Memory and Movement in the Roman Fora from Antiquity to Metro C[1]

Introduction: Movement and Memory

The built landscape of the city of Rome is a powerful engine of cultural memory. The visitor can pick out elements of buildings two thousand years old woven into the fabric of the modern city at every street corner in the *centro storico*.[2] But there is more to Rome than picture-postcard images of crumbling columns juxtaposed with modern development. Here perhaps more than anywhere else, ancient architecture is not only experienced as isolated and picturesque ruins, but also as an integral part of the living city. Scholars and tourists can choose to stand and wonder at these buildings, photograph, draw, or write monographs about each of them individually, but Rome's inhabitants and visitors also walk and drive between and around them as they go about their daily business.

In this paper I investigate the relationship between movement and memory, and in particular how the integration of a space or building into the city's wider movement patterns affects its role as a place of memory. By considering two neighboring districts with very different ancient layouts and subsequent history I demonstrate how awareness of the creation and reproduction of cultural memory through movement can illuminate the enduring influence of ancient street networks on the modern cityscape. The Forum Romanum and the neighboring Imperial Fora (Figure 1) shared in Antiquity and still share today a similar role as places of memory, but they have always had different relationships to urban movement networks. The fact that the Forum Romanum was a node on several of ancient, mediaeval, and Renaissance Rome's major routes was vital for its preservation as a place of memory for centuries, until in the last century it was isolated and enclosed. The Imperial Fora, on the other hand, were isolated from movement networks and their historical associations were largely forgotten

until Mussolini, who used movement – the great processional route of the Via dell'Impero –

to revitalize the area as central to Roman cultural memory and identity. Both, then, largely

saw continuity in movement patterns from antiquity until the 20th century, when sweeping

changes essentially reversed their relationship. Mussolini's road replaced the path through the

Forum Romanum as the major artery between Capitoline and Colosseum. The pattern of

long-term continuity and recent change in each area's relationship to the wider city and its

movement patterns are direct consequences of the way cultural heritage has been consumed

and cultural memory constructed through movement.

In recent years, the relationship between both areas and the wider city has come under greater

scrutiny than ever before. An entry fee for visitors to the Forum Romanum was introduced in

2008, and the practicalities surrounding payment and enforcement mean that only a few

points of entry and egress are now in use. The Via dell'Impero, now renamed the Via dei Fori

Imperiali, has long been the subject of calls for demolition or at least pedestrianization, and

Ignazio Marino made a proposal to close it as part of his successful 2013 campaign for mayor

– though a year later the part of the road which actually runs through the Imperial Fora

remains open to all traffic. Through these tensions between cultural heritage and traffic

circulation, the competing demands of memory and movement continue to play a role in

Rome's development.

The ancient urban landscape did not exist as a series of individual monuments, but as a

cityscape which organized space and movement. In Rome this aspect of the past still

impinges on modern movement patterns and behavior. Romans and tourists walk their dogs

in the Circus Maximus, swerve their cars to avoid the piers of aqueducts and walls at the

Porta Maggiore, and eat dinner in restaurants built into the access corridors of the Theatre of

Pompey, perhaps passing comment on the building's history as they eat. These activities form a vital part of how knowledge of the past is accessed, transmitted, and developed, but they are not necessarily stable over time. In a few generations' time the restaurant may be an office or a house, and the people who spend time there may tell different stories about it.

In Jan Assmann's formulation, stories exchanged over dinner would fall into the category of communicative rather than cultural memory practices.[3] Communicative memory, consisting of the memories built by casual exchanges of information and spontaneous interactions, is of vital importance in the identity formation of individuals and groups, but the knowledge created and preserved through these practices tends to dissipate within eighty or one hundred years. Cultural memory represents more lasting forms of shared knowledge about the past (for Assmann, "Vergangenheitsbezug"), and also includes the mechanisms by which they are collectively concretized ("Erinnerungskultur") through objects, rituals, or texts which cultural practices designate as separate from the everyday and which are thus preserved over time. Cultural memory offers fully realized ways of understanding the past which can be transmitted between generations, each of which in turn uses it to construct their own collective identity. Although each individual or generation will relate to the resulting stores of knowledge differently, they themselves are relatively stable.

It is no accident that Pierre Nora referred to objects, symbols, events, or even people which become crucial reference points in a group's understanding of history using a spatial metaphor: "liex de mémoire", which I translate as "places of memory".[4] Very often these places of memory are literal places. Buildings and landscapes are temporally enduring and easily loaded with emotional significance and meaning for the community. This makes them well-suited to play a role in the construction and reproduction of both communicative and

cultural memory. Individual events may be remembered in the spot where they took place, or deliberately memorialized by plaques, statues, or monuments elsewhere. Anything from an architectural style to a toponym may call to mind some element of the past. As a result, memories can be arranged spatially as well as chronologically, mapped onto the landscape in a way which disassociates each moment from its temporal context and produces new juxtapositions.[5] In Rome, especially, history lives as much in space as it does in time, if not more; thinkers from Virgil to Petrarch to Freud have used the sites of Rome to call up memories of the past.[6] But we should not stop there. If the past is not primarily ordered or understood in terms of the chronological progression of time, other methods of organizing and structuring it become important. In space, one way of joining together individual memories into meaningful wholes is movement: both the movement of individuals as they go about the city, and the shared knowledge and experience of forms of movement such as ritual processions which are separate from the everyday.[7] In such a city, movement is narrative.

When we actually come to consider ancient architecture as monument, our impulse is often to separate out the building from communicative memory and to move instead into the more permanent realm of cultural memory.[8] This can involve dismissing the ephemeral patterns of behavior and movement which surround it. It would be a mistake, however, to isolate an ancient building entirely from its place in urban life, either now or in any of the periods it has seen since it was first built. To do so would risk missing those forms of behavior and movement which fit into the more permanent category. Formalized or ritualized movement in particular is a key component of long-term cultural memory production and preservation. Each generation tells stories about buildings they live in and among, but it is those which are memorialized and formalized through cultural practices – including ritualized forms of movement – which have the greatest effect on how the cityscape is known and understood.

That understanding and knowledge in turn affects the decisions, some made by powerful leaders, some more anonymous and cumulative, which shape the city's architectural development over time.

Static and Moving Modes of Experience

The visual experience of ancient architecture has been a prime method of accessing the city's cultural heritage at least since the time of the Grand Tour. The *Vedute* of artists like Dupérac and Vasi (e.g. Figure 2) position the monuments they depict as part of a living city, but for the viewer the element of movement is absent. The presence of figures in the foreground in contemporary dress, some going about their business and others depicted as an internal audience of tourists, remind the viewer of these images that the monuments they depict have a wider context, both spatially and temporally. Yet the engravings themselves, souvenirs deliberately intended as *aides-de-memoire* to allow the returning Grand Tourist to recall and share with others his memories of Rome, preserve only static images. The medium privileges the experience of standing still in a particularly scenic point and taking in the view. Today, despite the alternatives offered by video, tourists nevertheless queue to frame the perfect still shot from a specific vantage point.[9] The literal reproduction of 'picture-postcard' images gives these spots and these views particular prominence in the cultural memory, and we see the results on the cityscape when a new project is halted, for example, because it blocks a famous view.[10]

The highlights of the static and visual mode of experience proposed by the *Vedutismo* tradition and its photographic descendants are the monuments that can still be seen standing at street level, picturesquely woven into the modern streetscape. But it is not only here that Rome's classical past touches the visitor. The contemporary city of Rome is not just built

alongside the monuments of its past, but also on top of them. Buildings from the time of the

Republic and Empire, built of almost indestructible Roman concrete, have continually served

as foundations for later structures. The result is that the traces of ancient monuments are

preserved in the city's fabric and layout almost everywhere: not just where columns and

capitals are visible, but also in the arrangement of streets and even the internal articulation of

buildings. So, for example, Piazza Navona is built on the foundations of the Stadium of

Domitian. The open space of the piazza traces out exactly the lines of the racetrack,

something the visitor walking through the piazza can easily grasp. Other examples are harder

to pick out at street level, but still affect our experience of the city. The area just south of the

Piazza Navona, across the Corso Vittorio Emanuele, overlays Pompey's theatre. The curve of

the Via di Grottapinta is formed by the curve of the cavea. Here the presence of the ancient

city does not impose itself directly on vision, but on movement. The foundations of

Pompey's theatre, below street level but respected by later construction, push anyone who

walks along the street into a curved path. The modern visitor may or may not realize that he

or she is tracing a route marked out by ancient architecture. Some modern routes follow an

ancient route exactly: for example, the Via del Corso is the direct descendent of the ancient

Via Flaminia and Via Lata. [11] Are movement patterns like these to be understood as

contributions to cultural memory? Is the route itself a monument? Unmarked and mostly un-

remarked upon except by occasional groups of archaeology students, they do not fit the

criteria laid out above for cultural memory.

As our appreciation of cultural heritage has expanded beyond the single monument, the

ancient streets which underlie the modern have sometimes themselves been excavated and

displayed. Rimini provides one example (Figure 3). In such solutions, ringed by railings or

covered by glass, the ancient streets fit into the pattern of the *Vedute*. At the same time that

these streets become places of memory, the ancient infrastructure of movement is transformed into a modern stopping-point, something to look at rather than travel through. In Rimini, the railings actually impede the progress of traffic along the modern road which follows exactly the same route.[12] The choice to mark the streets architecturally as places of memory disrupts the continuity of movement patterns, suggesting that static viewing rather than the experience of movement is preferred as a memory practice. Such choices throw into sharp relief the problems caused when memory and movement come together, or perhaps where memory brings ancient and modern movement into conflict. If the streets themselves are monuments, there is no space left in which to move, or from which to watch and remember.

Movement patterns in antiquity

The areas I consider here, Rome's Forum Romanum and the adjacent Imperial Fora, had and continue to have a variety of different relationships to citywide movement patterns. In antiquity, the Forum was a thoroughfare, a place of movement, while the Imperial Fora were largely not traversable. In the post-antique, mediaeval and renaissance periods the Forum remained an open space, while the Imperial Fora became heavily built over. Today, the situation is exactly the reverse of that in antiquity: the Forum Romanum is a sealed-off precinct for tourists, while the Imperial Fora are bisected by Mussolini's grand fascist parade route, nowadays the Via dei Fori Imperiali. A detailed analysis of a few key moments of urban development reveals that in both the Forum Romanum and the Imperial Fora modern patterns of movement are a direct result of their ancient equivalents in the same areas – which were exactly the opposite; and that the impetus for the switchover resulted from the different relationships between movement and memory which evolved in the two spaces.

The Forum Romanum was Rome's central square, its political and economic focus as well as an important site for religious activity.[13] Its location was determined by the intersection of two routes. The Via Sacra, which paralleled the Palatine slope before climbing up to the Capitoline hill, stretched along the Forum's long axis. Across the short axis ran the path from the river to the Esquiline heights, that is, from the river port and crossing at Tiber Island to Rome's main residential area. The Romans called this most-traversed place in the city the *locus celeberrimus*, 'the busiest spot,' and precisely because of its busyness it became the most prestigious site for monuments.[14] At the crossroads the Forum developed as Rome's most important representational space, a space of memory *par excellence*.

The Via Sacra was a processional route of great antiquity, used in such community-defining movement rituals as the triumph, the *pompa circensis* (procession to mark the start of the games), the elite funeral, and the inauguration of new magistrates, to name just a few.[15] Over time, it was marked by innumerable statues, inscriptions, shrines, and even full-scale temples set up by individuals or the community as permanent reminders of particular moments of celebration. Each arch or statue built to honor a general or emperor for some great achievement, each temple erected to thank the gods for success in a specific battle served as a space of memory for that occasion; the past was organized spatially rather than in chronological sequence. An individual was free to wander between them at will, creating his or her own narrative of the Roman past. But it was the formalized, ritualized movement of the great processions which allowed the creation of narratives that could live in communal (as opposed to communicative) memory. Each honorand reauthored and added to this communal narrative: as he moved in space he also journeyed in time past monuments of earlier achievements and linked his latest success to the unrolling history of the Roman people.

To a great extent, these narratives are lost to us today. We do not even know which of the paths along the long sides of the square was properly known as the Sacra Via, and the exact assemblages of buildings to be seen changed over time; many of the meanings they would have held for an ancient audience are no longer known. Still, there is much we can recreate: to take the triumph of the high empire as an example, the procession from southeast to northwest would have passed by or at least close to the points shown in Figure 4. If the triumphator and his soldiers entered on the south side, he passed through the Triple Arch of Augustus, a monument to the great achievements of Rome's first emperor which also bore a list of every consul and every triumph in Roman history from Romulus to Augustus' time (Figure 5).[16] The Temple of Castor and Pollux on his left was traditionally believed to have been founded as a sign of gratitude for victory at the Battle of Lake Regillus in 495 BCE, when the divine brothers themselves had come to the Romans' aid in person, and afterwards watered their horses at the fountain known as the Lacus Juturnae which still flowed next to the temple. Entering the open square, those processing saw to their left the Basilica (Aemilia) Paulli, decorated with friezes depicting events from early Roman history (Figure 6); straight ahead stood the temple of Saturn, which was thought to date back to the time of the kings, and off to the side of the route lay the Lacus Curtius, a low precinct containing a basin which legend told was named for a Roman youth who had plunged into it on horseback to avert by his sacrifice a doom-laden oracle. The basin would have winked in and out of view between the large freestanding honorific columns, themselves monuments to great Romans' achievements, as the participants moved along the length of the open square (Figure 7). Once the procession reached the far end of the Forum, their attention would have been drawn by the Arch of Septimius Severus, richly decorated with depictions of his triumphs over Parthia;

beyond it loomed the Carcer, the place of execution for Rome's defeated enemies, including such evocative names as Jugurtha and Vercingetorix (Figure 8).

After their progression through the Forum, the participants moved up to the heights of the Capitoline. Earlier in the day, before they had even entered the Forum, they had moved past dozens of other important monuments which lined the route elsewhere in the city, from comparatively small and unprepossessing temples which commemorated victories going back centuries, like those of Janus, Spes, and Juno Sospita in the Forum Holitorium (all three now built into the church of S. Nicola in Carcere) to the Colosseum (a monument to the Flavian conquest of Jerusalem). For a Roman traveller or viewer, no doubt, there would be a great deal more to say about the order in which the monuments were encountered, the specific associations brought to the fore by each juxtaposition, and not least by the interplay between the individual's own memories and the collective memory of the culture in which he or she participated. Even if we cannot hope to recover the full effect, we can say with confidence that the triumphal route thus provided not just a path through the confusing whirl of memories which had grown up in and around the Forum, but a way to link the Forum to other places of memory elsewhere in the city. The route which linked these places, each redolent of a different version of Rome's past, allowed each participant or spectator to read and find their own place in a larger narrative of patriotic service and Roman glory which stretched across but was detached from time: it applied equally both to the distant past of kings and living gods and to the imperial present. Even when no parade was taking place, the route did not lose its power: Romans had seen the same path traversed with eyecatching ceremony on so many important and festive occasions that this particular way of moving through the city was prominent in their minds. The parades along the Sacra Via, then, were perfect examples of

movement as narrative: an ongoing and iterative process by which Romans could find meaning among their disparate pasts by ordering them and linking them to the present.

The Forum was one of the most important nodes on this and other processional routes. It was endowed with monumental buildings from the archaic period onwards. But its overall architectural frame and definition arose haphazardly, the result of multiple building projects by competing patrons over many centuries. Particularly during the Republic, there was no centralized coordination in its planning, no patron who was responsible for the forum as a whole as opposed to one of its individual structures.[17] The colonnades which decorated many of its buildings and the repeated pattern of temple pediments and podia gave it a certain coherence in stylistic terms, but architecture of different periods and materials stood side by side. The square's limits were loosely defined by individual freestanding elements, often not arranged on a common orientation; its irregular shape is visible even in the imperial period (Figure 1). The only element which drew the entire group together was the paving: though controversies surround the dates of the various levels which had survived, the Forum of the late Republic and Empire was distinguished from the streets around it by stone flagstones which stretched neatly across its entire expanse.[18] This surface, rather than any building, defined the square, thereby further marking it as a space for movement.[19] The Forum Romanum can be better understood as a monumentalized crossroads, or even a widening in the Via Sacra, rather than an enclosed square. There must have been a great deal of traffic simply crossing the Forum on quotidian business, as well as the grand ritual processions which moved along the Via Sacra. It was a place to move through as well as a destination, and its pre-eminence as a space of memory was largely determined by its relationship to the city's movement patterns.[20]

Organized urban development would not come to the city of Rome until the unifying will of Julius Caesar and the emperors. Caesar, Augustus and the rulers who followed them devoted substantial time and money to improving the city of Rome. Among their projects were new squares, collectively known as the Imperial Fora, five of which were constructed in the area to the north of the original Forum Romanum between 46 BCE and 113 CE: the Forum of Caesar, the Forum of Augustus, the Temple or Forum of Peace (an enclosed precinct built by Vespasian, in practice indistinguishable from the other Imperial Fora despite the convention of its different name), the Forum of Nerva, and the Forum of Trajan (Figure 1).[21] Each was self-consciously designed as a monument, a lesson to contemporary and future audiences in how to read the past: the Forum of Augustus even had as one of its main decorative features a sculpture gallery depicting great men of the Roman past, with captions inscribed in stone listing their illustrious deeds.[22] The new Imperial Fora aspired to serve a similar representational purpose to the Forum Romanum, with the difference that all their allusions to the past were centred around the present emperor as the glorious culmination of Rome's history.[23] Their contribution to cultural memory was a snapshot of a particular moment, not an evolving narrative which brought together multiple pasts. So it is not surprising that these new projects differed substantially from the earlier Forum Romanum in architectural design and practical functions; also different is the way they are incorporated into the city today.

For the builders of the Imperial Fora, there was no need to respect the earlier layout of the areas they chose. They had the money they needed to buy property, and the authority to expropriate it if required.[24] Indeed, the observable imposition of a new order on the human and natural landscape of the city was a desired feature of the projects. We see this most clearly in the final example. Trajan's forum is an explicit conquest of landscape: in a crowded and hilly city center, he had 316 000 cubic meters of earth cut away to provide flat

land for his new square. The famous column that was one of its most striking features was explicitly intended to memorialize this achievement: its inscription tells the reader that it was placed there "to show how high was the mountain and place which was removed for such great works."[25] But it was also a conquest of cityscape, since the heights which were removed were not empty fields, but would have been densely inhabited and crossed by dozens of routes.[26] In their place, Trajan, like the emperors before him, built a monumentalized open square bounded by colonnades. Like all of the previous Imperial Fora, it was distinctly inward-looking: the colonnades were open and richly decorated on the side facing the square, but closed and unornamented on the other.[27] From the outside, all the Imperial Fora appeared as massive, unelaborated walls, which must have towered above the wooden residential districts beyond (Figure 9). Unlike any other area of the city of comparable size, they were laid out precisely with symmetrical rectilinear plans uninterrupted by older monuments. At the moment of entry visitors were confronted with a gleaming, open, and, above all, unified space, providing a pointed contrast with the narrow, dark city streets from which they had come.

The Forum Romanum had long been a place for grand, representational architecture, but it was also always a multi-purpose space, hosting commercial and recreational alongside political activity. There were plenty of shops in the square and the roads leading up to it, which hosted businesses ranging from prestigious moneylenders to disreputable brothels. Until the construction of the Colosseum in the 70s CE it was the standard venue for Rome's gladiatorial games. And, as described above, one of its most important functions was to determine movement patterns: situated at the crossroads of major routes through the city, the Forum Romanum continued to be used as a thoroughfare and processional route. The new Imperial Fora were designed to function differently and had almost the opposite relationship

to movement patterns, as recent studies have convincingly established.[28] The emperors created new spaces where art and architecture could propagate a single message, a single version of Rome's past and present, in honor of a single patron. To do this, they found new architectural forms which recalled the Forum Romanum but excluded its multi-purpose nature. Architecturally, they enclosed the new squares within massive walls with few openings. They were dead ends, with few pathways even from one forum to the next, excluding chance wanderers or through traffic (Figure 10). The emperors also restricted the activities which took place within these spaces, discouraging casual visitors. The Imperial Fora's main functions were religious and civic: they held important temples and were the venue for law-courts and imperial ceremonial, but by deliberate design they did not contain such features as shops which might have attracted passers-by.[29] The small entrances often only gave access by stairways, prohibiting wheeled traffic, and were screened by arches or colonnades (Figures 11-13). These architectural innovations meant that the new Fora stood apart from patterns of movement in the city. Indeed, they must have massively disrupted previous routes.[30] But the same innovations produced a unified, immersive experience for those inside, and the fact that they were so decisively set aside from the rest of the city and its quotidian business made them powerful places of memory in antiquity.[31]

The afterlife of the Forum Romanum and the Imperial Fora

The gigantic tufa walls which bounded the Imperial Fora have enabled their footprint to survive in the modern city (Figure 9). For centuries, though, much of the area was hidden under other structures which took advantage of the walls' strong foundations from as early as the fourth century CE, and gradually obscured their shape.[32] In a changing political context, as rulers shifted their attention away from the capital or towards new building types, their inward-looking separation from each other and from the rest of the city no longer served a

useful purpose. The area where they stood was gradually taken over by residential, commercial, and agricultural activities. Trajan's Forum survived the longest, but it too was eventually filled in by new building. These new uses demanded new movement patterns. Precisely because there were no obvious pathways across the area of the Imperial Fora, or from one of the enclosed spaces to the next, new routes developed cutting at angles across their careful plan. In parallel to changes in the area's use and movement patterns, knowledge of its earlier purpose and layout was lost.[33]

Sixteenth-century drawing and engravings by Dupérac, Van Heemskeerk and others show the standing ruins of the Temple of Minerva in the Forum of Nerva, though the long wall which originally flanked the temple has already been reduced to two lone columns (Figures 14-16). These engravings are our last surviving pieces of evidence for elements of the original layout, since in the 1560s Pope Pius V began construction of a new residential district in the area which ran according to its own, rather than the ancient or mediaeval, logic. Half a century later in 1606, Pope Paul V removed substantial amounts of marble from the temples of the Imperial Fora for his own construction projects elsewhere.[34] The 16th and 17th century papal interventions completely changed the area's layout once more. An engraving of Vasi (Figure 17) from *Della Magnificenze di Roma* (1747-51) shows part of the area previously belonging to the Forum of Nerva, in his time a small crossroads: of the long wall of the forum, only one short section survives (the section still visible today, known as the Colonnacce), and the street leading away from the viewer passes directly through the original line of the wall. The church of Santa Maria in Macello Martyrum at the far right of the composition occupies what had been the open space of the forum (Figures 18-20). Interestingly, Vasi did also produce a reconstructed view of the same area showing the lost façade of the Temple of Minerva in the Forum of Nerva, presumably based on his knowledge of earlier images. But for those not

endowed with his antiquarian interests, the original layout of the area was forgotten. The 1748 Nolli Plan of Rome shows that little trace of the original shapes of the Imperial Fora survived (Figures 21-22). The great eastern walls of the Forum of Augustus and Forum of Trajan are marked, as is the footprint of the Temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus, but almost all are surrounded by later buildings. Streets criss-cross the area.

In Nolli's time and the century following, the few standing remains of ancient buildings (the Colonnacce, part of the back wall of the Forum of Augustus, and Trajan's Column) received interest individually from architects, artists, and even Napoleon, who endowed them with new roles as places of memory in isolation from the complex of which they had been a part.[35] The area as a whole, though, did not feature in Rome's cultural memory; no toponyms marked the Pantano district which grew up there as the site of ancient temples and fora, and non-scholars would not have had much knowledge of its wider history.

The Forum Romanum, on the other hand, was still mostly open space right up to the excavations of the late 19th century. It had been partially reclaimed by the marsh in the Middle Ages as the ancient drainage system was gradually blocked, and cows pastured there: the area acquired the toponym "cow field" – "Campo Vaccino." Even so, the tops of monuments like the Arch of Septimius Severus still protruded from the ground, as in Figure 2, and the Forum Romanum remained a place of historical associations for Rome's inhabitants and visitors in a way the Imperial Fora did not.

The difference in the fates of the two adjoining areas was partly a product of their different relationships with Rome's street network. Without the commanding presence of the emperors, the practical need to create new routes across the massive block of the Imperial

16

Fora was too great to ignore. Widening the existing access points would have been impractical because of the stairs and changes of level these involved, so new paths were forged on new orientations, thereby lessening the striking effect of the area's rectilinear spatial choreography. The Forum Romanum, on the other hand, was already integrated into patterns of movement, so no new routes were needed.

In the mediaeval period, memory and movement combined to preserve the existing layout of the Forum Romanum. Early mediaeval Rome possessed many imposing ancient buildings which had lost their original functions. A consequence was that building activity was sometimes characterized by 'facadism', the practice of retaining imposing ancient facades at the front of entirely new buildings. In the eighth or ninth century CE, a rich Roman chose to build his new house on the site of the Basilica Paulli (better known today as the Basilica Aemilia) in the Forum Romanum (Figures 23-24).[36] He retained elements of the ancient façade in his new building. The decision to use this particular site and its facade was conditioned by a number of factors: the prestige of the space (including as a place of memory), the striking visual impact of the facade, and its position along a major route would all have played a role.[37] The result of the decision to retain the facade was that all these less tangible things were preserved as well: the space was re-marked as a place of memory and prestige and the route as an important one. What is more, facadism guaranteed that the spatial relationship between building and street remained unchanged.

Nearby, in the Forum of Nerva, more recent excavations have uncovered another house which was being built at about the same time (Figures 23 and 25).[38] This house stands in the center of what would have been a pedestrian precinct at the time of the forum's construction, but where ruts in the ancient paving stones show the development of a new route used by

wheeled traffic throughout the mediaeval period.[39] Unlike the Basilica Aemilia house, this house does not respect the open space of the Forum of Nerva, but directly impinges on it, contributing to the transformation of the space from relatively broad piazza to narrow road. The Basilica Aemilia house's use of an ancient facade preserved the ancient open space as well, and the route through the Forum Romanum remained stable; in the Imperial Fora, mediaeval building activity altered the area's spatial configuration and movement patterns.

We know from documentary as well as topographical evidence that a route through the Forum Romanum was still in use in the 8th or 9th century. The Einsiedeln Itineraries, a fascinating set of pilgrim routes, guide a pious visitor through the center of Rome, listing landmarks he passes on his left and his right. One route takes him "per arcum Severi" – through the arch of Septimius Severus. Next, to his left, come "sti. Hadriani. Forum romanum" – the church of Sant'Adriano (the ancient Curia), and the square in front of it which the author identifies as the Forum – and Santa Maria Antiqua on his right. The path is shown in Figure 26. In ancient terms, it passes directly along the Sacra Via. [40] The fact that the Itineraries, written for a Christian audience, list the ancient arch alongside the contemporary churches demonstrates the persistence of ancient monuments as places of memory even in an altered city; these routes told narratives about the transformation from imperial pagan glory to contemporary Christian piety. The practice of ritualized movement by pilgrims along these routes secured their continuing status as places of memory, as information about them was passed from pilgrim to pilgrim and preserved in documents like the Itineraries.

The Forum Romanum in the early middle ages thus continued to provide a pathway lined with evocative monuments and loaded with historical associations. In the practices of papal

Rome, from late antiquity through the renaissance and beyond, it continued in use both as a quotidian thoroughfare and as part of one of the most important grand processional routes which structured the city and linked together its most prestigious locations.[41] The route from Vatican to Lateran, known as the Via Papalis, followed the ancient Via Sacra from the Capitoline to the Colosseum directly through the Forum Romanum. In a ritual known as the *possesso*, the newly-elected pope would process across the city along the Via Papalis with a grand entourage to take possession of the Lateran.[42] In the Renaissance and early modern period, temporary triumphal arches would be set up along the route of the procession, contrasting with and calling attention to the ancient arches which still stood, and the parade passed through both. Vasi's engravings of these temporary arches use conceits of composition to play up the juxtaposition, showing in one example the arch of Titus visible through the opening of a temporary arch erected by the King of the Two Sicilies for the *possesso* of Benedict XIV in 1741 (Figure 27). The movement of the procession created narratives linking temporal and spiritual power ancient and modern, and rituals performed *en route* reinforced the monuments' role in cultural memory: at the arch of Titus, originally erected to commemorate the sack of Jerusalem by the Flavian emperors and decorated with a frieze showing the Menorah being carried through Rome in triumph (Figure 28), the pope would receive homage from the Jews of Rome.[43]

The Forum Romanum was not only active as a place of memory when a papal procession was in progress. The parade route was permanently marked, giving the rituals lasting power in cultural memory through physical form as well as repetition: Nolli shows a double line of trees marking an avenue running diagonally across the open area, from the Colosseum to the Capitoline (Figure 22). The contrast with the area of the Imperial Fora could not be greater;

as Nolli's map shows, they had been entirely subsumed into the residential Pantano (later better known as Alessandrina) district.

Into the modern period

Movement would continue to be an important way of experiencing the Forum as a space of cultural memory into the modern period. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, the static experiences of *Vedute* were supplemented in the imagination of the champions of Rome's cultural heritage with the idea of a *passeggiata archeologica*, walking routes through ancient monuments preserved in picturesque parkland. Luigi Canina himself instigated the trend during the Napoleonic period with his excavations and restorations along the Via Appia leading out of the city, and half a century later in 1871, after Rome had been granted its first self-government of the modern period, the new city council proposed a great *Parco Archeologico*, which took in large swathes of land from the Via Appia to the Circus Maximus, Colosseum, Palatine, and Forum. The idea would recur in different forms in the following decades. A law was passed in 1887 creating a zone protected from construction, and although funding for the purchase of land was slow to come, some expropriations were made. The *Passeggiata Archeologica* was formally inaugurated in 1911. The area had been gradually planted with trees which formed long vistas and mapped out walking routes, formalizing the concept that Rome's archaeological heritage was something to be explored in motion, as well as viewed as a static panorama.[44] Entirely excluded from the *passeggiata* was the area of the Imperial Fora, which were known to archaeologists but lost to the sight of tourists, and in any sense were too built up to fit neatly into the concept of a park characterized by open spaces and scenic views.

Rome's new *passeggiata*, promising movement, in fact posed a problem for circulation in the modern city. The ancient through routes of the forum, long used by all kinds of traffic from papal processions to cowherders, were now conceptualized as spaces set aside for edifying strolls. The park became an obstacle.[45] The parts of it which survive, linking Palatine and Forum, remain an obstacle today to foot and vehicular traffic, especially after the reintroduction of entrance fees (Figure 29). Separation from the rest of the city marks the area as a space of memory in a new way, but the movement rituals which had long preserved its centrality to the city's cultural memory as well as its integration with the urban fabric have been decisively curtailed. The Forum Romanum, always a place of transit as well as a destination, has become a dead end, isolated from the movement of daily life.[46]

The Imperial Fora, on the other hand, have had a very different afterlife. By the start of the 20th century, as we have seen, they had long been entirely built over, hidden from vision by more recent construction and their footprint obscured by winding routes dating from the mediaeval period and Pius V's 16th century interventions. But the problems of circulation that the new capital of Italy faced in the automobile age were soon to affect many of Rome's historic districts. A number of proposals were already on the table in the nineteenth century to create new, wider roads cutting through the city. Several involved the area of the Imperial Fora, as a new route was envisaged between Piazza Venezia (and the new Vittoriano) and the Colosseum—thus directly replacing the artery lost when the Forum Romanum became a park rather than a through route.[47]

The various new roads already created in modern Rome offered two different models for how to reconcile their paths with the earlier layouts upon which they were superimposed. The Via Nazionale and Via Cavour, taking advantage of the somewhat more regular layout of the

eastern, later areas of the city, cut Haussmannesque straight lines down the hill of the Esquiline. The Corso Vittorio, in contrast, was designed by the planner Alessandro Viviani as a modern traffic artery not at all in the style of Haussmann. It curves gently but perceptibly around the great palazzi of the Campo Marzio. In constructing the new road around, rather than through, the pre-existing street layout, Viviani actually succeeded in creating a route punctuated by picturesque piazzas and bounded by imposing facades which observers today might be forgiven for thinking is a relic of the city's ancient or mediaeval layout. Some of the buildings facing onto it were originally designed to front a roadway but were later englobed in later construction, from which Viviani freed them; others, like the Piazza della Cancelleria, have had their side facades elaborated to match their fronts.[48] Viviani's careful evocation of the city's organic development is congenial to present tastes, though the false sense of 'authenticity' it offers might find detractors.

Nineteenth century proposals for a route through the area of the Imperial Fora had been rejected because they would have required too much expropriation. The suggestions of the early 1900s hoped to ameliorate difficulties by suggesting a curving road with minimal demolitions on the model of the Corso Vittorio. The buildings these plans wanted to preserve were not those of the rectilinear ancient Imperial Fora, but the jumbled mediaeval and later constructions which overlaid them. In the same years, however, others had different ideas. The archaeologist Corrado Ricci and the architect Marcello Piacentini, both of whom would end up working with Mussolini on the eventual Via dell'Impero, proposed in 1911 and 1925 respectively that the area of the Imperial Fora should be cleared of post-antique structures. They were both primarily interested in investigating antiquity rather than freeing up circulation. Ricci's proposal did include the road, but Piacentini explicitly hoped for an expanded Archaeological Park to include the Imperial Fora, uncrossed by vehicular routes.[49]

Disagreements and funding difficulties meant nothing was done, but the various plans on the table in the early 1900s demonstrate for the first time an awareness of both the street layouts, antique and post-antique, which together constitute the architectural patrimony of the area. Indeed, the great archaeologist and topographer Rodolfo Lanciani, then a member of the Italian Senate, brought up the changes in the area's orientation over time at a hearing on Ricci's proposal in 1917.[50]

As with the original construction of the Imperial Fora, it would take an autocrat to cut through the deliberations and begin building a new road through the area. Mussolini was perfectly conscious of the parallel he was drawing between himself and the emperors, and saw his interventions in Rome's urban fabric as deliberate reworkings of the city's history and its people's memory and identity. Both his ideology of *romanità* and the process of expropriation, clearance, and construction here and elsewhere in the capital were well documented at the time and have been examined by many scholarly authors since.[51] Mussolini and those surrounding him were interested in 'liberating' the monuments of imperial Rome from what they saw as worthless accretions which had developed around them over time. They would then be placed in juxtaposition with the new great monuments of the fascist regime. To those who made a claim for the place of Rome's winding streets in her cultural heritage, Mussolini answered that a distinction should be drawn between "the living testimony of the glory of Rome" and "the picturesque and so-called local color."[52] Constant emphasis was placed on the distant past and the future; anything between was removed from the picture.[53] The mediaeval and later buildings which had occupied the area of the Imperial Fora were not considered by the fascists to be a useful part of Rome's collective history. The result was the destruction of an entire neighborhood, including 5,500 residential units, and

the construction of the grandiose Via dei Monti, soon renamed the Via dell'Impero, and now

the Via dei Fori Imperiali.[54]

Antonio Muñoz, whom Mussolini placed in charge of Rome's antiquities and fine arts,

produced a pamphlet on the construction of the new road which exemplified the fascist

attitude towards urban history, memory, and preservation.[55] The post-antique city, he wrote,

was an obstacle; displaying the monuments of antiquity was a key goal; but all was

subordinate to the needs of the contemporary city, not least its traffic circulation. Muñoz

noted that the project had a long history, and multiple different routes had been planned. He

was not interested in emulating Viviani's curving route around the present buildings,

objecting that a proposed curve at the Via Cavour which had been included in the *Piano*

Regolatore of 1931 to spare some Renaissance constructions would impede the view of the

Colosseum. He was not even concerned about minimizing the destruction of ancient

architecture. Full-scale excavations to uncover its exact layout would have required too much

money and time, he claimed, and so he proposed that the simplest solution, a straight line,

was the best (Figure 30). He was careful to note that the straight route would also offer the

best panorama, demonstrating the concern with scenography which often characterized

fascist interventions. The route required cutting away part of the Velian hill, a challenge

Muñoz welcomed for its parallelism with Trajan's landscaping at the other end of the valley.

Finally, Muñoz conceptualized the result as a kind of *passeggiata archeologica* as well as a

traffic artery; the area carved out, he claimed, would allow cars to zip by along the street

while pedestrians stroll in the green park areas of the verges contemplating the monuments of

the Imperial Fora which form the road's backdrop. With the interventions of Muñoz and

Mussolini, the Imperial Fora once again found a place in cultural memory as important

repositories of national identity and pride. Indeed, the new excavations undertaken by the

Comune di Roma for the millennium demonstrate their continuing importance today.

The road ran, and still runs, in a straight line obliquely across the Imperial Fora's layout,

creating a new line of sight between Piazza Venezia and the Colosseum (Figures 31-33). The

closed spaces of the Imperial Fora were now open for movement, modern speed, and fascist

parades which paralleled those of the ancient and papal periods through the Forum Romanum

next door (Figure 34). Mussolini was keen to exploit the Imperial Fora as places of memory,

and in many ways his imperial pretensions conjured up accurate reflections of their original

representational purposes. The new fascist roads were themselves monuments: monuments to

modernity, to the triumph of fascism, above all to speed. These roads-as-monuments

combined movement and memory in an entirely different way to the fenced-off Roman road

of Rimini. They were not there to be looked at: movement at the speed of the automobile was

an essential part of their existence, an urban ritual implying a new mode of viewing for the

ruins and a new form of cultural memory.[56] Mussolini's use of the area as a processional

route solidified its role in cultural memory through practice, and taught Romans and visitors

how to understand it during their own, speedier journeys.[57] But the demolitions also meant

that much was lost: not just the buildings of later periods which were entirely destroyed, but

the inward-looking separation and careful layout apart from the city's movement networks

which were key to the ancient spatial experience of the area.[58]

Mussolini was looking for a monument, a unified whole which could stand next to his

grandiose plans for the third Rome. But so much of the original ancient architecture, here as

elsewhere, had been lost, and what remained had embarked on new stories over the

intervening centuries. After the demolitions, what remained was inevitably fragmentary.

Nowadays, we mourn the loss of the intermediate phases, but for its original audience, the effect produced by the juxtaposition of the fascist showpiece with a past stripped of its context was differently problematic. Mussolini's propaganda described the ancient monuments in their new settings as examples for emulation or celebrations of Italy's imperial past and future standing together. But, as always, a city like Rome can bear many meanings, and the overlay of ancient and modern topography suggested competition as well as imitation.[59] The modern vision presented by Mussolini inevitably excited competition's two concomitant anxieties: that it might win – or that it might lose.

Mussolini's road did not respect the original architecture which had been newly isolated to form its backdrop. Large portions of the Imperial Fora were 'liberated' from later construction only to be buried under the road and its parks, and Muñoz and others were not shy to admit that traffic needs trumped historical preservation.[60] The huge ancient walls on display made clear the ancient orientation of the area, and the fact that the new road steamrollered across it at a defiant angle (Figure 30).[61] The smooth tarmac of the road contrasted with the pockmarked brick and tufa of the ancient walls, their marble revetments long since vanished. The visible triumph of new over old stood in contrast to and detracted from the intended message of continuity or inheritance.

On the other side of the coin, the triumph of new over old was not complete, and could be called into question. Despite his own unambiguous elevation of movement over memory, Mussolini's desire to preserve at least parts of the Imperial Fora as a backdrop for his road drew ire from some of his supporters who looked to the future. The Futurist movement, at times a contender for official fascist style, despised the remembrance of the past as imitation and fear. They had been among the strongest supporters of the demolitions, and their ideals

did not include leaving a few privileged remains standing against which to judge the present.[62] The futurist writer Filippo Marinetti wrote that history was a burden, a sack which the Italian people must set down, conjuring up the picture of workmen surrounding in awe "the latrine of the third public scribe who wrote the first love letter to Cicero's cook."[63] The supposed grandeur of antiquity, no less than the winding mediaeval streets that overlay it, was for him holding back modern Romans from their full potential. Memory and movement could not coexist under Futurist doctrine; all movement was forward and must be unimpeded by the past.

The Futurists had a point. The ruins of the Imperial Fora, picturesque as they are, were also monuments of decline and decay. From one point of view, Mussolini could claim to be avenging the shameful defeat of the ancient past by more recent barbarisms; but surely the eventual fall of the empire he held as his model could also be read as an omen for the inevitable end of his new order? Marginal voices, such as an American living in Rome quoted in the National Geographic, noticed the bleakness of the contrast.[64] Indeed, impressive as some of the area's newly-revealed standing ruins were, they were all unmistakably damaged and incomplete. The traumatic potential of ruined buildings was soon freshly apparent in Rome itself, as the city was bombed; Mussolini did not visit the affected areas.

Although official communications betray no trace of possible alternative readings, it is clear that in the final phase of his building projects Mussolini rejected the idea of a glorious unification of past and present, preferring to emulate the emperors more literally in creating new areas in which no extraneous material disrupted the unified modern vision.[65] Originally, the Via dell'Impero was to have been the site for one of the grandest Fascist projects of all, the Palazzo del Littorio, which would be the party headquarters. A massive open competition

was held for designs. But in 1935 the site was switched. The new building would now be built at the Foro Mussolini, on land well outside the city center which was less loaded with cultural memory. Its model was not the Imperial Fora as they had become, palimpsests of generations of building and destruction, but the Imperial Fora as they originally were: decisive steps away from the old, multilayered space of memory of the older Forum where a new ruler could paint his own image on a blank canvas.

Today, the road still runs at its angle across the Imperial Fora, despite the regular recurrence of proposals to demolish it for the sake of further archaeological investigation.[66] The road is a major source of pollution and vibration which threaten the ancient ruins and mar the experience of tourists arriving in the city center. On the other hand, the possible implications for traffic circulation (and not least for Rome's bus network) if the road were closed are a stumbling block. In 2013the mayoral candidate Ignazio Marino included in his campaign a proposal to pedestrianize the road: once elected, he succeeded in closing to private cars a stretch to the south of the Imperial Fora leading towards the Colosseum, but the rest of the road remains open (Figure 30). Full pedestrianization remains the mayor's stated goal.[67] In 2014, Marino has experimented with a series of temporary closures of the entire road, but they raised ire from drivers and passengers and the end result remains uncertain.[68]

Though traffic continues to thunder down the Via dei Fori Imperiali, in the open spaces of the Imperial Fora themselves the balance between memory and movement has tipped once again, and the more recently excavated portions appear as closed spaces, out of place in the modern street layout (Figure 35). They are still important places of memory, to Romans and to tourists, but only scholars with special *permessi* can actually visit them, and even they are guided by temporary fences through defined paths across the ancient open squares. Plans for

the area speak of valuing all the different stages of the site's development, and integrating architecture of different periods into the modern city rather than regarding it as something separate to be held apart.[69] Even so, the problem of movement and memory has reared its head once again with the excavations for the new Metro Linea C, which will run directly underneath the area. The tunnel itself does not pose a problem: inverting tradition, the engineers plan to dig it at a lower level than any human archaeological strata. But there is to be a station at Piazza Venezia, and in test excavations for possible entrance sites, the archaeologists have discovered few viable options; instead, they are constantly tripping over more and more fascinating structures connected to Trajan's forum. These represent some of the most exciting new archaeological discoveries in Rome for decades, which are as we speak reshaping the way we see the Imperial Fora.[70] The difficulties the metro faces are directly connected to the ways the Imperial Fora originally controlled movement. Their unified, centrally planned layout left no space unused. Since they butt up directly against each other, eliminating possible access routes even for the traffic of their own time, they have not left any gaps for metro passengers today.

Conclusion

In the Forum Romanum, movement and memory until very recently worked together; in the area of the Imperial Fora they were at odds. The success of movement-created narratives ensured the persistence of the Forum Romanum as a place of cultural memory, lifted above the quotidian or communicative by tradition, repetition, and ritual. Actors who wanted to link their present to a past significant to Roman identity, from triumphing Roman generals to early modern popes, created routes linking older and newer parts of the built environment and themselves to all those who had previously travelled the same path. Mussolini's new road

aimed to do exactly the same, but his imposition of a new movement pattern also created a sense of competition with the past which eventually became a threat.

An understanding of the relationship between movement and memory in Rome explains why the two areas under consideration had such different post-antique fates. The original design of the Imperial Fora deliberately did not allow for movement across the area, setting each closed space apart from the daily life of the city. Because they were not integrated into the city's movement patterns they did not survive in the developing post-antique cityscape. Once there was no longer a central authority able and willing to forbid it, people eventually made their own routes across the Imperial Fora, working against the massive walls and orthogonal rigor of the area's layout. Over time, the changes lessened the unified visual impact and sense of separation from the everyday which had originally made them such powerful places of memory. They languished unremembered until Mussolini simply ploughed his way through the area of the Imperial Fora to rediscover and reappropriate the memories he chose from among the many layers of memory the Alessandrina neighborhood embodied. In doing so he created a location of memory which was also a location of movement, appropriate to the motor age.

The Forum Romanum, on the other hand, had always been a location of movement. A great deal of its specific power in cultural memory was bound up in the processional practices of papal Rome, a direct inheritance from the ancient ritual of the triumph. The Forum's importance as a route, for both ceremonial and quotidian purposes, was one reason that it was never built over in the same way the Imperial Fora were. As a direct consequence, its ancient structures have survived well and it has become once again one of Rome's primary locations of cultural memory. But the way we consume our memories has changed since the papal

processions of the Renaissance and early modern period. Formalized movement still reigns, as we follow tour guides in a ritual dance from monument to monument; but we must now pay to get into a fenced-off area, and though we may wander as tourists along the ancient flagstones of the Sacra Via, the Forum Romanum's role as a location of movement integrated with the city's movement patterns is gone.

[1] Preliminary versions of this paper were presented at the European Architectural Historians Network Annual Meeting in Brussels, 2012 and at Durham; my thanks to Samantha Martin-McAuliffe and Daniel Millette as the organisers of the EAHN panel and to both audiences for helpful comments. I have also benefitted greatly from the advice and suggestions of David Newsome and Matthew Nicholls, and from the editorial and anonymous reviewing team at *JSAH*. Any deficiencies in the final result remain my sole responsibility.

[2] On the layering of multiple pasts in Rome see most recently Dorigen Caldwell, "Introduction: Continuities of Place," in *Rome: Continuing Encounters between Past and Present*, ed. Dorigen Caldwell and Leslie Caldwell (Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011), 1-16; David F. Karmon, *The Ruin of the Eternal City: Antiquity and Preservation in Renaissance Rome* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 3-20; R. J. B. Bosworth, *Whispering City: Rome and its Histories* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2011); many of the papers in David H. Larmour and Diana Spencer, ed, *The Sites of Rome: Time, Space, Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) are relevant.

[3] Jan Assmann, "Kollektives Gedächnis und Kulturelle Identität," in *Kultur und Gedächtnis*, ed. Jan Assmann and Tonio Hölscher (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1988), 9-19; Jan Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 34-44. Assmann built on the work of

Maurice Halbwachs, *La Mémoire Collective* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1950) by introducing this distinction.

[4] Pierre Nora, *Les Lieux de Mémoire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1984-92).

[5] Walter Benjamin explores the idea of documenting his life not chronologically but spatially, on a map of places tied to vignettes of memory, in "A Berlin Chronicle," written in 1932 but unpublished in his lifetime (here cited from Walter Benjamin, *Selected Writings*, ed. Michael Jennings, Howard Eiland, and Gary Smith (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1999), vol. 2.595-637, trans. Edmund Jephcott). He writes, "I have long, indeed for years, played with the idea of setting out the sphere of life – *bios* – graphically on a map" (596); later, "For autobiography has to do with time, with sequence and what makes up the continuous flow of life. Here, I am talking of a space, of moments and discontinuities" (612). The shifting relationships between time and space also extend beyond individual memories: in his final, unfinished project on Parisian arcades ("Passagen", here cited from Walter Benjamin, *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Rolf Tiedemann (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1982), 1041-3), he describes the arcades as "raumgewordene Vergangenheit" – "the past become space" (1041). For more of the specific roles played by place and the built environment in discourses of cultural memory, see Aleida Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization. Functions, Media, Archives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 281-324.

[6] David Larmour and Diana Spencer, "Introduction – *Roma, recepta*: a topography of the imagination," in Larmour and Spencer, *The Sites of Rome*, 1-60, esp. 15-18, provide a vital guide to a range of historical and contemporary approaches to the conflation of time and space in Rome. Not surprisingly, walks through Rome play an important role in Aleida Assman's conception of places of memory; quoting a letter of Petrarch (to Giovanni Colonna, *ad Fam*. 6.2) on a stroll he took with a friend, she writes (*Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, 294), "For the two walkers, time is now condensed into space… Chronology is

turned into a topology of history, and one can make one's way through it step by step over the very ground where it all happened."

[7] These last are part of "Erinnerungskultur." By repetition, and because they are marked as special, they transmit knowledge of particular routes.

[8] Astrid Erll, "Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction," in ed. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning, *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008), 1-15 works with a wider definition of cultural memory which resists drawing such boundaries between any different forms of memory related to culture and identity, including between communicative and cultural memory. For this paper, the distinction is vital, though we should be careful before deciding in which category any specific instance belongs.

[9] Samantha L. Martin-Mcauliffe and John K. Papadopoulos, "Framing Victory: Salamis, the Athenian Acropolis, and the Agora," *JSAH* 71 no. 3 (Sept. 2012), 332-61 explore the persistence of particular vantage points in drawn and photographic images of the Athenian acropolis.

[10] London has a View Management Framework which protects thirteen specific views in the capital; the latest detailed information can be found in *London View Management Framework: Supplementary Planning Guidance* (London: Greater London Authority, 2012). In Rome, one of the recent controversies over Richard Meier's Museo dell'Ara Pacis has focused on a wall which separates the piazza from the Lungotevere, thus blocking the view of the churches of San Girolamo and San Rocco from the river: "Ara Pacis, giù il muretto di Meier, spostata la Fontana dei naviganti," *La Repubblica*, 28 May 2012, http://roma.repubblica.it/cronaca/2012/05/28/news/ara_pacis_cancellato_il_progetto_del_sottopasso_ridimensionato_il_muro_della_fontana_del_navigante-36082819/ (last accessed 1 May 2014).

[11] For the persistence of one route, the Via Aurelia Vetus, in the Via della Lungaretta in Trastevere, see Deborah Robbins, "Via Della Lungaretta: The Making of a Mediaeval Street," in *Streets: Critical Perspectives on Public Space*, ed. Zeynep Çelik, Diane G. Favro, and Richard Ingersoll (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 165-76. A recent project hosted by the Swedish Institute in Rome has undertaken an interdisciplinary and diachronic study of the Via Tiburtina, with important contributions from both archaeologists and landscape architects on the infrastructure of movement as cultural heritage: Hans Bjur and Barbro Santillo Frizell, ed., *Via Tiburtina: Space, Movement, and Artefacts in the Urban Landscape* (Stockholm: The Swedish Institute at Rome, 2009).

[12] Other options are available: in Cordoba, the ancient flagstones have been covered with strong glass on which visitors can walk, with the result that the route can still be followed. Considerations of cost, the need to protect the ancient stones from the elements, modern movement patterns, and the attitude taken by local authorities to tangible and intangible cultural heritage will mean different solutions are appropriate in different places.

[13] David Watkin, *The Roman Forum* (London: Profile Books, 2009) provides an accessible overview of the Forum Romanum from antiquity to the present. On the Forum Romanum in antiquity and its relationship to the rest of the city see especially Nicholas Purcell, "Rediscovering the Roman Forum," *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 2 (1989), 155-65, and Nicholas Purcell, "Urban Spaces and Central Places: The Roman World," in *Classical Archaeology*, ed. S Alcock and Robin Osborne (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007), 182-202. Filippo Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano*, 2 vols (Rome: Quasar, 1982-1985) and Paul Zanker, *Forum Romanum : Die Neugestaltung durch Augustus* (Tübingen: E. Wasmuth, 1972) provide the fullest archaeological and topographical discussions for the Republican and Augustan periods respectively. For the Forum as a space of memory, see especially Diane Favro, "The Roman Forum and Roman Memory," *Places* 5 (1988), 17-24.

---

[14] The concept of the *locus celeberrimus* is explored by David J. Newsome, "Introduction: Making Movement Meaningful," in *Rome, Ostia, Pompeii: Movement and Space*, ed. Ray Laurence and David J. Newsome (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 1-54, esp. 22-26; Francesco Trifiló, "Power, Architecture and Community in the Distribution of Honorary Statues in Roman Public Space," in *TRAC 2007: Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference*, ed. Corisande Fenwick, Meredith Wiggins and Dave Wythe (Oxford: Oxbow 2008), 109-20, esp. 115-17.

[15] On the role of processional routes in ancient Roman identity and topography, see Stéphane Benoist, "Les Processions dans la Cité: de la Mise en Scène de l'Espace Urbain," in ed. Philippe Fleury and Olivier Desbordes, *Roma Illustrata. Représentations de la Ville* (Caen: Presses Universitaires de Caen, 2008), 49-62. Diane G. Favro and Christopher Johanson, "Death in Motion: Funeral Processions in the Roman Forum," *JSAH* 69, no. 1 (Mar. 2010), 12-37 provide a compelling analysis of the Roman elite funeral as ritual in motion through the Forum; see further John P. Bodel, "Death on Display: Looking at Roman Funerals," in *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*, ed. Bettina Ann Bergmann and Christine Kondoleon (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1999), 258-81, and Harriet I. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996). A great deal has been written on the triumph as community ritual; recent contributions include Ida Östenberg, *Staging the World: Spoils, Captives, and Representations in the Roman Triumphal Procession* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Mary Beard, *The Roman Triumph* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007); Tanja Itgenhorst, *Tota Illa Pompa. Der Triumph in der Römischen Republik.* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005). For the element of movement in particular see Jean Luc Bastien, "Le Triomphe et La Voie Sacrée. Quelques Réflexions sur les Interactions d'un Espace et d'une Cérémonie," in *Rome Antique. Pouvoir des Images, Images du Pouvoir*, ed.

Elizabeth Deniaux (Caen: Presses Universitaires de Caen, 2000), 149-61; Diane G. Favro,

"The Street Triumphant: The Urban Image of Roman Triumphal Parades," in *Streets: Critical Perspectives on Public Space*, ed. Zeynep Çelik, Diane G. Favro, and Richard Ingersoll (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 151-64.

[16] The Triple Arch has been definitively established as the original location of the triumphal and consular lists now on display in the Musei Capitolini as the Capitoline Fasti by Elisabeth Nedergaard, "La collocazione originaria dei *Fasti Capitolini* e gli archi di Augusto nel Foro Romano," *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma* 96 (1994-5), 33-70; "Facts and fictions about the *Fasti Capitolini*," *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 27 (2004) 83-99. Details of all the other elements referred to in the paragraph can be found in the works cited in n. 13. For archaeological and topographical information on particular buildings, see the relevant entries in Eva Margareta Steinby, *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* (Rome: Quasar, 1993-2000). The ancient textual sources which preserve stories linked to individual monuments are easily accessible in Peter J. Aicher, *Rome Alive: A Source-Guide to the Ancient City* (Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2004).

[17] Recently, Eva Margareta Steinby, *Edilizia Pubblica e Potere Politico nella Roma Repubblicana* (Rome: Jaca Book, 2012) has suggested that the Republican Senate played a larger role in urban planning than has sometimes been thought. The large-scale patterns she cites as evidence that there must have been a guiding hand, such as fact that all four sides of the Forum square were adorned with basilicas by different patrons within twenty years in the early second century BCE, can however be explained equally well by oneupmanship and fashion.

[18] The archaeological evidence can be found in Cairoli Fulvio Giuliani and Patrizia Verduchi, *L'Area Centrale del Foro Romano* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1987); Ray Laurence,

Roman Archaeology for Historians (London: Routledge, 2012), 31-33 has an excellent overview of the controversy.

[19] The emperors made various attempts to create a more unified visual aspect to the buildings lining the forum, and the arches installed at the two main entrances to the south-east in the time of Augustus added to the feeling of enclosure; for these changes see most recently Susanne Muth, "Reglementierte Erinnerung. Das Forum Romanum unter Augustus als Ort kontrollierter Kommunikation," in ed. Felix Mundt, *Kommunikationsräume im Kaizerzeitlichen Rom* (Berlin: De Gruyter 2013), 3-47; Even so, none of these interventions could match the Imperial Fora's sense of closedness and isolation from movement patterns.

[20] On movement as a defining characteristic of the Forum area see further Roland Martin, "Agora et Forum," *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome; Antique* 84 (1972), 909-33; and especially David J. Newsome, "Movement and Fora in Rome (the Late Republic to the First Century CE)," in *Rome, Ostia, Pompeii: Movement and Space*, ed. Ray Laurence and David J. Newsome (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 290-311.

[21] On the Imperial Fora, older works including James C. Anderson, *The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora* (Brussels: Latomus, 1984) and James E. Packer, *The Forum of Trajan in Rome: A Study of the Monuments* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997) still have much to offer, but in architectural detail they have been superseded by new excavation: Eugenio La Rocca, "La Nuova Immagine dei Fori Imperiali," *Mitteilungen des Deutchen Archäologischen Instituts. Römische Abteilung* 108 (2001), 171-213; Roberto Meneghini and Riccardo Santangeli Valenzani, ed., *I Fori Imperiali: Gli Scavi del Comune di Roma (1991-2007)* (Rome: Viviani Editore, 2007); Roberto Meneghini, *I Fori Imperiali e i Mercati di Traiano. Storia e Descrizione dei Monumenti alla Luce degli Studi e degli Scavi Recenti* (Rome: Libreria dello Stato, 2009). Excavations are ongoing; the most recent published results can be found in Roberto Egidi, Fedora Filippi, and Sonia Martone,

Archeologia e Infrastrutture. Il Tracciato Fondamentale della Linea C della Metropolitana di Roma: Prime Indagini Archeologiche (Florence: Casa Editrice Leo S. Olschki, 2010).

[22] The Latin word *monumentum*, derived from *moneo* – 'I remind', makes the didactic and mnemonic aspects of monuments explicit. The semantic connection was often commented upon by Latin authors (e.g. Varro, *de Lingua Latina* 6.49; Ulpian, *Digest* 11.7.2.6; Porphyry *ad Hor. Carm.* 1.2.15) and is thoroughly explored by Andrew Meadows and Jonathan Williams, "Moneta and the Monuments: Coinage and Politics in Republican Rome," *Journal of Roman Studies* 91 (2001), 27-49.

[23] The work of Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988), especially 193-95, has been fundamental to recent readings of the Imperial Fora and their involvement in the construction of imperial Rome's memory and identity.

[24] The purchase at great expense of huge amounts of prime residential land for the Forum of Caesar is described in a letter of Cicero of 54 BCE (*ad Att.* 4.16.8). Augustus famously boasted that he built his forum on private land (*Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 21), to be intepreted as a sign of his modesty in buying rather than expropriating; Suetonius claims that he could not persuade all the owners to sell (Suet. *Aug.* 56.2) and the slight irregularities of its plan at the north-east corner has sometimes been cited as evidence that he did make some changes in response. This is all more to do with propaganda than reality; if Augustus had wanted to make his forum a perfect rectangle, he could have done so. Augustus made a point of publicizing his refusal to expropriate because it was unexpected. Later emperors would have faced even fewer social constraints on their ability to build anywhere they wished.

[25] *Ad declarandum quantae altitudinis mons et locus tantis operibus sit egestus* (*CIL* 6.960).

[26] Noted by Domenico Palombi, "Morfologia, Toponomastica e Viabilità Prima dei Fori Imperiali," in ed. Xavier Lafon and Gilles Sauron, *Théorie et Pratique de l'Architecture*

Romaine. Études offerts a Pierre Gros (Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 2005), 81-92.

[27] For the development of this inward-looking architectural type and its contrast with the Forum Romanum, see in particular John R. Seneseney, "Adrift toward Empire," *JSAH* 70, no.4 (Dec. 2011) 421-41, especially 422-23.

[28] Eugenio La Rocca, "Passeggiando Intorno ai Fori Imperiali," in *Imaging Ancient Rome: Documentation - Visualization - Imagination*, ed. Lothar Haselberger and John Humphrey (Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 2006), 120-43; David J. Newsome, "The Forum and the City: Rethinking Centrality in Rome and Pompeii (3rd Century B.C. - 2nd Century A.D.)" (PhD diss., Birmingham, 2010); Newsome, "Movement and Fora in Rome."

[29] The absence of suitable architectural features in most of the Imperial Fora is argument enough; although Caesar's Forum is an exception, containing small rooms which would be suitable for use as shops, Appian, *Civil War* 2.102 tells us that Caesar explicitly barred commerce from his Forum. See further Roger B. Ulrich, "Julius Caesar and the Creation of the Forum Iulium," *American Journal of Archaeology* 97 (1993), 58-66.

[30] For further discussion see Palombi, "Morfologia, Toponomastica e Viabilità Prima dei Fori Imperiali"; Ulrich, "Julius Caesar and the Creation of the Forum Iulium."

[31] In 357 CE, when the emperor Constantius II visited Rome for the first time, he was taken to visit Trajan's Forum. The emperor had no trouble deciphering its message and thus its place in his own past and present. Ammianus Marcellinus wrote (16.10.15): "But when he came to the Forum of Trajan, a building which I believe has no equal under the sun and which even the gods agree is a marvel, he was transfixed with astonishment while his mind roamed around the gigantic complex, indescribable in words and never again to be attempted by mortals."

---

[32] New archaeological investigations in the Imperial Fora begun in 1999 have uncovered a great deal about the late antique and post-antique history of the area: see Roberto Meneghini, "Le Trasformazioni dei Fori Imperiali nella Tarda Antichità," *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma* 109 (2009), 145-60; Meneghini and Santangeli Valenzani, *I Fori Imperiali*; Riccardo Santangeli Valenzani, "I Fori Romani nel Medioevo," *Mitteilungen des Deutchen Archäologischen Instituts. Römische Abteilung* 108 (2001), 269-83.

[33] David Newsome (personal communication) has pointed out that the *Mirabilia Urbis Romae* (a loose family of descriptions of the city which can be traced back to the mid-twelfth century CE) mistakenly place the Forum of Caesar on the other side of the Forum Romanum entirely – *contra* the claim of Anderson, *The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora*, 44 that the Forum of Caesar was "never really lost." Chapter 24 of the *Mirabilia* (following the edition of Roberto Valentini and Giuseppe Zuchetti, ed., *Codice topografico della città di Roma* vol. 3 (Istituto Storico Italiano: Rome, 1946), 17-65) links the *forum Cesaris* with *templum Palladis* and *templum Iani*, identifying the former with the church of San Lorenzo in Miranda (the ancient Temple of Antoninus and Faustina) and the latter with the Torre dei Frangipane, which had at its core the Arch of Titus.

[34] The forum of Nerva forms a partial exception that tests, but eventually confirms, the rule: known in antiquity as the Forum Transitorium ('the going-through forum'), it stood on land which had previously been occupied by the Argiletum, one of Rome's major movement arteries, and at first glance has the appearance of a monumentalized street. Even so, the temple at the north-east end provides a satisfying visual terminus and at least the appearance of closure, and movement through the narrow passage which remained to the south of the temple was further hindered by stairs.

[35] The post-antique history of Trajan's column, including its appropriation by the Popes and early excavations under Napoleon, deserves an article in itself; but it was treated in the main

as an individual monument, not part of an urban landscape. For the Napoleonic interventions, see in particular Ronald T. Ridley, *The Eagle and the Spade: Archaeology in Rome during the Napoleonic Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 152-66.

[36] This house and the practice of facadism are discussed in detail by Caroline J. Goodson, "Roman Archaeology in Mediaeval Rome," in *Rome: Continuing Encounters between Past and Present*, ed. Dorigen Caldwell and Leslie Caldwell (Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011), 17-34. For the continuing prestige of the Forum Romanum as a residential location throughout the late antique and early mediaeval periods, see Robert Coates-Stephens, "Housing in Early Mediaeval Rome, 500-1000 AD," *Papers of the British School at Rome* 64 (1996), 239-59.

[37] The owner was presumably, in the words of Richard Krautheimer, *Rome: Profile of a City, 312-1308* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 315, one of the "respectable burghers able to afford festooning their houses and the adjoining stretch of street for papal processions."

[38] Riccardo Santangeli Valenzani, "Strade, Case e Orti nell'Alto Medioevo nell'Area del Foro di Nerva," *Mélanges de l'Ecole Française de Rome: Moyen Âge* 111 (1999), 163-69.

[39] Indeed, this stretch was part of the papal processional route *from* the Lateran *to* the Vatican, which according to the order of Benedictus Canonicus of around 1140 CE passed through slightly different areas of the city to the reverse path discussed here; it crossed the area of the Imperial Fora here and continued up Salita del Grillo, behind the back wall of the Forum of Augustus. For further detail see Krautheimer, *Rome: Profile of a City*, 278-9.

[40] Goodson, "Roman Archaeology in Mediaeval Rome," 25-26 discusses this section of the Itinerary and the links it suggests between old and new architecture in the Forum.

[41] Mark Humphries, "From Emperor to Pope? Ceremonial, Space, and Authority at Rome from Constantine to Gregory the Great," in *Religion, Dynasty, and Patronage in Early*

Christian Rome, 300-900, ed. Kate Cooper and Julia Hillner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 21-58 discusses the evolution of processional ritual in Rome from late antiquity to the mediaeval period, noting how many imperial practices and routes were retained and revitalized by the popes even as entirely new forms also developed. The *possesso* shows specific links with the triumph and the imperial *adventus*, the ceremony of an emperor's arrival in the capital.

[42] The *possesso* was a long-standing ritual, though in the mediaeval period it involved movement from the Lateran to the Vatican and back, rather than beginning at the Vatican. For the sixteeth-century version, see Irene Fosi, "Court and City in the Ceremony of the Possesso in the Sixteenth Century," in *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700*, ed. Gianvittoria Signoretto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 31-52. David Mayernik, *Timeless Cities: An Architect's Reflections on Renaissance Italy* (Boulder: Westview Press, 2003), 66-74 reads the *possesso* route as a "memory path."

[43] Discussion in Fosi, "Court and City in the Ceremony of the Possesso in the Sixteenth Century," 36.

[44] For the history of the *passeggiata*, see Piero Maria Lugli, *Urbanistica Di Roma: Trenta Planimetri Per Trenta Secoli Di Storia* (Rome: Bardi, 1998), 128-9; Paola Ciancio Rosetto, "La 'Passeggiata Archeologica,'" in *L'archeologia in Roma Capitale tra Sterro e Scavo* (Venice: Marsilio, 1983), 75-88.

[45] The problem is noted by Lugli, *Urbanistica*, 128-9.

[46] Newsome, "The Forum and the City," preface (unpaginated) reacted in 2010 to the problems created by the introduction of ticket barriers (which took place in 2008, during the period in which he was carrying out his research) in similar terms: "The Forum Romanum has changed from a place that one might move through, to a place that one moves to; from a

shortcut to an obstacle. This has implications for how one should evaluate the perception of this space in the city at large. The Forum Romanum is no longer a well integrated route but is a segregated destination."

[47] Lugli, *Urbanistica* collects the evidence for Rome's urban development in this period; Italo Insolera and Francesco Perego, *Archeologia E Città: Storia Moderna Dei Fori Di Roma* (Roma; Bari: Laterza, 1983) is particularly helpful for the area of the Forum Romanum and Imperial Fora.

[48] Terry Kirk, "The Political Topography of Modern Rome, 1870-1936: Via XX Settembre to Via dell'Impero," in *Rome: Continuing Encounters between Past and Present*, ed. Dorigen Caldwell and Leslie Caldwell (Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011), 115-9.

[49] Mario Piacentini, "La Grande Roma," *Capitolium* 1, no. 7 (1925), 413-20; Corrado Ricci, Antonio M. Colini, and Valerio Mariani, *Via dell'Impero* (Rome: Libreria dello Stato, 1933), 3.

[50] For Lanciani's intervention, see Francesco Mora, *Da Via Cavour a Piazza Venezia Attraverso ai Fori Imperiali* (Rome: Direzione della Nuova Antologia, 1917), 7.

[51] Important treatments include David Atkinson, "Totalitarianism and the Street in Fascist Rome," in *Images of the Street: Planning, Identity and Control in Public Space*, ed. Nicholas R. Fyfe (London; New York: Routledge, 1998), 13-30; Antonio Cederna, *Mussolini Urbanista: Lo Sventramento di Roma negli Anni di Consenso* (Rome: Laterza, 1979); Emilio Gentile, *Facismo di Pietra* (Bari: Laterza, 1997); Spiro Kostof, *The Third Rome, 1870-1950: Traffic and Glory* (Berkeley: University Art Museum, 1973); Borden W. Painter, *Mussolini's Rome: Rebuilding the Eternal City* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005). Most recently, Paul Baxa, *Roads and Ruins: The Symbolic Landscape of Fascist Rome* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010) has revitalized the study of fascist urbanism with a new emphasis on the lived experience of the city.

---

[52] Speech of 18 March 1932, quoted in Kostof, *The Third Rome*, 18.

[53] Baxa, *Roads and Ruins*, 63-66 speaks of "rupturing memory."

[54] In addition to the works cited above at n. 51, for the Via dell'Impero project in particular see Fabio Betti, *Via dell'Impero. Nascita Di Una Strada, Demolizioni E Scavi: 1930-36* (Rome: Palombi, 2006); Insolera and Perego, *Archeologia e Città*; Rossella Leone and Anita Margiotta, ed., *Fori Imperiali. Demolizioni e Scavi: Fotografie 1924-1940* (Milan: Electa, 2007).

[55] Antonio Muñoz, *Via dei Monti e Via del Mare* (Rome: Governatorato di Roma, 1932).

[56] Baxa, *Roads and Ruins*, 80-84; on p.85, specifically on the Via dell'Impero, he quotes Le Corbusier and Muñoz' conflicting ideas on how best to appreciate ruins. In an interview with Muñoz himself published as Antonio Muñoz, "Le Corbusier Parla di Urbanistica Romana," *L'Urbe* 14 (Nov. 1936), 35, it was Le Corbusier who counselled against the juxtaposition of roads and ruins; he preferred that ruins be studied in an atmosphere of "calm, solitude and time for reflection" (transl. Baxa). Muñoz, as Baxa notes, preferred a model whereby speed of movement enhances the immediacy with which a passer-by is confronted with, even surprised by, the ruins: Antonio Muñoz, "La Via dell'Impero," *Emporium* 10 (Oct. 1933), 242.

[57] For further discussion of fascist rituals of the street, focused on claiming control over public space, see Atkinson, "Totalitarianism and the Street in Fascist Rome."

[58] Angela Maria D'Amelio, "Foro di Augusto," in *Fori Imperiali: Demolizioni e Scavi: Fotografie 1924-1940*, ed. Rossella Leone and Anita Margiotta (Milan: Electa, 2007), 49 discusses in general terms the loss of the ancient "spazialità", pointing out that post-antique interventions meant it was not only unrecovered, but unrecoverable.

[59] Muñoz, *Via dei Monti e Via del Mare*, 10 remarks with pride that the two exedras which in the new layout of the area flank the Vittoriano are ten metres larger than Bernini's exedras at

St. Peter's. As Spiro Kostof, "His Majesty the Pick: The Aesthetics of Demolition," *Design Quarterly* 118/9 (1982), 32-41 remarks: "The presentation of ancient monuments in a drama of historical association brings out the comparable or rather competitive grandeur of the present regime in relation to the past."

[60] Noted by Kostof, *The Third Rome*, 21.

[61] On ideological impulses behind the change in orientation, see Kostof, *The Third Rome*, 24; Baxa, *Roads and Ruins*, 85.

[62] The link is noted by Kostof, "His Majesty the Pick," 33, quoting Marinetti's *Futurist Manifesto*: "Get hold of picks, axes, hammers, and demolish, demolish without pity, the venerated cities."

[63] Filippo Marinetti, "Senza Zaino: Conclusione sul Decennale," *Futurismo*, 18 Dec. 1932; see futher Marja Härmänmaa, *Un Patriota che Sfidò la Decadenza: F. T. Marinetti e l'Idea dell'Uomo Nuova Fascista, 1929-1944* (Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 2000), 145-68; Günther Berghaus, *Futurism and Politics: Between Anarchist Rebellion and Fascist Reaction* (Providence, R.I.: Berghahn Books, 1996), 218-76.

[64] Painter, *Mussolini's Rome*, 52-3 quotes an American living in Rome who was interviewed for John Patric's *National Geographic* article "Imperial Rome Reborn" (March 1937): "Look to your left. See those young Fascists on the athletic field. Behind them lie ruins of Caracalla's Baths. Vast in size and equipped with every luxury then known, they marked the beginnings of Rome's fall."

[65] Kostof, *The Third Rome* traces the three phases: reverence and concern for authenticity in the display of monuments; then the juxtaposition of ancient and fascist architecture; and finally the move to entirely new contexts.

[66] One set of proposals can be found in Carlo Aymonino, *Progettare Roma Capitale* (Bari: Laterza, 1990); Insolera and Perego, *Archeologia e Città*; Raffaele Panella, *Roma Città e*

Foro: Questioni di Progettazione del Centro Archeologico Monumentale della Capitale (Rome: Officina Edizioni, 1989).

[67] Full details can be found at the project's website, www.foripedonali.it (last accessed 14 May 2015).

[68] Opposition to the plans is noted by e.g. Paolo Bocacci, "Cancellare via dei Fori Imperiali? I residenti faranno le barricate," *La Reppublica,* 31 Oc. 2013, http://roma.repubblica.it/cronaca/2013/10/31/news/cancellare_via_dei_fori_imperiali_i_resid enti_faranno_le_barricate-69879936/ (last accessed 14 May 2014); "La 'pazza idea' di Marino. Smantellare i Fori Imperiali," *L'Unita*, 30 Oct. 2013, http://www.unita.it/culture/pedonalizzazione-fori-imperiali-smantellamento-area-archeologica-mibact-bray-veloccia-marino-protest-1.530520 (last accessed 14 May 2014).

[69] Already in the 1980s Insolera and Perego, *Archeologia e Città*, xxi wrote of "the multiplication of points of intersection and exchange" between periods. The most recent project, in the words of Sonia Martone, "La Linea C della Metropolitana di Roma. Procedure e Nuove Prospettive," in *Archeologia e Infrastrutture. Il Tracciato Fondamentale della Linea C della Metropolitana di Roma: Prime Indagini Archeologiche*, ed. Roberto Egidi, Fedora Filippi, and Sonia Martone (Florence: Casa Editrice Leo S. Olschki, 2010), 14 has the aim of "recuperating and exalting the value of the stratified city."

[70] The most recent published synopsis can be found in Roberto Egidi, Fedora Filippi, and Sonia Martone, *Archeologia e Infrastrutture. Il Tracciato Fondamentale della Linea C della Metropolitana di Roma: Prime Indagini Archeologiche* (Florence: Casa Editrice Leo S. Olschki, 2010).