

Sebastiano Barassi

Although it was written over a century ago, Alois Riegl's 'The Modern Cult of Monuments'¹ still provides a valid analytical framework for the study of key theoretical issues surrounding the transmission to the future of works of art. Given their age, some of the broader philosophical principles underlying the text may appear outdated (for example, Riegl's evolutionism and his theory of *Kunstwollen*, the notion of art specific to each period in history). However, Riegl's analysis of the processes governing the attribution of values to what he calls 'monuments' offers a useful starting point to address some of the ethical questions we are asking today.

Riegl defines the monument as an artefact that retains in itself, intentionally or unintentionally, an element of the past – a definition which effectively encompasses any object resulting from human activity. A significant distance in time from the beholder is therefore what first of all characterises a monument. For the purpose of this workshop, the definition can be restricted to sculptural works, in particular those in public collections.

For Riegl, different ages encourage the cult of different values. He believes that our attitude towards conservation depends entirely upon which values we attribute to the monument. Far from wanting to sanction any one value over another, his declared aim is to identify the processes of valuation that determine different approaches to conservation (for example, the preference for reconstruction to regain the original condition – if this is ever possible – or the acceptance of the aging process and the 'mortality' of the work).

A detailed summary of his text is not possible here, but a brief outline of the values classified by Riegl might be useful. He identifies two main categories: memory values and present-day values.

Memory values pertain to the satisfaction of psychological and intellectual needs. They are:

- age-value (somewhat Ruskinian), which promotes a view of the monument as an organic object in a state of degradation from the moment it is created. It thrives on a purely visual appreciation of age, regardless of historical or artistic considerations. Its cult demands no interference with the natural deterioration process, thus rejecting all forms of conservation;
- historical-value, which views the monument as representative of a particular aspect of a precise moment in history. Its emphasis is on documentary value and it aspires to have the monument as close as possible to the original state, primarily through preventative conservation;
- intentional commemorative-value, which only applies to intentional monuments (a minority of artefacts, those created specifically to memorialise an event or deed). It promotes the conservation of the monument as new, to honour adequately the event or person it memorialises. It advocates restoration and opposes age-value.

With its aspiration to an eternal present, the intentional commemorative-value is closely linked with present-day values. They are concerned with the satisfaction of both practical and aesthetic needs and include:

- use-value, which relates to functionality and everyday use. It is generally, but not always,

are not betrayed. It is thus imperative to be very open about the nature of the object, in order to offer the beholder an 'honest' experience. How can this be achieved? A fair approach could be to present the replica as an object that is immediately recognisable as different from an original. My experience suggests that, when visitors become aware of a replica's presence, they often question its display alongside original art work, and occasionally feel deceived. To avoid this, one option could be to present replicas as strictly

