to the artistic and traditional folk products of Italy were to be exhibited. Moreover, there was an increasing interest in folk art, which in the nineteenth century had already been considered from a romantic point of view, and an increase in the use of expressions such as 'folk traditions', also in the fascist rhetoric. Alongside these reasons, the influence that had caused the separation of the Musée d'Ethnographie from the Musée de l'Homme in Paris, changing the name into Musée des Arts et Traditions Populaires on a proposal of the museographer George Henry Rivi re also played an important role. However, even if a National museum on ethnography is today an important focal point for many activities in Italy, and the main institution for anthropology (IDEA, Istituto centrale per la demoeoantropologia), it is important to remember that the idea of a presenting a national museography, as conceived by the founders, has been definitely abandoned to highlight the multiple regional and local identities of the Italians.

It was only in 1964, that the Commission Franceschini recognized a legal definition of national cultural heritage.<sup>5</sup> At the same time Tullio Tentori (1920-2003), director from 1956 to

1972, and chief of the National museum from 1968, defined the following tasks and functions: collection of the anthropologic heritage in Italy, divulgation activities, consulting services for the State and public authorities, analyses and research activities, training, and updating activities for the internal and external administrative staff. Yet, even after the 1960s ethnographic heritage was not legally recognised, and this caused a lack in its protection and conservation (Mariotti 1999: 105).

Official recognition came as a result of the restructuring of the *Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali* (MiBAC) in 1998 (Dlgs 368/1998), with the creation of a Superintendence for the tangible and intangible heritage that takes care of archaeological, historical, artistic and architectural heritage as represented in the *Museo Nazionale di Arti e Tradizioni Popolari*. In 2004 the *Codice dei Beni culturali e del paesaggio* (Dlgs 42/2004) was published setting out criteria for the recognition of this type of property. Finally the *Istituto Centrale per la Demoetnoantropologia* (Decreto del Presidente della Repubblica del 26 November 2007 n. 233) was created in 2007. However, a significant commitment came from the Regions<sup>6</sup> that have encouraged the development of Centres for Documentation in collaboration with Universities (Bravo & Tucci 2006: 82). The academic interest towards folk art has increased since the 1970s, when a movement of rediscovery of local culture emerged.

From an historical point of view the social-cultural context after the war in Italy was particularly complex. On one hand the north was more and more urbanised and there was a strong economical development, on the other hand the south was marginalised, the style of life was still very traditional and there was a high rate of immigration to the north. Therefore the phenomenon of abandonment of traditional culture was much more pronounced in the industrialised regions and explaining the earlier creation of local museums in northern Italy.

Actually, since the 1950s people have been leaving the countryside and new generations have been neglected rural culture, considered as backward, whilst the conditions of life in the city were considered better and industry was seen as a more secure jobs sector. The elders stayed in the countryside, but the process of cultural transmission and other agro-pastoral aspects were lost. It seemed as though the economical boom had made all the rituals, usages of the traditional agricultural calendar disappear, to make room for the new models of mass culture society.

However, since the 1970s people started to be interested in the conditions of life in the past. Even if the urbanisation and industrialisation process did not stop, such phenomena as the energy crisis, pollution, and high unemployment rates, brought people back to the past (Bonato 2006: 21) restoring rituals and festivals (the immaterial aspect of the culture) and leading to the collection of objects that belonged to rural culture.

Living in a complicated society led to by a 'desire of the past' from the youngsters who, committed to an 'ethnography of recovery' (Clemente & Rossi 1999: 20), created local museums to display the traditional lifestyle of their parents and grandparents through its material culture and its changes in industrial society. In this case, the museography that developed has been described as 'spontaneous' (Bravo & Tucci 2006: 60-67), because it is often linked to the activity of communities. This movement has enabled the development of museums strongly linked to the local residents of a territory. They draw on the Open-air model of museums established at the end of the nineteenth century in Northern Europe with the aim of preserving elements of the rural environment, and of creating a reality closer in time and space, much like the Ecomuseums

established in France in the 1970s with the aim of giving a diachronic vision of territorial change connected to the local community.

The local ethnographic museum is a cultural project with specific connotations and particularities: first of all a founder, that could be a single person or local group naturally established and then transformed into an association, who create a group of local intellectuals, as organiser and defenders of this culture. (Bravo, 2006, p. 18) The museum gains its lively personality from their experience. Among those promoters of culture who have contributed to the establishment of important museums, there are Ettore Guatelli, founder of the house-museum that bears his name in Ozzano Taro (Emilia-Romagna), and Giuseppe Šebesta, who establish the *Museo degli Usi e Costumi della Gente Trentina* in San Michele all'Adige (Trentino Alto Adige). These museums were established on erghologic (related to the 'old profession') and georgologic ('the rural civilisation') paradigms; the majority of the local ethnographic museums recalls pre-industrial manual work and are set into a wider context of etereogenic folk interests such as the creative revisitation of the traditional technologies and traditions, a phenomenon known as folk revival which includes singing, festivals and the Carnival (Bravo 2006: 17). Lastly, the language of these museums came from a reflection on the nature of time and from the nostalgia for what is an irrecoverable past.

At university level, such bottom-up phenomenon were studied by academic anthropologists who took interest in Italian traditions thanks to the rediscovery of Antonio Gramsci's theories on the hegemonic culture (see Cirese 1973). This allowed them to formulate an applied anthropology referring to the creation of participating museums and the interpretation of the objects on display (Turci 1999).<sup>7</sup> Through these developments, folk culture started to be analysed as a science of 'cultural gradients' resulting from the difference between the dominant culture and the subordinate ones. Gramsci (1891-1937) believed that the subordinate social classes that define the people have a culture which reflects social diversity (different conceptions, costumes and uses, religion and morality). The consciousness of the social class in the context of the 1960s, has led experts Alberto Mario Cirese (1921-2011) to concentrate on the phenomenon of the ethnographic museums establishment, which analyses the subordinate class culture of the agropastoral world, as a result of a 'consciousness of the price paid' that refers to the birth of industrial society and post industrial, urban life that in a short time to the loss of a traditional style of life. Both Alberto Mario Cirese and Pietro Clemente elaborated museological theories that still condition the organisation of local museums. They privilege a central vision of the museum as an anthropological discourse on the issue of representation and on the function of the object as a document of different social contexts.

Alberto Mario Cirese was the protagonist of this new interest and also the founder of new museum studies in anthropology. He built a bridge with the past by adopting the arguments advanced in the Congress of 1911, referring to the passage of the object in historical document when it is moved from its context of use to the museum. Through his theory, that considered the museum as a meta-language (Cirese 1977), he addressed the problem of the object that loses its original use inducing a loss of vitality and becoming something dead. The museologist's task is to make the ethnographic museum a vital place because, by the characteristics of what it presents, it must recreate for the visitor life as it is beyond the museum: it means reconstructing social and functional contexts of use for the ethnographic object but also the comparison of the

morphological characters between objects of the same provenance or from other contexts. In Cirese's view, the museum continues to be a place of scientific research where exposure coincides with the most faithful representation of knowledge (Cirese 1977: 44).

In turn, Pietro Clemente theorized about, and subsequently put into practice, a method of display based on the evocative dimension of the object: meaning that the museum was no longer uniquely a place of scientific research but also a place where objects are at the centre of the exhibition. The visitor is then driven in the first person with his memories, his imagination and his life experience (Clemente 1996). What becomes important is the scenography that binds objects in the network of a social and cultural system: the display and the museum became the translation of scientific conventions in different languages that use all human senses.

## **Regional Outlook**

The current study of ethnographic museums in Italy observes the strong local and regional identity of these institutions and the repetitive character of their collections, with a narrative based in particular on the peasant's work and traditional lifestyles.

The first analysis of ethnographic museums dates back to the 1985 (in Togni, Forni and Pisani, 1997: 11), with a recording of 150 institutions; a census led in the 1991 and reported by the Jalla (2003: 42-47). Out of 3311 recorded museums, the ethnographic museums made up nearly four hundred, a seventh of the total (Bravo 2006: 58). In the 1990s the number increased, confirming an unequal territorial distribution that showed the north ahead of the centre or south Italy: in 1997, in Piedmont there were 70 museums, a number that rose to 188 in 2007 (Bonato 2007: 64). The third edition of *Il Patrimonio Museale Antropologico, Itinerari nelle Regioni Italiane, Riflessioni e Prospettive* was promoted by the Ministry (MiBAC), the other two editions published in 2002 and 2004, had already recorded the increase of ethnographic museums: there were 1300 museums in Italy in 2009. The data from the census carried out during those years, shows the diffusion across the territory of museums, often private or local institutions run by volunteers.

Apart from major institutions such as the already mentioned Museo Nazionali di Arti e Tradizioni Popolari we find regional museums that occupy an important place for research, such as the Museo degli Usi e Costumi della Gente Trentina, in the region of Trentino- Alto Adige, the Museo della Civiltà Contadina di San Marino di Bentivoglio and the Museo degli Usi e Costumi della Gente di Romagna, both in Emilia Romagna: the latter two were founded in the 1970s, and promoted those popular movements referred to above: the material testimony to the past is saved from time only by putting it into a museum.

The work of Giuseppe Šebesta (1919-2005) is related to the Museo degli Usi e Costumi della Gente Trentina. He was an ethnographer, a writer and a painter (Kezich 1994: 71). He began a collection of objects in 1966, and only two years later he opened his museum dedicated to his region. By analysing this operation there is a strong contrast with the views that currently dominate in the anthropology of museum work. In fact, his work is the result of a holistic perspective on alpine culture that aims to present the totality of social and historical facts: Šebesta had more familiarity with the positivist studies and the tradition of evolutionary diffusionism, two approaches that had already been dropped from museology since the Second World War.

The ethnographic museum becomes an offshoot of the natural history museum: the primacy is given to material, to the technologies and to handicraft in view of a traditional museography of

the daily work of peasants, based on the reconstruction of the major processes and technical evolution, and on a vision of the museum as a research laboratory of the historical and technological territory (Clemente 1999: 16). In the course of his work, Šebesta favoured a display focused on specific technological networks, beyond a local approach, breaking with the Italian anthropology museum devoted to the agricultural cycle and to the calendar; this is so because the material culture of mountain people is inserted in the great currents of the circulation of cultural traits in a transalpine perspective and with a comparative analysis where he tries to trace its proximity with prehistoric man (Kezich 1994: 75).

Although rearranged, the museum still deliberately retains traces of its founder's work. It is currently one of the most lively in the panorama of Italian ethnographic museum, a reference point for studies in the Alpine area and for the safekeeping of anthropological collections. A Permanent Seminar on Alpine Ethnography (SPEA) is held each year and in July 2011 a summer school was inaugurated on museological and ethnographic issues.

The museum in San Marino di Bentivoglio (province of Bologna) was founded by a group of citizens called 'Gruppo della Stadura' in 1968. Initially, this group was devoted to the organization of meetings and debates on the rural world. Then, through their participation in festivals, carnivals and markets, a large number of objects, tools and materials of traditional rural life were gathered. Thanks to the intervention of the public authorities and with the University the museum was established two years later and it is still one of the best examples of spontaneous museography (Papa 1994: 551-552). Another example of this is the *Museo degli Usi e Costumi della Gente di Romagna* founded in the 1980s under the supervision of Giuseppe Šebesta in which the collections were made by researches in the field ten years earlier.

Today, anthropology thinks back on several attempts to found a new conception of the museum as a place for the intersection between tangible and intangible heritage as explained in the definition of ICOM (International Council of Museum):

a museum is a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment. (Statutes art.3 para.1).

One example to illustrate this might be the interactive installation *Montagna in Movimento*, located in the fortress of Vinadio in Piedmont and opened in 2007. The exhibition will provide an experience of the Maritimes Alps, once part of the *Occitania* region, and it tries to bear witness to the vitality of the mountain world as something that is not immutable, as it might be imagined, but is a dynamic world of cultural exchange. In this case the museum's work can be compared to that of a scenographer. Indeed nothing is set in advance and visitors can choose the direction of their visit and also interact with objects and multimedia products. Each question related to traditional knowledge, traditional calendar rituals, or material culture is explained with the help of sound recordings and movies. This kind of museum is the result of research on oral data and the participation of the ethnographer in the restitution of a life experience.

We have seen that one of the issues concerning the work of the anthropologist in the ethnographic museum is the field research for the constitution of a corpus of oral sources. These constitute the major vector of social communication and transmission of those cultural traits of the societies best represented in Italian ethnographic museum (Gandolfi 1994: 67). Through oral



sources it is possible to reconstruct the context and the dynamics of the social layer to which the objects belonged: they provide information on technical and ergonomic aspects of the objects, whose use is also connected to rituals, songs, tales, proverbs and stories.

The use of this type of data and its placing in the museum historicize the artifacts and cultural expressions by returning to a diachronic approach and introduce a communication between past and present. It follows that this methodology transformed the anthropology of museum into a science *engage*, the primary function of cultural transmission of lived experience (Gandolfi 1994: 68).

The emphasis placed on the use of oral sources allows the museum to go beyond the object and the diversity of its forms of documentation for the representation of the past. It tries to build installations and exhibitions based on ethnographic research based on the collection and the valorization of local oral sources and their translation into museum language: operations that can result only from a deep understanding of the reality in which anthropologists work. This kind of museum privileges the discourse at the expense of object, so the museum becomes a real space for 'writing ethnography'.

## **Conclusion**

Italian anthropology in museum over the last thirty years has been through a series of experiences dictated by several goals, including the collection, preservation, cataloguing, and the exposition criteria that go beyond collecting and aestheticism. The new communication of an ethnographic museum seems to be problematic because it has a didactic character, aimed at training and educating the public, but mainly because the museums were involved in the recent revolution of communication technology that offers the possibility of new experiments by the authors of exhibitions and the visiting public.

Multimedia products, as hypertext, are characterized by non-linearity, by a writing and a reading that is non-sequential and that branches off in different directions, that is multisensory, combining different forms of learning and that is by nature interactive. The museological multimedia approach combines many types of communication: written pages of illustration of the argument as tables, cards, analysis, bibliographies, still and moving images and sound that reproduces music, songs, stories and interviews (Bravo 2004: 51). Multimedia dispositions can evoke the original context of objects exposed in the museum and constitute the foundation for an online museum system that allows network users to access the cultural content of local interest which, by their nature, are intended to be enjoyed by a few. The new technologies can therefore expand the knowledge and the potential spread of material culture and folk traditions of a given context but also preserve and comparatively analyse cultural heritage.

In their work, anthropologists look at various policies that support the local building of a shared heritage. In addition, they have an active role in the foundation of new museums and new collections based on field research and using a qualitative methodology and participatory planning by means of the involvement of local population. In this sense, anthropological sciences are increasingly called upon to aid in this participatory planning as mediation between different cultural contexts on the same territory as a transcultural approach.

In fact, the regional and local outlook persists in the request and in the preparation of new museums that demonstrate the plural inflections of the Italian identity. As we have seen

previously, since the 60s the terms "arts and traditions" or "the people", declined territorially at the regional borders, have been favoured (besides the already mentioned museums we can take the example of the *Museo delle Genti d'Abruzzo*). Now, with the evolution of this institution and the emergence of the eco-museum, the salient features of the museum narratives pass through the local crafts, the landscape or the traditional crops, which become new elements on which to invest in view of capitalizing on local cultures. These elements become the symbol of new identities, and the museum becomes their guardian and informant.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> For an overview of the developments of museological theories in anthropology also see Stocking (1985).
- <sup>2</sup> Folk is used as a term in the study of folk traditions while ethnology is the study of extra-European cultures, a distinction created by the anthropologic sciences in Italian historiography.
- <sup>3</sup> The verse is part of the ode 'La chiesa di Polenta' in the collection of poetries *Rime e Ritmi* (1899).
- <sup>4</sup> One can find discussions on the *Lares* journal (published since 1912 until 1915 and directed by Lamberto Loria and then Francesco Novati).
- <sup>5</sup> Established with the *Legge del 26 aprile 1964, n. 310*, it recognizes cultural property as a value of civilization.
- <sup>6</sup> In the Italian law, Regions are responsible for the actions of promotion and preservation, while the State has the task of protection (Dlgs. 42/2004 art. 7).
- <sup>7</sup> The opening of the museum by anthropologists has been made possible by the establishment of the Section of Anthropology Museum at the Associazione Italiana per le Scienze EtnoAntropologiche (Aisea), while a contribution to the promotion of various jobs linked to anthropological museology was made by the Società Italiana per la Museologia e i Beni Demoeoantropologici (SIMBDEA).

## Bibliography

- Becucci, S. (2007) 'Quando l'antropologo gestisce il museo: da negazione a modello', *Etnoantropologia on line*, Atti del IX Congresso AISEA, n. 1/2007: pp.38–43. Available: [http://digidownload.libero.it/aisea/atti\\_2004/etnoantropologia%20numero%201\\_2007.pdf](http://digidownload.libero.it/aisea/atti_2004/etnoantropologia%20numero%201_2007.pdf), (accessed 2 October 2011).
- Bellato E. (2009), 'La dolce seduzione. Un museo-non museo senza oggetti', in Porcellana V. & Sibilla P., *Alpi in scena. Le minoranze linguistiche e i loro musei in Piemonte e Valle d'Aosta*, Torino: Daniela Piazza Editore.
- Bertolino, M.A. (2011) 'Museo-grafare le culture locali. Un caso di studio: la sezione del legno del Museo Etnografico di Pinerolo', *Antrocom Online Journal of Anthropology*, vol. 7, supp. Al n. 1: pp.17–25.
- Bertolino, M.A. (2012) 'La ricerca sul campo nella tradizione italiana delle scienze demoeoantropologiche', in Kottak C.P., *Antropologia Culturale*, Milano: McGraw-Hill: pp.79–82.
- Bonato, L. (2006), *Tutti in festa: antropologia della cerimonialità*, Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- (2007), 'Musei e feste: mappe a confronto', *Etnoantropologia on line*, Atti del IX Congresso AISEA: n. 1/2007, pp. 64–73. Available: [http://digidownload.libero.it/aisea/atti\\_2004/etnoantropologia%20numero%201\\_2007.pdf](http://digidownload.libero.it/aisea/atti_2004/etnoantropologia%20numero%201_2007.pdf), (accessed 2 October 2011).
- Bravo G. L. (2004), 'Far parlare il museo' in Bravo, G.L., Cafuri, R. (eds), *Comunicare il passato: appunti di metodo per una didattica museale sulle culture locali*, Torino: Provincia di Torino: pp. 31–52.

- (2005), *La complessità della tradizione*, Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- (ed.) (2001) *Tradizioni nel presente. Musei feste fonti*, Torino: Omega.
- Bravo, G. L. & Tucci, R. (2006) *I beni culturali demotnoantropologici*, Roma: Carocci.
- Carducci, G. (1899) *Rime e Ritmi*, Bologna: Zanichelli. Available: [http://www.letteraturaitaliana.net/pdf/Volume\\_9/t215.pdf](http://www.letteraturaitaliana.net/pdf/Volume_9/t215.pdf), (accessed 20 September 2011).
- Cirese, A. M. (1973), *Cultura egemonica e culture subalterne. Rassegna degli studi sul mondo popolare tradizionale*, 2. ed. accresciuta. Palermo: Palumbo.
- (1977) *Oggetti, segni, musei. Sulle tradizioni contadine*, Torino: Einaudi.
- (1985) ‘Sulla storiografia demo-etno-antropologica italiana’, in Clemente, P., *et al.* (1985) *L'antropologia italiana, un secolo di storia*, Bari: Laterza.
- Clemente, P. (1996) *Graffiti di museografia antropologica italiana*, Siena: Protagon.
- Clemente, P. & Rossi, E. (1999) *Il terzo principio della museografia. Antropologia, contadini, musei*, Roma: Carocci.
- Clemente, P. & Meoni, M.L. & Squillaciotti, M. (1976) *Il dibattito sul folklore in Italia*, Milano: Edizioni di Cultura Popolare.
- Cordero M. (2009), ‘Montagna in movimento nel Forte di Vinadio, Valle Stura. Un cantiere per il futuro’, in Porcellana V. & Sibilla P., *Alpi in scena. Le minoranze linguistiche e i loro musei in Piemonte e Valle d'Aosta*, Torino: Daniela Piazza Editore.
- De Risi, L. (1995) ‘Il carteggio Mochi-Loria. Primo bilancio del contributo di Aldobrandino Mochi all'etnografia Italiana’, *La Ricerca Folklorica*, n. 32: 105–109.
- Di Vito, A. (2007) ‘Patrimoni contesi, fra antropologia teorica e antropologia applicata’, *Etnoantropologia on line*, Atti del IX Congresso AISEA, n. 1/2007: pp.112–18. Available [http://digidownload.libero.it/aisea/atti\\_2004/etnoantropologia%20numero%201\\_2007.pdf](http://digidownload.libero.it/aisea/atti_2004/etnoantropologia%20numero%201_2007.pdf), (accessed 2 October 2011).
- Gandolfi A. (1994), ‘Fonti orali e didattica museale’, in Kezich G. e Turci M. (a cura di), *Antropologia Museale. Caratteri, rappresentazioni e progetti dei musei antropologici, demologici ed etnografici. Atti del 1° Seminario Nazionale di Antropologia Museale (Roma-San Michele all'Adige, 1993)*, in “SM. Annali di San Michele”, n. 7:
- Jacknis I. (1985), Franz Boas e le mostre. Sui limiti del metodo museale in antropologia, in Stocking jr., G.W. (ed.) (2000), *Gli oggetti e gli altri. Saggi sui musei e sulla cultura materiale*, Roma, EI: pp. 117–154 (orig. *Objects and others : essays on museum and material culture*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985).
- Jalla D. (2003), *Il museo contemporaneo. Introduzione al nuovo sistema museale italiano*, Torino: UTET.
- Kezich G. (1994), ‘Il Museo degli usi e costumi della gente trentina e l'opera di Giuseppe Šebesta’, in Kezich G. e Turci M. (a cura di), *Antropologia Museale. Caratteri, rappresentazioni e progetti dei musei antropologici, demologici ed etnografici. Atti del 1° Seminario Nazionale di Antropologia Museale (Roma-San Michele all'Adige, 1993)*, in “SM. Annali di San Michele”, n. 7: 71–80.
- Lattanzi, V. (1994) ‘Il museo etnografico nelle derive della modernità. Appunti di critica antropologico-museale’, in G. Kezich & m. Turci (1994) *Antropologia Museale. Caratteri, rappresentazioni e progetti dei musei antropologici, demologici ed etnografici. Atti del 1° Seminario Nazionale di Antropologia Museale (Roma-San Michele all'Adige, 1993)*, numero unico di “S.M. Annali di San Michele”, n. 7: 81–92.

- (1999) ‘Per un'antropologia del museo contemporaneo’, in Turci M. (1999) *Antropologia museale*, n. 39: 29–40.
- Lombardozi, A. (1994) ‘Metodologia della ricerca e progetto museale in Lamberto Loria’, in G. Kezich & M. Turci, *Antropologia Museale. Caratteri, rappresentazioni e progetti dei musei antropologici, demologici ed etnografici. Atti del 1° Seminario Nazionale di Antropologia Museale (Roma-San Michele all'Adige, 1993)*, numero unico di “S.M. Annali di San Michele”, n. 7: 109–115.
- Loria, L. (1907) *Com'è sorto il museo di Etnografia Italiana in Firenze*, Comunicazione al VI Congresso Geografico Italiano: Firenze.
- Loria, L. & Mochi, A. (1906) *Il Museo d'Etnografia Italiana in Firenze. Sulla raccolta di materiali per l'Etnografia Italiana*, Milano: Marucelli.
- Maffi, I. (ed) (2006) ‘Il Patrimonio Culturale’, in *Antropologia*, 6, n. 7, Roma: Meltemi.
- Mariotti, M. (1999) ‘Antropologia museale. I luoghi del dibattito della formazione e del mestiere’, in Turci, M. (1999) *Antropologia museale*, n. 39, pp.101–16.
- Papa, C.(1994) ‘Le travail entre démologie, muséographie et culture matérielle’, in *Italia, regards d'anthropologues italiens*, Ethnologie française, XXV, n. 3: 549– 65.
- Porcellana, V.(2009) ‘Il museo partecipato. Il caso di Gressoney- La- Trinité (Ao) ’, in Porcellana, V. & Sibilla P. (a cura di), *Alpi in scena. Le minoranze linguistiche e i loro musei in Piemonte e Valle d'Aosta*, Torino: Daniela Piazza Editore, pp. 53–58.
- Puccini, S. (1985) ‘Evoluzionismo e positivismo nell'antropologia italiana (1869–1911) ’, in Clemente, P., *et al.* (1985) *L'antropologia italiana, un secolo di storia*, Bari: Laterza.
- (2005) *L'itala gente dalle molte vite. Lamberto Loria e la mostra di etnografia italiana del 1911*, Roma: Meltemi.
- Stocking jr., G.W. (ed) (2000), *Gli oggetti e gli altri. Saggi sui musei e sulla cultura materiale*, Roma, EI (orig. *Objects and others : essays on museum and material culture*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985).