

The Eternal(ly Changing) City: Demolition and Roma Sparita in Visual Culture from the Risorgimento to Fascism

ZOE S. FOX

University of Birmingham

Roma *sparita*, or ‘vanished Rome’, is a particular phrase that encapsulates the unique power of memory in a city comprised of so many layers.¹ The term started to appear in discourse about the city at the turn of the twentieth century, and was made popular by the watercolour collection of the Risorgimento-era artist Ettore Roesler Franz (1845-1907), which now bears the phrase as its title. Throughout the end of the Risorgimento and the rise of the Fascist period, the term came to be used to encompass the entirety of what was demolished in the modernisation of Rome, and it is still used today. Above all, the invocation of *Roma sparita* invited audiences and artists to participate in the process of remembering and documenting what was being lost — both the tangible and intangible. That being said, who was remembering, what was remembered, and why, all shifted from the end of the nineteenth century through the rise of the Fascist regime. This article will chart the rise of *Roma sparita* as a concept by considering the Risorgimento-era works of Franz alongside the works of Maria Barosso (1879-1960), a watercolourist who was employed by the Fascist regime. By viewing the works of these artists together, we can see the shift away from Risorgimento-era nostalgic documentation of *Roma pittoresca*, which was created out of anxiety about change, towards a celebration of this change and the dramatic Fascist demolition process. More broadly, this shift helps us understand how the process of remembering the disappearing city was transformed—and manipulated— as it first became a capital, and then the heart of Fascist Italy.

¹ This paper is dedicated to my mom, Melissa Fox, who so desperately wanted to live long enough to see my name in print. I hope I make you proud forever.

BACKGROUND AND FRAMEWORK

The rise of *Roma sparita* took place within the context of the drastic transformation of Rome over the period heralded in by the unification of Italy, and especially during the Fascist *Ventennio*. From 1870 through 1945, the urban fabric of Rome became the most important tool with which numerous politicians and urban planners communicated their new ideals for a modern Italy.² During the Risorgimento, the city was transformed through various iterations of the *piano regolatore*, which, while including dramatic interventions in the city, generally adhered to the principle of respecting the existing urban layout. In the Fascist period, Mussolini moved from these “surgical” interventions in the urban fabric to *sventramento*, which encouraged all-encompassing demolition of entire neighbourhoods in order to both “liberate” ancient monuments and to make space to create the “Third Rome” of Fascism.³ Such a policy left both physical and social devastation in its wake— a problem with which Rome continues to grapple today.

Scholars have continuously analysed the ideology, iconography, and consequences of the Fascist urban project in the city of Rome since the post-war period. Journalist Antonio Cederna established the precedent for the denunciation of Fascist *sventramento* on both social and aesthetic grounds, while architectural historian Spiro Kostof led the first foray into the study of Fascist demolition within the context of urban design.⁴ Both of these scholars placed the focus upon the demolition process itself as a key element of Fascist ideology, and not simply what was built in its wake. However, no scholarship has examined in depth the broader wave of cultural production that accompanied demolition in the Fascist period, and the various types of media that were employed to promote it. Yet, woven

² See the classic text about Rome’s modern transformation: Italo Insolera, *Roma Moderna* (Einaudi, 1962).

³ For Mussolini’s role in Rome’s urban planning, see Borden W. Painter Jr., *Mussolini’s Rome* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), and Paolo Nicolosi, *Mussolini, Architect* (University of Toronto Press, 2002). For the “Third Rome”, see Aristotle Kallis, in particular *The Third Rome, 1922-1943* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), and R.J.B. Bosworth, *Whispering City: Rome and its Histories* (Yale University Press, 2011). For Fascist urban planning’s relationship to ancient Rome, see Paul Baxa, *Roads and Ruins* (University of Toronto Press, 2010) and Joshua Arthurs, *Excavating Modernity: The Roman Past in Fascist Italy* (Cornell University Press, 2012).

⁴ Antonio Cederna, *I vandali in casa* (Laterza, 1956), and *Mussolini urbanista* (Laterza, 1979). See also Bruno Bonomo, “The vandals at home’: Antonio Cederna’s denunciation of the devastation of Italian cities in the postwar period’, *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*, 21.5 (2016).

Spiro Kostof, *The Third Rome, 1870-1950: Traffic and Glory* (University Art Museum, Berkeley, 1973), and ‘His Majesty the Pick: the Aesthetics of Demolition’, *Design Quarterly* 118/9 (1982).

into the Fascist demolition process was a vast body of written sources and artistic depictions of Rome's transformation, which have not benefitted from the same scrutiny as their Risorgimento predecessors. In particular, Maria Barosso, the artist whose works form the backbone of this article, has not been the subject of any sustained scholarship, nor any major exhibitions, before 2025.⁵ Similarly, although Antonio Muñoz was an immensely influential figure in the visual culture of Fascist Rome through his leadership of both the Soprintendenza ai Monumenti di Roma and the Direzione Generale di Antichità e Belle Arti, there is only one substantial monograph dedicated to his activities.⁶ Finally, despite its ubiquitous invocation in the parlance of Rome's modern urban development, no scholars have considered the rise and power of the term *Roma sparita*. It is these lacunae that this article hopes to address in the following analysis.

In order to do so, this article will utilise the lens of Henri Lefebvre's conceptual triad of space— spatial practice, representations of space, and representational space— and in particular the tension between representations of space (conceptualised space) and representational (lived) space.⁷ The demolition activity in Rome, and especially *sventramento*, completely upended both types of space of the city as those in power tried to assert their control over the urban fabric. This destabilisation acted as a catalyst for Risorgimento artists such as Roesler Franz to try to preserve their memories of the disappearing conceptualised space through paintings, which engaged in the creation of representational lived space through their emphasis of certain emotions and activities. In the Fascist period, as *Roma sparita* grew out of this initial artistic impulse, competing visions of these lived spaces arose: the nostalgic version in the style of Roesler Franz, and the new, celebratory version of the Regime. As this article will show, Muñoz's manipulation of *Roma sparita* served as an attempt to control the social space of the city; through his actions, he was able to establish an "official" representational space for the residents who had to make sense of the new conceptualised space of Fascist Rome.

RISORGIMENTO-ERA ROMA SPARITA

⁵ This situation is thankfully changing with the exhibition *Maria Barosso, artista e archeologa nella Roma in trasformazione*, and the publication of its accompanying catalogue in Autumn 2025 at Musei Capitolini Centrale Montemartini.

⁶ Calogero Bellanca, *Antonio Muñoz* (L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2003).

⁷ Henri Lefebvre (trans. Nicholson-Smith), *The Production of Space* (Blackwell, 1991), pp. 38-39.

With the creation of Rome as Italy's capital city in 1871, and the development of the first *piano regolatore*, which was ratified in 1873, residents, scholars, and artists grew increasingly anxious about remembering the old Rome that was slated for disappearance. This fear was triggered by the impending transformation that would be created by extensive demolition for the sake of modernity, and was rooted in a deep nostalgia for a certain traditional way of life. By the early 1880s, writers, architects, and artists were publicly sharing their desire to preserve the memory of the disappearing city, for fear that it would be completely forgotten.⁸ These concerned residents found their champion in the watercolourist Roesler Franz, who had already embarked upon his first series of paintings that faithfully documented those areas that were about to be demolished. In 1883, the city itself took interest in his paintings, and bought 40 watercolours for the opening of Palazzo delle Esposizioni; after this purchase, Roesler Franz created 80 more paintings of Rome, all of which were purchased by the government after his death in 1907.⁹

The 120 paintings that resulted from Roesler Franz's two decades of work are remarkable images of Rome's pre-modern representational space, which sought to preserve the emotions and perception of the city before its transformation (Fig. 1-4). In terms of subject matter and location, Roesler Franz concentrated upon scenes that viewers might have regarded as mundane, and almost exclusively upon working class locales, the built environment of which exhibited details such as crumbling facades, detritus and debris, roofs overgrown with weeds, and other less-than-idealistic elements. Such depictions engaged with a certain perception of Rome— what the Fascists would later call the *colore locale*, and others would call picturesque. Indeed, the initial title that Roesler Franz gave to his collection was '*Roma pittoresca, Memorie di un'era che passa*'; the title *Roma Sparita* only appeared over a decade later, thus eliding the picturesque and *Roma sparita* into one.¹⁰ However, this quaint version of Rome was exactly what the *piano regolatore* was working to dismantle with the new conceived space of the modernised city, and its endangerment was precisely why Roesler Franz committed it to memory on paper.

Beyond the built environment, however, the paintings blur the line between documentation and emotion through his inclusion of people, and it is this blend that enabled Roesler Franz to truly engage in the preservation of the pre-modern representational space of Rome. While the paintings are seemingly faithful, realistic views

⁸ Maria Elisa Tittoni, 'Ettore Roesler Franz', in *Paesaggi della Memoria* (Mandragora, 2007).

⁹ Francesco Roesler Franz, *Ettore Roesler Franz: biografia romanzata del pittore di Roma sparita* (Intra Moenia, 2017), pp. 151, 229.

¹⁰ Francesco Roesler Franz, *Ettore Roesler Franz*, p. 151.

of the urban fabric that was about to be demolished, it is the residents that he depicts, and the activities in which they are engaged, which preserve the memory of the intangible aspect of *Roma sparita*— that is, the social, representational space of the city. This is particularly true of the watercolours that depict hubs of traditional activity that were wiped out by demolition, such as the *pescheria* in the Portico of Octavia, fishermen on the banks of the Tiber, and street vendors in the Jewish Ghetto (Fig. 1-3). In these cases, it was not simply the buildings themselves that had to be remembered, but also a way of life. There is also a potent sense of melancholy in the apparent unawareness of the subjects; in these images, there is no hint of the demolition to come. The only exception is one painting of via Rúa, made in 1888, in which there is a torn-up, camouflaged notice about the demolition of the Ghetto hung on the wall; its presence is ominous, yet barely detectable amidst the rest of the bustling scene (Fig. 4).

Thus, Roesler Franz's images, although spurred on in their creation by the demolition works, exist in a world in which nothing has yet changed. They are a snapshot of a particular vision of Rome, somewhere between picturesque fantasy and detailed reality, that are meant to encompass and epitomise the way of life in Rome that was disappearing — both the environment and the daily lives of the people within it. The timeframe of Roesler Franz's world ends when demolition begins, and does not depict any part of the process of disappearance. This omission of the demolition process will put Roesler Franz's works in stark contrast with later depictions of *Roma sparita*.

FASCIST-ERA ROMA SPARITA

After its initial popularity from the 1880s to the 1910s, the ideology of *Roma sparita* experienced a dramatic shift in the 1920s and 1930s. This change was a result of an intensive propagandistic campaign spearheaded by Antonio Muñoz. As the director of the Office of Antichità e Belle Arti, he was paradoxically in charge of both the major demolition projects in Rome, and the artistic and institutional remembrance of what was being demolished— and so, he had to power to control both the conceptualised and lived space of the city. This remarkable position allowed the Regime to take hold of *Roma sparita* in order to create an official representational space of the new Rome at a time in which it was facing increasing instability. Over a period of about ten years, through a combination of exhibitions, periodicals, and artistic patronage, Muñoz was able to completely appropriate and transform the intention, meaning, and message behind *Roma sparita*. As a result, by the

mid-1930s, the term had shifted from a nostalgic, mournful remembrance of traditional, picturesque Rome, into a triumphant rallying cry for the Governatorato and its *sventramento*.

The first step in Muñoz's transformation of *Roma sparita* was the creation of an exhibition entitled '*Mostra della Roma che sparisce*', which opened in 1927.¹¹ The exhibit featured 260 different artworks of areas that were slated to be demolished in the coming years with the ratification of the 1931 *piano regolatore*. In a brief preface that Muñoz wrote for the exhibition catalogue, he laid out his justifications and goals. He noted the dramatic changes that had already occurred in the city, and that,

Più grandi trasformazioni si avranno certamente nel prossimo avvenire, per l'applicazione del nuovo Piano Regolatore, pubblicato in questi giorni dal Governatorato, che secondo le direttive tracciate dal Duce nel suo memorando discorso in Campidoglio, persegue il nobile intendimento di provvedere in modo degno alla formazione della futura Grande Roma.¹²

He continued, 'sono condannati a sparire molti edifici d'interesse storico ed artistico; molti ambienti caratteristici dovranno mutare aspetto', and thus, 'di tutte queste memorie mi parve fosse opportuno conservare il ricordo in forma artisticamente decorosa' through the creation of the exhibition.¹³ He concluded by mentioning, 'le opere più interessanti e più degne andranno a far parte del nuovo Museo di Topografia Romana, a complemento della celebre raccolta di acquarelli della *Roma Sparita* del Roesler-Franz'.¹⁴

This testimony, although short, nevertheless provides clear insight into Muñoz's true intentions regarding the ideology of *Roma sparita*. He cited the incoming *piano regolatore* as the impetus for creating the exhibition, and his focus was on the loss of 'buildings' and 'environments' as Fascist urban planners enacted their visions of the new conceptualised space of the city. In doing so, he made demolition the centrepiece of *Roma sparita*; it was no longer focused on the picturesque and its traditions, ways of life, and local customs, but rather, a reaction to the changing urban fabric, and part of the process of demolition. Indeed, the subtle shift of the title, bringing the past *Roma sparita* into the present tense of *Roma che sparisce*, heralded in the development of this ideological difference. According

¹¹ Antonio Muñoz, *Mostra della Roma che sparisce* (Associazione artistica internazionale, 1927).

¹² Antonio Muñoz, *Roma che sparisce*, introduction.

¹³ *ibid.*

¹⁴ *ibid.*

to the *Roma sparita* of Muñoz, the act of remembrance was no longer about the past, and what had already been lost; instead, it was about the change that was actively in process all around the city. The transformation of Rome had not happened, it was happening at the moment of the exhibition.

Additionally, in choosing ‘*Roma che sparisce*’ as the title, and centering Roesler Franz as the core of the exhibition, Muñoz was taking the first step in his appropriation of *Roma sparita*. Over the preceding decades, the term had become evocative of the emotional burden of loss and placelessness felt by those who watched as their city was drastically transformed. It was not a concept that originated from the Roman government itself, or from urban planners, but rather from artists and writers in reaction to the actions of the government and planners. And while the Roman government purchased and exhibited Roesler Franz’s works during the Risorgimento, it is difficult to determine whether it did so because it endorsed the nostalgic sentiments behind it, or because it wanted to control the narrative of *Roma sparita*.

This ambiguity of motive vanished in the 1927 exhibit; from that point forward, the Regime was the patron and arbiter of the idea — and more importantly, the art — of *Roma sparita*. This position allowed the Regime to gain control over the creation of the new lived space of the city in the minds of residents while simultaneously dictating its conceptualised space. By appropriating the term and separating it from the artists who created their art as an emotional act, the Regime also removed any sense of nostalgia for the picturesque, or regret at its disappearance. For Muñoz, the documentation of these memories was not an organic cultural act, but rather, an academic pursuit of art historical and architectural preservation, separated from the emotions of Risorgimento-era *Roma sparita*. According to him, this process of remembrance was best achieved through the creation of artworks. This focus on artworks is made clear by the last paragraph of Muñoz’s introduction, in which he states that the memory which he seeks to curate is specifically an ‘artistic’ one, and is meant to ‘complement’ the collection of Roesler Franz. Both of these changes to *Roma sparita* — the focus upon the demolition process, and the removal of nostalgia — would become central to the term’s development over the next decade.

This process began in earnest after the closure of the exhibit, when Muñoz began implementing his plans to turn ‘*Roma che sparisce*’, along with Roesler Franz’s collection, into a permanent museum: an institution that would come to be known as Museo di Roma. This museum, which was inaugurated in 1930, contained a blend of two versions of *Roma sparita*, the nostalgic and the triumphant, in its first few years. Galleries tending

towards nostalgia displayed dioramas of Roman street life, cultural items donated by Romans or rescued from demolished buildings, and a multitude of paintings from the previous centuries that depicted the old ways of Rome, all of which joined the Roesler Franz images. Amidst these displays, however, Museo di Roma quickly became a useful tool to promote Muñoz's new vision of *Roma sparita* as well. This is largely due to the fact that a group of contemporary paintings joined these artifacts in the museum's permanent collection, many of which did not depict the lost neighbourhoods *before* their demolition, but rather, the demolition process itself. It is these demolition artworks, as a discrete genre, that enabled Muñoz to divert *Roma sparita* onto a new, Fascist course.

As the museum was being developed, Muñoz carried out an intensive acquisition campaign while also fielding offers from artists and collectors, and this process enabled him to exert almost complete control over the museum and its collection. The permanent collection was built through a combination of commissions sought out by Muñoz, and donations from artists who sought him out in order to offer their works.¹⁵ As a result, a section of this collection focused on depictions of the demolition process itself began to develop in a permanent sequel to '*Roma che sparisce*', and included works executed over a number of years by more than a half-dozen artists. The encouragement of such artworks demonstrated how the term was used to invoke the physical transformation of Rome as an achievement to be celebrated, and not a loss to be mourned.

At the centre of this artistic initiative was Maria Barosso, a highly trained artist from Turin and the first woman hired by the Amministrazione delle Belle Arti.¹⁶ Barosso painted dozens of scenes of the demolitions in the Centro Storico. In 1930, after being featured in '*Roma che sparisce*', she approached the Governatorato directly and offered to sell fifteen of her demolition paintings to the city, which were recognised for their value in preserving the memory of *Roma sparita*.¹⁷ The city agreed, and hired her as an artist for the Office of the Forum Romanum and Palatine, for whom she continued to paint a multitude of watercolours depicting the demolitions for the next several years.

When looking at Barosso's body of work, as representative of demolition paintings as a whole, there are several aspects that stand out within the context of Muñoz's *Roma sparita*

¹⁵ Rome, Archivio Storico Capitolino (ASC), Ripartizione (1921-1931) Appendice, t. 1931, cl.1 sottocl.9, b.363, f.4.

¹⁶ 'Maria Barosso', in *I colori dell'Archeologia*, ed. by Luigia Attilia and Fedora Filippi (Edizioni Quasar, 2009), pp. 62-65.

¹⁷ ASC, Ripartizione X A.B.A. b.358, f.1, sf. 3.

campaign (Fig. 5-8). First, and most noticeably, Barosso's paintings are extremely dynamic, and almost exclusively depict the act of demolition *in medias res*. Unlike Roesler Franz, or even the exhibition of 1927, there is no inclusion of the Rome before the loss; Barosso's paintings exclusively focus on the demolition that is already happening. They are zoomed-out, broad scale landscapes that encompass the half-demolished buildings, the workers, the equipment, and the surrounding landmarks and ruins, and are almost always a snapshot of the demolition in action, full of movement (Fig. 5). It is the process that must be noticed, documented, and remembered, not the disappearing urban fabric itself — *Roma che sparisce*, so to speak, and not *Roma sparita*.

Barosso's focus on the overall demolition process, as opposed to an interest in the people and places being lost, can be seen in one particularly curious stylistic choice: throughout her corpus of work, Barosso does not depict the faces of any of the people in the scenes. Although the paintings are often crowded with workers, she chooses to leave them anonymous. This choice makes the workers seem as if they are simply cogs in the demolition machine, and almost incidental to the scene being depicted. While their presence is important because they are carrying out the work of demolition, they are only one part of it; they blend into the bustle of the process, akin to the machinery and the scaffolding. This lack of focus on the people in the paintings, along with the broader scale of the compositions, creates a sense of overall industriousness and activity, but removes any details that might individualize the workers, and thus humanize the losses being depicted.

Similarly, when Barosso does choose to include residents in the composition, she includes them as taking part in the demolition action as spectators (Fig. 6). These residents usually have their back to the viewer and lean on barriers or fences; they are seemingly engrossed in the process unfolding in front of them, and some have the infamous *umarell* pose with their hands clasped behind their backs. Barosso's inclusion of these figures implies the residents' complacency regarding the demolition; while they seem curious about the process, they also seem to accept it, and their clasped hands signal submission. At the same time, their presence also seems to hint at the process of cultural memory formation taking place amongst the Romans themselves; these residents standing as witness to the demolition of their homes and neighborhoods suggests that they were also imprinting the memory of these locations, and the way in which they were lost, upon their minds for posterity.

While the spectators might have been creating a shared cultural memory, Barosso's paintings actively engage in the process of institutional memory by taking pains to

document the concrete details of the demolition process. One major way in which she includes this documentation is through the consistent inclusion of captions, which were written directly on the artworks themselves, within the frame. While some of these captions are quite straightforward with only her name and the date, more often, they include more detail, such as the exact location, the extent of time the painting was meant to represent, and a description of the work that is being carried out. Aside from these more clinical details, sometimes, her wording provides glimpses of her own thoughts and engagement with the Fascist program. For example, a caption written on a painting from February 1932 says, ‘nuovi visioni di Roma Febbraio 1932 – dalle demolizioni delle casupole di via Cremona emerge il Campidoglio e si scopire il Foro di Cesare’ (Fig. 7). The wording strikes the viewer as celebratory; the proclamation that *nuove visioni di Roma* are being created by the demolitions, while the grand ruins of the Campidoglio and Forum of Caesar are emerging from the *casupole*, aligns with Mussolini’s call for ancient Rome to be freed from the ‘costruzioni parassitarie e profane’.¹⁸ Indeed, the caption seems to anticipate Mussolini’s speech delivered to the senate a month later, in which he declared, ‘demoliamo tutte le casupole infette’.¹⁹

Similarly, on another painting of the demolitions in the same area, made a few months later, Barosso wrote, ‘come muoiono le vecchie case per la grandezza di Roma’ (Fig. 8). However, it is especially interesting to note that Barosso, an illustrator of ancient architecture by trade, formats this phrase in the style of Roman monumental inscriptions: the words are written in all capital letters, with an interpunct between each word. Such stylistic choices situate this phrase as a triumphant title for the image, and not simply a caption — indeed, her more typical informational caption is written below this title. The language of the title is in keeping with its monumental formatting, and seems to harken back to Mussolini’s infamous 1925 speech *La Nuova Roma*, in which he outlined his plans for Rome’s urban transformation.²⁰ Barosso’s use of *grandezza*, Mussolini’s own word for his vision of Rome, is particularly telling, as is the sentiment that the old houses of Quartiere Alessandrino, the working-class district, were dying ‘for the sake of’ this grandeur.

Overall, Barosso’s body of work epitomizes Muñoz’s new vision not just for *Roma sparita*, but for Museo di Roma as a whole. Her celebratory images are designed to inspire

¹⁸ Governatorato di Roma, *Piano Regolatore di Roma 1931* (Treves-Treccani-Tumminelli, 1931), p. 8.

¹⁹ Benito Mussolini, *Scritti e discorsi di Benito Mussolini* vol. 8 (Ulrico Hoepli, 1934), p. 34.

²⁰ Governatorato di Roma, *Piano Regolatore 1931*, pp. 8-9.

excitement for the demolition process: the scenes are full of frenzied work, blue skies, and rosy buildings, and, most importantly, the grandeur of both ancient and Fascist Rome rising from the dust of the demolished buildings. It is precisely these types of artworks that were meant to consume the nostalgia of the old *Roma sparita*; this could be achieved by creating a museum that both entombed this pre-Fascist version, while presenting dynamic new artworks that overrode it. Such was the fate of the sorrowful *Roma sparita* of the past—the cohort of artists creating demolition paintings for the Museum represented the triumphant *Roma che sparisce* of the Fascist present.

In conclusion, the story of *Roma sparita* represents the power that one phrase could have in the collective memory of the city at the hands of authority; namely, the power to redirect the cultural reception of a drastically shifting urban fabric. Thus, *Roma sparita* underscores the ability of art to both preserve, and later construct, a preferred representational space while conceptualised space was being dismantled and destabilised. However, this paper provides only a small glimpse into the all-encompassing campaign led by Muñoz. Aside from artworks, the appropriation of *Roma sparita* extended across multiple fronts through the creation of new institutions, academic and popular publications, propaganda, and cultural works. As a result, the powerful emotions behind the idea were transfigured into a way to celebrate the very demolition process against which it had initially been protesting. Such a campaign continues to linger in today's cultural memory, where we can detect the original, nostalgic version of *Roma sparita* in book titles, restaurants, archives, and even songs. At the same time, we can also see Muñoz's version in the top floor of Museo di Roma, which is dedicated to Rome's Fascist-era demolitions, and the upcoming exhibition devoted to Maria Barosso. But in the end, the full picture of Rome's transformation involves all of these images: while we need to remember the sorrowful losses of *Roma sparita*, we cannot forget the processes by which it disappeared.

FIGURES



FIG 1. Ettore Roesler Franz, *Il Portico d'Ottavia guardando a destra* (1887), watercolor on paper, 53 × 75 cm (photograph by Alfredo Valeriani). Roma, Museo di Roma, Archivio Iconografico; Copyright Roma Capitale, Sovrintendenza Capitolina ai Beni Culturali.



FIG 2. Ettore Roesler Franz, *Continuazione di Via Capocciuto nel Ghetto* (1886), watercolor on paper, 53 × 75 cm. Roma, Museo di Roma, Archivio Iconografico; Copyright Roma Capitale, Sovrintendenza Capitolina ai Beni Culturali.



FIG 3. Ettore Roesler Franz, *La piazza delle Azimelle in Ghetto* (1881), watercolor on paper, 53 × 75 cm (photograph by Roberto Lucignani). Roma, Museo di Roma, Archivio Iconografico; Copyright Roma Capitale, Sovrintendenza Capitolina ai Beni Culturali.



FIG 4. Ettore Roesler Franz, *Via Rua. In Fondo il Portico d'Ottavia* (1888), watercolor on paper, 53 × 75 cm (photograph by Roberto Lucignani). Roma, Museo di Roma, Archivio Iconografico; Copyright Roma Capitale, Sovrintendenza Capitolina ai Beni Culturali.



FIG 5. Maria Barosso, *La via dei Colli con l'abside della Basilica di Massenzio nel 1932* (1932), pencil and watercolor on paper (photograph by Alfredo Valeriani). Roma, Museo di Roma, Archivio Iconografico; Copyright Roma Capitale, Sovrintendenza Capitolina ai Beni Culturali.



FIG 6. Maria Barosso, *Demolizioni di case medioevali tra Via Cremona e Via delle Chiavi d'Oro*, 1932 (1932), pencil and watercolor on paper (photograph by Alfredo Valeriani). Roma, Museo di Roma, Archivio Iconografico; Copyright Roma Capitale, Sovrintendenza Capitolina ai Beni Culturali.



FIG 7. Maria Barosso, *Demolizione delle case in Via Cremona per gli scavi al Foro di Cesare*, 1932 (1932), pencil and watercolor on paper (photograph by Alfredo Valeriani). Roma, Museo di Roma, Archivio Iconografico; Copyright Roma Capitale, Sovrintendenza Capitolina ai Beni Culturali.



FIG 8. Maria Barosso, *Demolizione di un isolato tra Via della Croce Bianca e Via della Salara Vecchia* (1932). pencil and watercolor on paper (photograph by Alfredo Valeriani). Roma, Museo di Roma, Archivio Iconografico; Copyright Roma Capitale, Sovrintendenza Capitolina ai Beni Culturali.