

FORMS OF MEMORY. ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FOR THE ANCIENT MURVIEDRO IN THE CONTEMPORARY CITY OF SAGUNTO

Valerio Tolve - Politecnico di Milano, DASTU, via Bonardi 3, Milano - Italy
valerio.tolve@polimi.it

Abstract. The relationship between old and new is one of the main theme of contemporary architecture. The comparison between the contemporary city, the ruins of archaeological complexes, the myth of their, is however a controversial theme. It's always destined to find a new balance, since the Modern time, when archaeology was defined as an autonomous discipline with respect to architecture. Since then we suffer for the 'fatal separation' between architecture and archaeology: united by the same desire to question time and shapes, but separated due to the outcomes of their researches. If the first, in its most enlightened expressions, proposes to carry on the deep meaning of crumbling shapes through new logical-syntactic compositions, the second limits itself to "reconstructing the history and art of remote times through the remains of the past, on which it bases a series of reflections, reconstructions, interesting conjectures, highly scientific, but absolutely infertile for life". The most orthodox interpretation of archaeology leads to the conservation as a static form of knowledge, crystallizing the event in the suspended time of a still-image. But when architecture applies in the concrete of a layered site, it should instead lean towards a perspective of renewed knowledge that admits the re-construction as a tool to reach the intelligibility of the underlying potential shape.

In order to the main topic of this conference this contribution aims to show how it's possible today work on the relationship between old and new not only for conservation reasons, rather to add 'something new' that can explain 'something old'. One of our recent project is a paradigm which thinks on the ontological relationship between architecture and archaeology. The goals of the project is understand and renew the urban and landscaping relationships that have historically characterized the image of these sites.

Architecture and Archaeology after the 'fatal separation'. In a conference held in November 2009, Francesco Venezia discussed the 'fatal separation' between architecture and archaeology, related disciplines that, starting from the early 19th c. have taken different paths. Until then, architecture held a sort of primacy in arts and construction, as it was the guardian of drawing. The decline is precisely represented by the gradual affirmation of modernity and the cultural changes it induced, which sanctioned the diaspora of knowledge classically understood – fragmented into sophisticated specialisms entrusted to various disciplines – exacerbating the conceptual and operational divergences even among traditionally related fields of thought and production. For example, in the case of the relationship between architecture and archaeology, it is the recognition of a different sensitivity towards the ancient and its maturation over time-parallel to the definition of antiquarian culture – that leads to a changed

perception of the ruin, primarily aesthetic: the ruin is no longer approached as a potential form to be interpreted and renewed but rather as an autonomous form endowed with its own expressive value. Since then, architecture and archaeology, once united by the same will to interrogate forms, diverge in their instrumental use of drawing – inventive in the first case, objective in the second – and evidently in the outcome of their research. While architecture, in its most enlightened expressions, aims to perpetuate the deep meaning of ruined forms through new logical-syntactical compositions, archaeology limits itself to "reconstructing through the remains of the past the history and art of remote times, overlaying them with reflections, reconstructions, and highly scientific conjectures, but absolutely unfruitful concerning life itself." [6] From this 'original sin' all subsequent disciplinary splits concerning architecture derive: 'restoration' and 'conservation' are just some of the direct offshoots.

Le Corbusier, just over a hundred years ago, tried to reconcile the antinomy between the old and the new by proposing an analogical reading that placed the achievements of the classical world – exemplified through the harmonious form of the Parthenon – on the same level as those of early modernity, embodied by the automobile, which, like the Greek temple, was recognized as a unit of elementary parts composed according to a predetermined syntax, thus exalting the idea of a possible 'new order' not modern because it was situated outside of time.

Especially concerning contemporaneity, the relationship with the ancient often appears insolubly suspended between innovation and conservation, equally necessary acts whose imbalance risks anchoring the terms of the debate towards a sterile dichotomy suspended between the idolatry of the ancient – not very profitable in terms of innovation – or conversely, in the opposite direction of an equally vacuous mystification of the new with the risk of obliterating memory. In this sense, both the practice of pure conservation and uncompromising innovation devoid of historical consciousness and continuity deny the process of sedimentation and modification of forms over time. Dissatisfaction with these approaches has led our research towards alternative experiences and points of view, seeking not only a coexistence between different aesthetics but a real genealogical relationship of derivation and descent that once again places architecture as a point of intersection between knowledge and skills. The reference is to that tradition of thought – strongly rooted in Western architectural culture and particularly in Italy – that still understands the forms of architecture and the city as facts of civilization and fields of study and interpretation. Therefore, our attention has turned to the heritage of research and contributions that, even in contemporary times, have pursued the enhancement of historical buildings as cities and landscapes transform, with the goal of reaffirming a specific operational line founded on the relationship between architecture/city and architecture/landscape (in general, architecture/context), on the theme of typology, and on the issue of built form. Or, returning to the words of Francesco Venezia, it has focused on those good practices that have been able to "evaluate the action of design as almost inherent to the world of stratigraphy of ruins." [6]

The privileged field for testing this research is the areas of fracture in the fabric and the zones of dissolution between the constituent parts of the

city and the landscape, those places where, in the void, all the inconsistencies of the sedimentation of different settlement principles over time, sometimes even alternative to each other, are more evident. In each of these contexts, architecture is called to act not so much in terms of recomposition but rather of revelation, making understandable through the project what would otherwise remain hidden in the syncopated stratification. In this sense, complex and archaeological areas are notable places where this line of research can be experimented with, aiming to investigate the validity of the architectural project on a simultaneous ambivalence of references: on the one hand, with the city and the landscape and their stratification, and on the other, with aspects more closely related to the constitutive identity of their parts.

Regarding the experience carried out in Sagunto, conscious of the impossibility of interpreting the uniqueness of the constituent parts of the ancient Roman city – also due to the obliteration of traces as in the case of the Circus destroyed in the 1960s – we intended to explore the complexity of the entire Roman layout, hidden by the modern fabric, which – besides the Theater already rehabilitated in the Grassi and Portaceli's project (1984-1993) – still survives in sporadic episodes detached from the original unity. Our approach relies more on memory than history: memory is exaltation of recollection without scientific rigor, but founded in history.

Sagunto. Construction of a city. Sagunto represented a key-point for connecting the North and South of the peninsula due to the presence of the port and the connection with maritime routes. Near Sagunto Via Augusta deviated from its route to reach the entrance to the city from the Northeast. In this area, beyond a few silent remains, the current toponymus still preserve the ancient memory of the place. Carrer Pont Romà – just beyond the river – and Plaça Antiga Moreria – in the historic center – tell of the complex system of access to the city: a Roman bridge – of which the ruins of the piers still resist in the riverbed – continued towards the hill, the path of the Via Augusta's branch that, just beyond the river, reached the monumental entrance to the city constituted by a gate – identifiable with the ancient Puerta Ferrisa – and a porticoed street, proposing a solution found in other Roman cities as well.

To those who traveled this stretch, a monumental urban scenography opened up, articulated on several terraces ascending towards the mid-slope Theater and the Forum at the top of the hill. This suggestive urban landscape was also captured by some artists visiting Sagunto: van den Wijngaerde portrayed the view of Murviedro (fig. 1), as did Laborde, who redrew the urban plan (fig. 2a), reporting in detail the remains of the monumental apparatus of the city, including the now-vanished Circus, whose construction would alter this system of access to the city.

The city scene and the monumental apparatus. The Circus occupied the space between Calle de Los Huertos and Avenida de Los Santos de Piedra. Until the mid-1970s, it was almost entirely preserved, as reported in the *Guía de los monumentos romanos y del Castillo de Sagunto*. Then, the necessary protection ceased and the entire area was converted into building land and saturated, erasing almost every trace of the Roman monument. However, it is possible to hypothesize a reconstruction based on

the work of Bru i Vidal and his detailed descriptions, confirmed by recent excavations. The construction of the Circus can be dated to around the mid-IInd c. BC on an area outside the city, probably used for burials. Its placement radically altered the system of access to the city from the Northwest, defined in the Republican era, as it interrupted the continuity of the Via Augusta's branch, which may have already been in a state of abandonment.

The study of aerial views from the 1930s (fig. 2b) and the detailed analysis of recent archaeological findings in Plaça Antiga Moreria have raised the hypothesis of the presence of an Amphitheater near the Circus. This complex is mentioned in the *Disertación sobre el Teatro y Circo de Sagunto* by E. Palos Y Navarro (1793) but finds no confirmation in the texts published by Chabret at the end of the 19th c.: this suggests that it was already lost. Taking as a reference the urban plan of Murviedro by Laborde, it's possible to hypothesize the location of the Amphitheater in the orchards just behind the curve of the Circus: however, Laborde's meticulous plan doesn't report any reference to the presence of an Amphitheater in this area: if these hypotheses were confirmed by evidence of traces, the set of public entertainment buildings in this part of the city would be completed.

The Theater is located halfway up the hill that descends from the Castle to the plain where the town of Sagunto is located, dominated by its mass. Archaeological studies place its construction just after the completion of the Forum, supporting the hypothesis of a complex designed as a unit to redesign the urban scene of the city. Its construction combines the idea of the Greek Theater, with the seating area resting on the slope, with the Roman Theater type, which presents the scenafrente raised to close off and exclude the view from inside to outside. This solution, while simplifying the construction of the seating, required the building of the stage body on an imposing terrace to overcome the slope below the complex. The appearance of the Theater until the early 1970s was that of a romantic ruin, although already in the early 1950s, the Theater's Museum was built against the eastern walls, contributing to concealing some portions of the ruins. Also, part of the scenafrente was hidden by a structure far from ephemeral, built in the early 1970s as support for theatrical activities, with no morphological or dimensional coherence with the Roman structure. A lot of restoration campaigns have been carried out continuously since the 1930s; however, they were poorly documented and followed mimetic criteria – in line with the trends of the time – that emphasized the picturesque character of the structures. A. Almagro Gorbea, tasked with continuing the consolidation and restoration operations in 1976, reported the impossibility of distinguishing the original parts from those already restored, precisely because of the gaps in documentation and the use of ancient materials and techniques. Before his photogrammetric survey conducted between 1977 and 1978, knowledge of the Theater was based on numerous textual descriptions – which, although contemporary, often contradicted each other – and the drawings by Laborde and Chabret, which, although precise, lacked scientific rigor. After the rehabilitation intervention by Grassi and Portaceli, the Theater has returned to express its role as an organizing element in the urban landscape of Sagunto, directing the view and the ascent path towards the hill.

The hill that marks the southern boundary of Sagunto is dominated by the Castle, a defensive complex composed of eight walled enclosures that extend along an East-West axis for about 800 meters. The layout has undergone several modifications over the centuries, primarily because its defensive vocation often led to the demolition of buildings and the reuse of materials to meet new needs. The discovery of remains from the Iberian and Roman periods on the western and southern slopes suggests that the limits of the fortress, as redrawn in the Islamic era, have little to do with the previous ones. The first settlement was the Iberian one, traces of which remain on the southern and western slopes of the hill. The Republican-era urbanization involved a significant expansion of the built areas, including the Northeast sector. The hill was topped by two enclosures: one to the west, where the oppidum would have been concentrated, and one to the east with the first official Roman-type buildings. Between the Punic Wars, the ancient oppidum improved its defenses, and a further enclosure was built east of the first. The II Punic War also favored the expansion of the city's perimeter with the construction of another sector in the current Plaça de Armas, perhaps the most interesting enclosure of the Castle, both for its history and the quantity of Roman-era remains found here. This area is the site of the Republican Forum, whose construction began after the victory in the II Punic War, when the city gained importance as a symbol of resistance against Carthage. To create the Forum, it was necessary to lower the entire area, demolishing some pre-existing Islamic-era buildings: this allowed the configuration of an open central space – respecting Vitruvius' proportion – surrounded by a porch on four sides. During the Middle Ages, the Roman-era buildings were demolished to their foundations; however, the analysis of these structures allows a plausible reconstruction of the original dimensions of the complex and the layout of the buildings. On the eastern side, a series of quadrangular rooms opened: the tabernae, spaces dedicated to commercial activities. Only the foundations of four of these rooms remain; however, it is plausible that these continued along the entire length of the square, interrupted only to allow passage from the Forum to the current Plaça de Almenara. The southern side was closed by a rectangular cistern: the presence of large water tank often denotes the nerve centers of the Roman city and confirms the importance of this enclosure in the urban layout. The most imposing building that faced the open central space of the Forum was certainly the Basilica, which delimited its western edge. This was the seat of the stock exchange and the court and served as a public meeting place for citizens. Today, only the foundations of this complex are appreciable, from which we can deduce the typical layout. On the northern side of the square, the portico – set on a raised base about a meter high – was interrupted in the middle by a building, whose importance is emphasized by its central position relative to the Forum's plan. It was probably a temple predating the construction of the Forum, later included in the new complex. In the northeastern corner was another building, also raised on a base, internally divided into two rooms, accessed via a staircase leading to a sort of pronaos. It is likely that the entire Forum system was designed simultaneously but that some buildings, like the Basilica, were built later.

Forma Urbis Sagunti. Sagunto is the result of a complex stratification of different historical epochs overlapped without interruption and sometimes

alternately, one compared to the other, and so dense as to make it difficult to distinguish the few remains. Paradoxically, even in the Theater, where the construction is contemporary and has not undergone overwriting except in modern times, the rehabilitation project by Grassi and Portaceli clashed with the inconsistency between the remains of the original Roman layout and the most recent modern restoration works, carried out with excessively mimetic techniques and materials.

In our research, the Roman layer was isolated and studied both in its singularity and in its relationship with previous and subsequent urban transformations: in this sense, the premise of the project's was the reconstruction of the Forma Urbis Sagunti (fig. 3) between the Republican and Imperial eras. Through the study of this complex and incomplete system it was possible to identify the formal determinants of the territorial and urban structure, the permanences – the Forum-Castle hill, the Theater, the Rio Palancia, the Via Augusta, and its branch – and the elements missing or incomplete today, to recompose the majestic scenography capable of qualifying the city's image and guiding the view and the path as one proceeds from outside to inside up to the hill to reactivate a visiting route and start a real large-scale enhancement process capable of combining the complex relationships between the monument and the ordinary fabric.

The first intervention concerns the access to the city from the Northeast along Carrer Pont Romà and beyond the Rio Palancia, at the site of the ancient Roman bridge, marked only by the presence of four incomplete piers. This was the 'pronaos' of access to the city before the system of porticoed street discovered under Plaça Antiga Moreria; from here, it was possible to perceive and admire the Forum-Castle hill as a whole and the imposing composition of public buildings rendered in the juxtaposition between the Forum and the Theater. The second area is directly located within the Forum's area, the administrative and religious center of the Roman city.

In the different contexts of this proposal, our research has been conducted through the project in a continuous interplay between different scales: from the urban scale – in wanting to rewrite the relationships between parts, including those today most unusual – to that of the individual artifact – solving local situations within the Forum or near the access on the Rio Palancia – up to the detail scale – in defining the way in which new volumes emerge to reaffirm their being a monument and thus their otherness compared to the fabric, today as in the past.

The Archaeological Promenade. The proposal for an Archaeological Promenade (fig. 4) is configured as a sequence of diffuse and articulated places within the consolidated body of the city, also reconnecting ancient relationships between different areas and parts that were once connected and today are fatally separated.

The route begins to the northeast in Carrer Pont Romà, just outside the urban center naturally bounded by the Rio Palancia, and ends on the hill of the Forum-Castle, crossing a portion of the modern city, today entirely without continuity until the edge of the slope. The intention is to restore formal autonomy to the scattered and decontextualized fragments to recompose the memory of the imposing urban scenography that was offered from the monumental Northeast access: "In Sagunto, the hill is the city of

a palace; the city is a sequence that unfolds from the base of the hill to the top, passing from the Theater to the Castle,” says Manuel Portaceli Roig.

Beyond the specific programmatic contingencies, the project becomes an opportunity to recognize the Forma Urbis Sagunti and enhance the notable elements of the Roman city – the Bridge and the Via Augusta’s branch; the Circus and the presumed Amphitheater; the Forum and the Castle – and to reaffirm on the urban scene the dialectical relationship between public building and ordinary fabric in terms analogous to what happened in antiquity. The approach to the theme, however, cannot disregard a dimension of thought that considers the necessity of concretely reconnecting the past time of the ruin with the present time of its possible use, also in relation to some of the Sustainable Development Goals identified by the UN Agenda 2030. The intent is theoretical when it aims to affirm the terms of a working method of a particular discipline as well as practical, proposing a possible formal and programmatic definition consistent with the premises.

The new Bridge as a ‘Monumental’ Gate. By its ontological nature, the ‘inhabited bridge’ combines the act of crossing with the possibility of accommodating other functions of various kinds. In this sense, in our proposal, the suggestion of a new ‘inhabited bridge’ can, therefore, reasonably constitute both a physical connection between different and divided portions of the same urban fabric as well as a ‘metaphorical’ connection between the contemporary city and the ancient one. The opportunity to establish communication also conceals the opportunity to bring to the surface the idea that supported an urban and territorial design, now lost, with the construction of the Circus and the demolition of the Bridge but which has inevitably continued to influence the very form of the city, as it is indelibly imprinted on the urban plan. The new Bridge manages to justify and substantiate all the monumental constructions that dot the hill of the Castle and its slopes, putting them back in the right scale compared to the ordinary fabric.

The ruins of the Roman bridge are taken as the formal and dimensional matrix of the new structure, determining the position and rhythm of the new supports for the newly constructed deck. Furthermore, the plan at the city’s level – designed to ensure the proper physical continuity for pedestrians and cyclists between the opposite banks – is also conceived in relation to the very presence of the ruins, allowing them to be viewed from above, even though the new volume overlaps exactly with the site of the ancient Roman bridge.

Reinserted into the urban syntax, this element is visually continuous with the ruins of the Circus, the funeral monument of the Gens Sergia, the Theater, the Hill, and the Forum-Castle. The importance of this visual axis is emphasized by the placement of a privileged observation point: the southern elevation is characterized by a large loggia that directs the observer’s gaze precisely towards the hill. However, the new bridge is a very introverted construction, open towards the outside only in relation to the city.

There are three distinct but related levels of movement, although its height is always within the height of the surrounding buildings: it distinguishes and qualifies itself for being an urban infrastructure rather than for its bulk.

The new volume, although appearing monolithic, is characterized by a

high degree of fragmentation, expressed to the fullest in the city-level plan conceived for autonomous nuclei and in the large cleft that characterizes the upper volume. This cleft is made at the three central piers to chip away at the formal perfection of the artefact and accentuate the presence of the ruins. Towards the Rio, the Bridge shows a split-face cladding of the walls and abstract surfaces. Inside – at the ends and in correspondence with the large central void – the ‘unfinished’ form of the architecture is balanced by the use of a polished stone slab cladding.

In the two volumes generated by the cleft, an exhibition space is located, where the model of Roman Sagunto, along with other artifacts, is presented; a center for archaeologists equipped with a stepped conference room, a double-height library, four classrooms, and a small patio.

While the upper levels’ public opening is connected to the activities carried out there, the city-level plan remains always accessible and hosts various functions mainly concentrated on the northern front, typologically configuring itself as a fragment of a porticoed street, recovering the memory of the ancient monumental access. The ruins-level plan at the river’s height is conceived as an Urban Park: this level is accessible from the street by long and contained ramps that simulate slow progress in coherence with the dimension of otium generally associated with park use.

The new Forum. The intervention in the Forum focuses on the necessary signs to bring out the open and bounded central space of the Roman Forum. This system is evoked through the (re-)construction of partitions that propose the original layout without ever directly affecting the ruin. Each structure is, in fact, supported by stone curbs founded superficially in the soil only where the ruin is no longer present and cannot, therefore, constitute a prejudice to the underlying archaeological substrate, with the aim of a completely reversible and temporary intervention.

The same constructive philosophy is pursued in every area of the project, even in the Temple, the only intervention that – facing directly outward from the Forum’s site – aims to restore a logical and plausible volumetry of the previous building based on a proportional study returned through the measurement of the site. This choice is directed at the will to restore the memory of the Forum’s monumental front and the hill towards the city.

The new Temple is articulated on three successive levels, starting from a slightly elevated level compared to the Forum – like in Grassi and Portaceli project (not realized) – considering the threshold space as an initiatory moment of mediation between the outside and inside. This level aims to evoke the Temple type according to the reconstructions provided by archaeological studies: the tetrastyle pronaos is recalled by the relocation of the two remaining column bases and the construction of two lateral vertical walls; the cella is instead described by an enclosed environment whose cover rises slightly above the perimeter partitions, cut only by a horizontal slit on three sides that allows the view outwards. The intermediate level houses an exhibition space from which it is possible to observe the ruins from above; the top floor is located right at the foundation structures’ level.

The remaining sides of the Forum are redefined locally to underline the Forum’s enclosed and confined space condition. To the west, the (re-) construction of the Basilica wall is proposed, while to the east, the (re-)

construction of the tabernae front is carried out. The southern side, originally delimited by a large cistern extending also to the underground level, the only trace still surviving today, is closed by a new volume in which a perspective relief is inserted, literally staging the reconstruction of the Forum's porticoed front. This is realized using the technique of perspective relief, working with slight and progressive subtractions from material from a massive stone block wall: in this way, it was possible to recreate the perception of a portion of the portico (about 18 meters) in a reduced thickness. This artifice contributes to providing a full understanding of the Roman Forum and the aspect it must have had around the 1st century BC.

The portico around the Forum is also described through the pavement that proposes the rhythm of the colonnade with slight variations in level and colour in correspondence with the columns.

Excavations carried out in Plaça de Armas between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries resulted in some areas being at a level nearly 4 meters lower than the site's average level. These areas refer to Iberian stratification since the Roman Forum was built on the foundations of previous buildings. It seemed appropriate to preserve this diversity without, however, renouncing to uniform the Forum's level. At the portico's location, walkable covers have been placed in continuity with the rest of the parterre's design, while for the square, the solution involves a non-walkable cover treated on top with stabilized earth. In this way, it was possible to highlight the stratigraphic succession of the Forum area and create a suitable environment for exhibiting Iberian-era remains.

Part of the project is located in the overlying Plaça de Almenara, which is already the subject of Grassi and Portaceli's proposal. Even in our proposal, it is considered necessary to confirm the hypothesis of intervention along the path of the Arab walls with the intent to gain a privileged viewpoint on the Forum, to appreciate and understand its space.

The right construction. The complex of these interventions, despite the heterogeneity of themes and specific physical application contexts in which they were developed, represents, if not a theory, at least a plausible contemporary trend in the architecture project that, starting from the recognition of a specific operational tradition of intervention on heritage, moves towards a renewed form of synthetic elaboration of knowledge capable of reestablishing the role and meaning of architecture within the complex process of project elaboration, from the ideation phase to realization, which today necessarily cannot disregard multidisciplinary. Beyond the intrinsic quality of the individual proposals, these hypotheses are an example of a process to refer to in reaffirming a central role for the architecture project into the wide panorama of knowledge. In relation to the multidisciplinary dimension of the project, a significant part of these projects has been applied to studying the most appropriate construction technologies in relation to the different areas, both to limit the risk of intersection with the archaeological site and to try to translate into concrete form the idea of reaffirming the volumetric presence of the monuments within the fabric, evoking their ancient form in the scene of the contemporary city.

References.

1. Aa. Vv., *Guía de los monumentos romanos y del Castillo de Sagunto* (Valencia, Spain 1989).
2. C. Aranegui Gasco, *Saguntum*, in *Ciudades Romanas Valencianas* (Alicante, Spain: MARQ, 2013).
3. M. Marzo, *Archeologia, Città, Turismo. Un possibile ruolo per il progetto di architettura*, in L. Coccia (a cura di), *Architettura e turismo*, (Milano, 2012).
4. J. M. Melchor, *Dos siglos de destrucción de patrimonio histórico de Sagunto*, in *ARSE*, 2007.
5. V. Tolve, 'L'unione fatale'. Il nuovo Museo Romano di Atene, in *VIII Forum ProArch. Il progetto di architettura come intersezione di saperi. Per una nozione rinnovata di patrimonio*, edit by A. Calderoni, B. Di Palma, A. Nitti, G. Oliva, 686-691 (Napoli, 2019).
6. F. Venezia, *Che cos'è l'architettura. Lezioni, conferenze, un intervento* (Electa, Milano, 2011).

Figures.

FIGURE 1 - View of Murviedro (A. van den Wijngaerde, 1563)

FIGURE 2 - Planta de Murviedro (A. Laborde, 1811) compared with an aerial view (1937)

FIGURE 3 - Forma Urbis Sagunti and the Archaeological Promenade (part of the research work by B. Barile, A. Bertasini, L. d'Onofrio under the supervision of prof. V. Tolve and dott. E. Hernández Hervás, 2018)

FIGURE 4 - The Archaeological Promenade (part of the research work by B. Barile, A. Bertasini, L. d'Onofrio under the supervision of prof. V. Tolve and dott. E. Hernández Hervás, 2018)

FIGURE 5 - The new Forum (part of the research work by B. Barile, A. Bertasini, L. d'Onofrio under the supervision of prof. V. Tolve and dott. E. Hernández Hervás, 2018)

