SPACES OF THE ARCHAEOLOGY.
CONTEMPORARY CONCEPTS AND INTERPRETATIONS*

Oana Diaconescu**

Keywords: charter of archaeological risk, urban archaeology, collective memory.

Abstract. Archaeological sites are an origin of successive changes among city's areas and values that led to the evolution of urban composition. The city, as a place of condensation, is the only medium in which the architect, the archaeologist and the urban planner meet. By explaining the term "urban archaeology" there will present the connection between the archaeological excavations and the expense of the aesthetic "envelope" of the contemporary city, following the normative previsions of the charts.

Rezumat. Siturile arheologice sunt originea schimbărilor succesive din cadrul urban și valori care au condus la evoluția compoziției acestuia. Orașul, ca loc de condensare, este singurul mediu în care arhitectul, arheologul și urbanistul se pot întâlni. Explicând termenul de „arheologie urbană" se vor prezenta relațiile dintre săpătura arheologică și "anvelopanta" estetică a metropolei contemporane, urmărindu-se prevederile normative ale cartelor.

"The first journey along the Via Tiburtina […] is a chaotic experience. The car inches along at junctions and traffic lights, the dust swirls in the wind and the distant views are blurred. There are numbers of connections […] nodes that clearly serve a purpose both as generators of movement on the Via Tiburtina, and as diverters of traffic from parts of the road".[1] Thus begins Kristina Hellerström her work on the Via Tiburtina. The text presents the difficulties of understanding urban archaeology, due to flows that constrain and condition the individual perception of urban landscape, through loss of his orientation sense. Problems are often encountered in historical zones, where the city communicates with its visitors.

If monuments, generally, are put in danger of abandonment, archaeological sites are more vulnerable, due to their condition as invoking "traces" and lack of understanding of their function in the urban ambiance. A sum of generalized issues should be applied to solve the problem, based on the specific example of Rome, the "archaeological city", with two levels of reading: one on "archaeology in the city" and another as "archaeology of the city".[2] In the first case it identifies a report based on the meaning of ruins in the city, in the second, archaeology is considered as a hidden layer, illegible, the initial support found under the contemporary architecture. Archaeological sites are an origin of successive changes among city's areas and values that led to the evolution of urban composition. Various processes are defined as: new functions that guarantee the protection, active musealization and visiting the preexistences, with the contiguous environment, conservation and protection programs, not because of monumental or age values, but the representation of local identity.

Urban archaeology versus archaeology in the city

Urban archaeology[3] refers to the overall archaeological research, through which the city is seen as a conglomerate and every archaeological excavation is a starting point in its recomposed history. The phrase "archaeology in the city" refers to operations and interventions circumscribed to thematic issues and specific places. In the context of new developments, when urban extends to the whole contiguous territory area by grasping tentacles such as infrastructures, research on the archaeology acquires new dimensions.

---

1. Hellerström 2009, p. 95-96.
2. Zanker 1993, p. 25. The discovery of the 18th century of Pompeii represented the moment when "urban archaeology" was defined.
3. Council of Europe 1999, p. 13-14. The report presents the situation of the urban archaeological research in European countries, from limes interest to current forms of preservation.

Archaeology in the city should not be regarded as a specialized discipline in data gathering, but as a research method that calls into question the urban area and its history. By this development and the continued enhancement of the suburbs, the number of archaeological discoveries generally increases. Most times the lack of studies to certify preexistences lead to direct confrontation with the recovery projects of new sites, respectively with their report to adjacent zone. This problem arises from how the direct presence of the remains (sub)ordinate the city. Completely isolated places, enclosed in wire netting away from the invasive gaze of the inhabitants, these urban holes tend not to link isolated parts of a context, but to be seen as an intrusion into a well individualized nucleus, creating what is called "archaeological territory".[4] In formulating the new premises of giving their function back, it can be considered that the site represents the base of stratigraphic composition, which is always highlighted the "active" historical and cultural value and not just its monumental importance. Starting from the principle of permanent use, it will be presented new ways of managing the urban project, in an integrative view, generated by society need to understand contemporary interference.

Differences between involved professionals and interested institutions lead to separation of conservation process from urban re-qualification. The situation occurs since 1980, when Franco Minissi developed a series of regulations, reassumed in the research of Professor Lucio Carbonara.[5] Each specialist treats the ruins from an angle, which generates two perpetual problems: lack of interventionist actions and the permanently damage of the monument and the insufficient collective knowledge of the site, in relation to the context to which it belongs. Most interventions deny the complex value to facilitate the property transformation, while the conservative process is regarded beyond the adjacent environment of excavation. Dialectical relationship with the changes of the city is often considered as a limitation in understanding and correct interpretation of preexistences. In order to find the basic relations with the context, the "compatible changes" of the process will be presented, knowing that every remnant formally conditioned the city.[6] After the Valletta Convention of Malta in January 1992, it was concluded that the excavation can be replaced by other non-destructive means.[7] Problems due to the *in situ* conservation leave exposed few newly discovered areas. The city, as a place of condensation, is the only medium in which the architect, the archaeologist and the urban planner meet. Design subjects induce physical and functional transformations of the city space, the fundamental difference between the two of them being the scale. Archaeology, on the other hand, operates by digging, thus of reflective contribution to changes in territory.

Systematization of the archaeological site often completes, after the implementation of the excavation campaign, without taking into account the immediate urban transformations. Daniele Manacorda explains these new concerns in contemporary archaeological practice.[8] Excavation is a stratigraphic "disassembly", a destruction of previously generated order, by each intervention will be published, exhibited, exercising from the start a clear cultural position. Practice shows that long time and lack of funds tend to accelerate the end of excavation work. Of the three types of research that determine by intuitive recognition of the potential

---

[4]   Fazzio 2005, p. 15-25.
[5]   Carbonara 1992. Carbonara studies the physic-geographical organization of the territory, deepening methods and analyses of complex planning.
[6]   Fazzio 2005, p. 14.
[7]   In the third article of the convention it is stipulated that instead of "controlled destructions" it is preferred the applying of new research methods and inventory of archeological patrimony.
[8]   Manacorda 2001, p. 88.

archaeological preexistences: systematic[9], preventive[10] and rescue[11], only the preventive once are strictly connected to the necessity of transformation. This type of analysis does not describe the entire site (generally the entire stratification is not known), but can provide a broad framework in urban planning. The found vestiges can be valued in order to transmit new information, adapting the area to the dynamics of the city. Rescuing interventions generally occur in the absence of the other two types of research and involve a decision for the recovery and safeguard of the site, through high adaptability initiatives.[12] Sites in peripheral and destructured areas can help to generate the congruence of space, characterized by a greater capacity for uptake of interventions. Otherwise, the ruins absorb and change the whole context, becoming, by a relationship of alienation, a conflict urban zone in which the structured city face the archaeological gap.[13] In the Anglo-Saxon countries, after 1950, the new archaeological sites were part of the urban re-qualification, relying on theoretical and methodological pecuniary development. In Romania, where ancient nucleus underwent a series of historical trauma, the progressive tissue changes hardly noticed. Regardless of the context where they constituted and the urban theory on which were based, it was always sought to generate an archetype of planimetric continuity[14].

Archaeology and memory

In the current mentality ruins are a closed, bounded and physically separated space from the rest of the city. Archaeologist Daniel Manacorda proclaims the difficulty for studies to arrive to the public and invokes their necessity to defining the culture.[15] The destructured aspect of archaeological excavations at the expense of the aesthetic "envelope" of the contemporary city often generates community protest.[16] The way in which ruins are being approached differentiates the social memory of the collective one.[17] Often the remains are analyzed as part of a collective memory, being characterized by an amount of trace defined as the identity of the whole society in which every element is delimitated and protected. Archaeology will develop an urban research position to the punctually found remains by a methodical knowledge outlining a series of necessary traces of the narrative construction. Social memory consists of "deposits" of marks available to a singular community, in particular circumstances, without forming a common heritage. It addresses a unique society, a "privileged" class, which may access the archaeological area. Depending on the type of memory that is allocated, it can cause two types of areas: areas of congestion (subject of cultural policies) and areas of abandonment (urban goals that don't belong to the collective perception); the lack of a relationship with the context makes the site generally inaccessible.[18]

---

[9]   Cathedral San Lorenzo, Genoa, excavations were made to strengthen the Madonna statue "Regina di Genova", revealing beneath the altar a ritual stone of the Roman period *(in Designing Archaeology 2011)*.

[10]   At Monastery Sant' Agostino, Genoa there had been interventions to systematize the museum market. Work continued on the patio, where at the based of the cloister were found Roman foundations. The archaeological remains were annexed to the museum trail (in *Designing Archaeology 2011*).

[11]   In Piazza Matteotti, (Genoa) begins the works on changing the water pipes. Excavations lead to the discovery of five rooms building from the second century AD used in Roman times until the fourth century AD. They found two pieces of marble, one dedicated to the cult of goddess Fortuna Redux, introduced by Augustus in 19 AD and one of Philip the Arab 244-249 AD (in *Designing Archaeology 2011*).

[12]   Among the methods there are: documenting the destruction, treatment, removal or preservation *in situ*.

[13]   Fazzio 2005, p. 33.

[14]   Despite the evidence of historic instability, the urban planimetrics present a model of morphological continuity between the historical and current texture, up to their total overlay.

[15]   Manacorda 2007. The archeologist debates in his work the relation between archaeology, architecture and public.

[16]   De Darwin 2009, p. 24. In 1991 in Vienna Michaelerplatz, architect Hans Hollein is adding the ruins of the Roman *castrum Vindobona* in the urban and includes them to a museum trail, visible from the street area.

[17]   Fazzio 2005, p. 44. Social use value refers to how people accept the changes of the space and how property can be conserved.

[18]   Fazzio 2005, p. 88.

Archaeology and urban planning

As for the historical assets, reuse is one of the important actions of rescuing, the conservation process for the archaeological sites often involve the withdrawal of the preexistence from urban dynamics. It will be presented some examples of interventions based on "the chart of archeological risk" and "cultural code". These documents are designed to regulate the implementation of a project, in the presence of archaeological deposits. Urban archaeology study is based on the elaboration of charts. The definition of the term according of its role and to the distance from it to the nowadays metropolis, results in shaping the analyzed fields. It can be described medieval archaeology, industrial, seeking an archaeological method rather than an object analysis. The historical presences are those that can, in their consolidated form to contribute to urban dynamics, to the changes due to the maintenance of the basic functions and prosperity.[19] Andrea Carandini appreciates as useful the conservation of a patrimony heritage only if it is used by people and culture.[20] Often it is considered that the lack of re-using of the monument and its "sparing" from urban changing are the only ways to protect it. The principles connected to preservation refer almost all European legislation to museums and archaeological parks, not to archaeological areas. Today specialists search for elements that, without undergoing traumatic change, can be used for the same purpose for which they were created initially, such as theaters or auditoriums. It is considered incompatible those uses that isolate physically the monument from its context: practices that alter and affect the heritage conservation[21], its physical or cultural parts by inappropriate destination; destruction or formal modification of original image; excessive and uncontrolled using quantity in intensive visited areas; applying foreign symbols or elements in commercial purpose, action that denies the motivational value of the monument; achieve insertions to become an inappropriate precedent; altering the environment, functions, size, color, respectively shape of the complex.[22]

Charts appear as a legislative background, where normative provisions are missing. They send instructions on urban management instruments to sites with a minimum probability of finding the preexistences. In her reflection on urban archaeology, Andreina Ricci considers necessary the "coexistence" of the vestige and new interventions.[23] Perspective would provide a double advantage: the first would find economic instruments for conservation and valorization, the other, an important element of interest. By lack of flexibility (generated by ideas of total saving), there are advantaged illegal despoiler and abusive builders. In such cases, the archaeological material is considered to be either "uncertain", because it does not compromise the progress of transformations, or "untouchable", thereby avoiding urban dynamics and becoming isolated. A third form, lately emerged, incites to see archaeology as the object of future changes in order to re-qualify the city and territory. The end of a conservation purpose is considered important only when this act gives a "public use of history".[24] Andreina Ricci considers that the simple gesture of regarding the ruins, involves a series of changes.[25] The monument, as condensation place, offers marks and enriches culturally, redrawing the city and its paths. Three principles are identified by Daniele Manacorda to legitimate the direct connection between project, town and ruins.[26] The first presents the archaeological knowledge as an origin for future changes. Urban operations can be determined based on consistent and systematic preliminary definition of

---

[19] Mannoni 1994, p. 39. Tiziano Mannoni expressed the presented aspects „The cultural use does not maintain archaeological remains, but it normally accelerates degradation, compared to buried or controlled archiving form; an old house instead survives rather [...] if it is used as a house than musealized." [our translation].

[20] Carandini 2006, p. 53. Having Colosseum as example he asks: "would be better to know it buried, without seeing it, but perfectly preserved or would we prefer that the Colosseum, a bit ruined of time, consumed by wear, cracked by earthquakes, continues to influence the Western culture?" [our translation].

[21] Case of *Piazza d'Oro*, Villa Hadriana, Tivoli. It was used as camping and recreation area for a long time. In this way the north temple and the remains of central portico were completely destroyed.

[22] Fazzio 2005, p. 68.

[23] Ricci 1999, p. 97-127.

[24] *Idem*, p. 74.

[25] Manacorda 2007, p. 77, quot. 8.

[26] Fazzio 2005, p. 77, quot. 10.

areas inside the project. A second criterion examines the interpretation of archaeological values and identifies opportunities of transformation of the ruins and urban context. This induces an unconditional freedom of design, taking into account the two parameters - the archaeology and the city and seeking more adaptable solutions. The third issue identifies the role of plan in the construction of provided interventions, without compromise or subsequent changes.[27]

The relationship between archaeology and the city covers aspects such as: region connection, build dynamics, continuity of life area, perceived by the difference between abandoned historical centers, where archaeological research is isolated and centers fundament on ancient street network, based on the overlapping of urban levels, the first two inducing sometimes conflicting situations in the intervention policy.[28] Locating remains to urban context, in the central areas, where there extend beyond the contemporary area will cause a division between revealed elements and buried ones, under the current level of buildings. Those found in peripheral areas, where the city has expanded over time and come to incorporate them stand under the sign of transformation.

Reading remains with respect to the conservation, conditions directly the plan regulation.[29] It is considered that preexistence may be more or less legible, configured or represented by the preserved traces. Typological setting is determined from archaeological knowledge, understanding the degree of transformability of the structure, depending on the unique or accessibility characteristics of the item. Further possibilities of use of the remaining generate functional stratification results from the initial to the present, referring to the territorial scale, urban and not just single object. In the case of musealization terms of accessibility, visibility and legal are important for the monument life offering a way of objective knowledge and appropriation of the given archaeological, the classification into four categories of remains: accessible, limited, inaccessible or occult to build.

It isn't a certainty that the isolation of the rest of the archaeological zone, by a fence may lead to better conservation. There may be find compatible uses that generate controlled transformations. Spontaneous changes are made in the absence of a project anyway. Nowadays preservation is conditioned by the compliance of safety strips and distance from each element. Research can be applied only to those forms of archaeology that do not destroy or disturb the surrounding areas and have potential value, generating building re-qualification, center extension, public spaces revitalizing, upgrading of services. Archaeological relationship with the city changed renouncing at boundaries through contextualization, in three types of documents: constraints charts, charts of archaeological risk and charts of archaeological potential. Archaeological charts are a way of representing the following classifications related to the typology of preexistence, dating and degree of preservation. They occur where there is a stratification of knowledge induced by the preservation authority and the planning field. In the Syracuse General Urban Plan it was made a statement of the archaeological areas without any typological classification or distinction between seen and covered remains. The city of Naples functions today after topographic plans, without any particularization. Charts of archaeological risk and potential are the most useful tools for the integration of archaeological knowledge in urban planning. Organized data according to their use for predictions, expresses in degrees of probability to find other archaeological sites and in a division of levels of meaning of information potential. This becomes an important tool for planning through details on the zero risk areas where the absence of the remains is demonstrated.

The first role of the plan is to define the conditions for the location of archaeological areas and also illustrates the valorization proposals derived from the preservation authority's programs. There is a consolidated connection between these areas and the city anticipating into how research can continue, pointing expansions to free remain areas. Also the plan may include areas necessary for the re-qualification of regions interconnected by environmental systems. In Cordoba the knowledge of archaeology started from the undiscovered zones,

---

[27] Baiani, Ghilardi 2000, p. 25-40. The text explains the importance and the use of monuments, in front of urban development in the relation between the observatory and the archeological site.

[28] Fazzio 2005, p. 94-95. The architects identify classes of monuments according to the stipulations of the charts, from the global level of the relation ruin - city, to the isolated characteristics of the site.

[29] Fazzio 2005, p. 88.

new urban areas forming now the negative of the archaeological complexes. These areas have the necessary equipment for the re-using and address to a new category of audience: the visitors, due to their service function.[30]

Archaeology and politics (Rome's case)

Archaeology becomes a political tool, which can support the new doctrine. With the '40s, Mussolini unites the roman forum with the historic city center, through an artery that has become a symbol of fascism, contested by liberal policies, based on the indifference at the ancient values. Mussolini builds Via dei Fori Imperiali demolishing part of the medieval buildings and joining the city. Fascism uses these interventions to emphasize its ideological origin. In the '60s the idea is to destroy this street, considering that, by its alignment and direct way to cross the ancient sites, heritage values would not comply. The conclusion is that archaeology is a political tool, which can support the new doctrine.

Archaeology and context

The need for prevention by limiting imposes a number of rules, depending on the risk zone, so that in unpredictable cases transformations are minimal and with no other determinations. The means of intervention appear after a typological research of the ruins and the percentage of preserved buildings of each class, which contraindicate a series of practices.[31] The metropolitan network implementation in Athens and the unification of archaeological central sites has allowed the urban integration and renewal. The distinction between full conservation and transformation has to be made by reference to the project. In some cases too much importance is given to certain objectives, while others, through legislation, get abandoned, clandestine theft, left damaged by the environment or remain inaccessible. The lack of urban policies applied to protected areas, has a number of repercussions by the impossibility of transformation of these areas. To generate a historical and archaeological continuity system, there should be a framework in which to specify complex possible, proposed or incompatible transformations.

Reconstruction of a building following destruction is not a restoration work but the equivalent of a new intervention. Any operation performed on a body which needs a restorative-conservative project, must take into account of the structural identity of the complex, respectively of the functional actual revitalization.[32] In some specific cases, what can be seen from the original building is a trace of what was in the past, a different substance from the preexistence in size and shape. The image of an abandoned building is the main reason for intervention. These examples are the subject of urban reorganization or new construction processes.

By legislation, restructuring of the building was defined in terms of restoration and renewal.[33] There are many differences in legal conditions between the terms. The building restructuring refers to altering state of each unit volume and to changing of use of its internal parts. All buildings, subject to recovery of preexistence elements are subject to restoration and renewal that may conserve the body and preserve its functionality to typological formal and structural elements, without changing the identity, physiognomy or configuration of the volume or surface. Restructuring interventions refers to "transformation of constructed bodies mediated in a systematic complex of works that can bring it whole or in part different from the previous one".[34] Such processes relate to reuse or replacement of elements of the building, at the removal, modification and insertion

---

[30] Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali 2009. A ‚service area' represents an archaeological or a complex remain, entering in the collective perception of the city, used in relation to contemporary urban activities such as: parks, museums, collections; theaters, amphitheaters, churches on archaeological base, commercial enclosures or residential zones.

[31] André Carbez in *Parliamo di metodo*, asks "*how can we know the Baroque, if we have two ruins of Bernini, Borromini's dome and we know nothing about Neumann*?". *Apud* Fazzio 2005, p. 86, 92. quot. 7

[32] For many of the interventions on the A class monuments in Italy and Spain have filed lawsuits, which are provided after the cessation of work. In some cases favorable decision was obtained from the Regional Administrative Court of Calabria Catanzaro, II, n. 2321/2004. On this occasion they put the legislative basis for reconstruction and reintegration processes.

[33] Regional Administrative Courts Legislation regulated by Emilia Romagna, Parma, sentence n. 703/2003 renewing the conservative principles based on A class monuments in Italy.

[34] Bordini 2010, p. 3. Legal cases like Italy and Spain are described by examples in Bordini's research.

of utilities. Also included are all the works relating to demolition and reconstruction of volumetric preexistence, the only allowed innovations being on seismic normative.[35] The contribution of new techniques and materials transform construction and restoration practice, in a form of overcoming the previously limitations imposed by traditional methods. This post-war "modernization" caused a fracture, often questionable in the restoration. One of the most widely discussed examples due to the use of structural concrete in such a process is the Parthenon. By 1933, Nikolas Balanos interventions have paid tribute to new technologies. Chierici and Giovannoni criticized the operations and considered it an experience where "primitive" techniques have no results and that new ways of implementing work should create a balance by the using of anastylosis reordering all structures that have survived. Fragile metal reinforcing concrete elements tend to imitate Greeks techniques, ensemble playing and feeling the physiological drive to original art. The same effect would have been obtained by using colored limestone and Parthenon's marble. In this way it could eliminate the problem of false and translation of the monument. They did not know the effect of subsequent use of reinforced concrete when the discussions took place. The attempt of Manolis Korres[36] to restore the Parthenon in its original form, based on direct dating of the stone blocks, tarnished the image of the classical temple provided by Balanos. With this intervention are replaced, for the first time, the concrete structures placed before, with Pentelic marble and the metallic junction iron elements with titanium. Just after the restoration process begun it was understood that Balanos intervention brought the monument in danger of collapse. Many similar restorations were made in Italy, with the same disastrous effect on ancient component. The concepts were expressed by Camillo Boito, after the restoration of the Arch of Titus.

From April 24, 1945 architect Piero Gazzola began the discussion with the municipality, about the new project of reconstruction of the two bridges Castelvecchio and Pietra in Verona, destroyed during the war. Various ruskinian type opinions, not interfering with the testimony of traces left by the bombing would increase its value.[37] They tried numerous photographic material and surveys made at each of the previous interventions, starting with Napoleonic to the interwar period.[38] The reconstruction problem has been much debated. The Minister of Public Instruction, Guido Gonella, authorized drafting the executive project.[39] Beyond the scientific issues of restoring it's important to determine the ways in which collective memory can be given through an architectural monument. The Pietra Bridge, from the Roman period, was the oldest bridge in Verona and although suffered a series of partial destruction, preserving ancient construction techniques testimony. Because of its dating, its reconstruction was more laborious and expensive. Gazzola has decided to preserve its medieval image.[40] It was found that any other construction project in that location would compromise the relationship between the monument and its surroundings. Lack of a clear element becomes the value that ultimately determines the need for restitution process.

A different example is that of Sagunto, made by Giorgio Grassi and Manuel Portaceli. Grassi saw the Roman theater, during his first visit on the site, as a great "artificial ruin". Restoration that took place before destroyed much of the historical evidence. The original idea to rebuild the whole image from the ancient theater was a utopia because of the lack of historical knowledge. The traces of unaltered ancient building were

---

[35] Aveta 2005, p. 13. "Not everyone could design or construct by reinforced concrete ... [but] it seemed in good faith that could be enough ... make concrete castings including irons. And there are seen so miserable scene structures basted with even exuberant irons, but placed ... so that almost nothing in their successful resistance to stress; or vice versa […] irons properly installed, but ... of insufficient section, or unrelated to ensure the intimacy of team structure" (our translation). *Apud* A. Manfredini, *Le costruzioni in cemento armato e la loro stabilità,* in Il Cemento, II, n. 4, August 1905, p. 107-109.

[36] Manolis Korres was the restoration's coordinator, until September 2005. He contributed at the redraw of the main parts of the Acropolis temples, using the most innovative techniques for their replacements.

[37] Aveta 2005, p. 113

[38] Magagnato 1964, p. 5. Although the German commander Kesselring had ensured that the bridges won't be reached, in Verona nobody received the last measures proposed by architects Spelta and Degani.

[39] Site reconstruction work began on 15 February 1949 and was inaugurated in 1951.

[40] Aveta 2005, p. 93. („who is responsible for the monumental heritage should take into account that - faced with the loss of a certain complex - you need to set aside reserves and play unaltered conditions that allow the vitality of compromise environment" (our translation). *Apud* P. Gazzola, *Ponte Pietra,* in Ponti Romani, Firenze, 1963, p. 122).

kept, intervening in an innovative way on the entire building. The reconstruction started from the desire to provide the classic image of antique theater. Post-scene was represented by its well-known elements: *regia*, the central door; hospitalia, the side doors, the exterior wall separating the Roman theater and the surrounding landscape is treated by Grassi as a *antiquarium*, canceling the archaeological area. The *proscenium* was rebuilt by anastylosis, while the upper scene area in a mimetic style with the Roman one. Partial reconstruction of the *cavea* is the most visible, because the stairs finish with antique arena area, out of sight. Total height of the building and *velarium* was determined through studies and analogies with other similar Roman theaters. In terms of geometry Sagunto's building is unusual, since its large size. The *cavea* is withdrawn from the scene, the latter advancing to *postscaenium.* Current theater imitates its previous Roman forms narrating the architect's ability to change the history of preexistence.

Situations like Greece and Spain, where important archaeological nucleus are becoming completely annihilated due to urban speculation can be met in the city of Bucharest. Is it a simple matter of real estate property management? Is it a passive hiding of professionals under the excuse of lack of regulations? Bucharest is systematically shattered by abandonment, declassification, respectively archaeological discharge and further illegal demolitions. Lack of cohesion of all specialists involved in saving these goods culminates with the obliteration of local identity. In a subsequent presentation of a series of critical issues that are going to establish the possibility of rescue and conservation of a newly discovered archaeological sites, is counting on the future global urban policy development and the awareness of the serious threats faced by these values.

The importance of the remains in a world of expansion should be understood by analyzing the founding relationship with the context. Such open spaces museums in cities that host works of commemorating value, induce a new integration system, by the permanent and unconditional presence of all those who participate in the dynamics of the environment, causing moments of interaction of contemporary urban ambience with history.

Bibliographical abbreviations:

Aveta 2005 –   C. Aveta, *Piero Gazzola, Restauro dei monumenti e conservazione dei centri storici e del paesaggio*, Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II, 2005.
Bordini 2010 –   M. Bordini, *Cenni sulla nozione di restauro e ristrutturazione edilizia*, PhD at Università di Roma "La Sapienza" and Universedad de Zaragoza, Spagna, 2010.
Carandini 2006 –   A. Carandini, *La leggenda di Roma 1: dalla nascita dei gemelli alla fondazione della città*, Milano, 2006.
Carbonara 1992 –   L. Carbonara, *Le analisi urbanistiche : riferimenti e metodi*, Roma, 1992.
Council of Europe 1999 –   *Report on the situation of urban archaeology in Europe, Strasbourg Cedex,* 1999.
De Darwin 2009 –   P. De Darwin, *Vienna & the Danube Valley,* New Jersey, 2009.
Designing Archaeology 2011 –   International Conference "Premio Piranesi-Grand Prix de Rome", Ara Pacis, Roma, September 2011.
Fazzio 2005 –   F. Fazzio, *Gli spazi dell'archeologia. Temi per il progetto urbanistico*, Roma, 2005.
Hellerström 2009 –   K. Hellerström, *Ways of Experience*, in Bjur, 2009.
Magagnato 1964 –   L. Magagnato, *Il restauro di Castelvecchio a Verona,* Verona, 1964.
Manacorda 2001 –   D. Manacorda, *Dare un senso ai resti del passato*, Archeo 201/2001.
Manacorda 2007 –   D. Manacorda, *Il sito archeologico: fra ricerca e valorizzazione*, Roma, 2007.
Mannoni 1994 –   T. Mannoni, *Archeologia dell'urbanistica*, Istituto di Storia della Cultura Materiale, Genova, 1994.
Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali 2009 –   Carta della Qualità dei Servizi dell'Area Archeologica di Veleia (PC), 2009.
Ricci 1999 –   A. Ricci**,** *Luoghi estremi della città. Il progetto archeologico tra "memoria" e "uso pubblico della storia"*, in *Topos e Progetto. Il topos come meta*, Roma, 1999.
Zanker 1993 –   P. Zanker, *Pompei, Società, immagini urbane e forme dell' abitare,* Torino, 1993.