

# MUSEUM USE

This issue of *Archeomatica* is dedicated, in no uncertain terms, to the use of museum heritage, a complex topic that has millions of facets, between public and private, not least of which is the intercontinental transmigration of cultural contents and, above all, of the narrative language that unites them and that separates and distinguishes them.

The change in focus on the very delicate topic, in almost all countries including the institutional level, in 2022 has changed the definition of museum by the international ICOM's body, mainly addressing the cultural role of intergenerational communication of the museum.

It does not mean that the accessibility of the museum and the removal of architectural barriers have faded into the background as regards the functional objective of opening and practicability of museum containers to the public, which increasingly needs to be increased in terms of frequency, being their permanent framework according to the historical world museum organization.

It means that museums, like libraries, are even more instruments of cultural diffusion which, in making use of the audiovisual image and interactivity as a means of communication on an emotional level, does not forget the sustainability of the public integration projects advanced and to be advanced, including the public that once said they were simply less fortunate.

That is, the integration of sustainability with disability, of any kind, even alphabetic, whatever the cost. Tactile and audiovisual values are at the center of the communicative effectiveness of the museum complex and of the conservation of the works of art and literature that build the language and their transmission to the future: being visitable is the purpose of its collections and being open the purpose of its databases.

For paintings and sculptures to be interpretable, they must not be modified, even when profoundly altered, and the Restoration Charters and Risk Maps are still the fundamental communicative tools of the artistic sign and writing, even when it has traveled the world, on paper and by cable. The meaning intentionally and unintentionally participates in interpretations, even the most equivocal identifications throughout the centuries, and the historian like the visitor moves through the contradictions of the vast and borderless work on the image, even more so if offered through the materials and techniques of art reproduction, now no longer just engraving, photographic and cinematographic, but radiographic, infrared, laser scanning, punctiform, holographic and so on through which even an expert orients himself as if he were blind in front of a hieroglyph: its meanings have not changed unless the sign has been corrupted, they have increased immeasurably in the memory of artificial intelligence and sometimes even distorted and disguised.

To the point that today it is possible to coherently object to *Walter Benjamin* and his essay entitled '*The work of art in the era of its technical reproducibility*' that the *work of art in itself* was born and lived in the era of its technical reproducibility and that there has not been an era that has not reproduced its samples and masterpieces, as long as sustainability and memory have not become in the common language above borders and frontiers synonymous with substitution, if not in the digital evanescence of web and viewers. The only tool in terms of prevention and protection from the perishability of materials that allows you to imagine the work of art totally as it was in the most immersive of uses.

*Buona lettura,  
Francesca Salvemini*