Magister Gregorius de Mirabilibus Urbis Romae: A New Description of Rome in the Twelfth Century

Author(s): G. McN. Rushforth

Source: *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 9 (1919), pp. 14-58

Published by: [Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/295987>

Accessed: 09/05/2014 13:27

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Roman Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

MAGISTER GREGORIUS DE MIRABILIBUS URBIS ROMAE:
A NEW DESCRIPTION OF ROME IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY.¹

(Plate I)

By G. McN. RUSHFORTH, M.A., F.S.A.

In 1917 Dr. M. R. James, now Provost of Eton College, discovered in a manuscript belonging to St. Catharine's College Cambridge, and printed in the *English Historical Review*, a description by a certain Magister Gregorius of the most remarkable sights or 'wonders' of the city of Rome. The manuscript appears to be English, of the last years of the thirteenth century; and Dr. James thinks that the author was an Englishman, and lived in the twelfth century.² Though this is the only copy of the work that is known, it is not the first that we have heard of it, for it was used in the fourteenth century by Ranulf Higden (d. 1364) in the description of Rome in the first book of his *Polychronicon*.³ We now know that he passed over some of the most curious and interesting of Gregory's statements, so that the discovery of the original is a real addition to our knowledge.

When I say 'a real addition to our knowledge,' I mean to emphasize the characteristics which distinguish it from the various forms of a work with which we should immediately be inclined to compare it—the *Mirabilia*.⁴ As Dr. James says (*E.H.R.* p. 539), the points of contact between the two works are remarkably few; and such as there are can be explained by the use of common material. If Gregory knew of the *Mirabilia* he ignored it.⁵ On more than one occasion, indeed, he contrasts his own information with the idle and frivolous stories current among the pilgrims,⁶ but they are not legends that appear in the *Mirabilia*. His position is one of independence, and his object is different, viz., to describe what he saw

¹ In addition to those whose information on special points is acknowledged in the notes, I must record my general obligation for assistance from Dr. T. Ashby, Mr. W. St. Clair Baddeley, Sir J. E. Sandys, Mrs. Strong, and Prof. H. Stuart Jones. Mr. Baddeley has also kindly presented plate I, which has been taken from his copy of Cock's *Monumenta*.

² *English Historical Review*, xxxii (1917), pp. 531–533, 543. The text is reproduced at the end of the present article.

³ Dr. James prints the extracts from the Rolls Series edition. *E.H.R.* pp. 533–536.

⁴ The *Mirabilia* is sometimes described as a guide book for pilgrims, but Duchesne has pointed out its true character as 'le plus ancien essai de topographie erudite,' though 'cette exégèse savante

est tout ce qu'on peut voir de plus artificiel et de moins réussi.' This interest in antiquity was due to the rise of Roman political independence. Everything points to the *Mirabilia* being the work of Benedictus Canonicus, and written before 1143 when the Commune of Rome was established. Introduction to *Le Liber Censuum de l'Église Romaine*, vol. i (Paris, 1910), pp. 98–104. See also Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages*, English translation (2nd ed.), iv, p. 306.

⁵ The earliest manuscript of the oldest form of the *Mirabilia* (Cod. Vat. 3973) belongs to the end of the twelfth century (Urichs, *Codex Topographicus Urbis Romae*, p. 91). The *Liber Censuum*, to which it forms an appendix, was compiled by Cencius Camerarius (Honorius III) in 1192. Duchesne, *Introduction*, p. 1.

⁶ Sections 4, 27, 29.

NO. I. THE TEMPLE OF MINERVA WITH THE HORREUM CARDINALIUM. ON THE RIGHT THE TOR DE' CONTI IS SEEN BEHIND 'LE COLONNACCE' (p. 30).

NO. 2. VIEW OF THE SAME FROM THE BACK (p. 30).

From H. Cock's *Praecipua aliquot Romanae antiquitatis ruinarum monumenta*, pls. v and x.

from his own observation, supplemented by information given by the best instructed local authorities, among whom he specially mentions the *cardinales et clerici Romane curie* (4, 15). Of course, much of the matter supplied by them was fabulous; for instance the stories told about the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius (4, 5). Other legends, again, may represent popular local tradition, for in one place (4) he distinguishes the story of the 'populus Romanus' from that of the 'peregrini.' On the whole, however, his information seems to have been much more nearly related to the facts than the fanciful or legendary accounts of the *Mirabilia*; and where he goes astray (for instance, in his account of the gates) the fault may be due to his own misunderstanding of, or confusion between, names or facts conveyed to him orally. Apart from the historical compilations which he must have used for some of his accounts (e.g. 22-29), he appears to have carried about with him and copied only one book, and that is the tract *De Septem Miraculis Mundi*, found in manuscripts as early as the tenth century, and formerly printed among the works of Bede.¹ Dr. James has shown (*E.H.R.* p. 537-539) the amount of Gregory's indebtedness to it in the case of the six 'wonders' which he has used. The first of these being the so-called *Salvatio Civium* in the Capitol at Rome, with its story of the images of the conquered provinces and their warning bells, apparently led him to think that three more of the 'wonders' were there also, and I have suggested below that, in some, if not all, of the cases, a corrupt text may have helped towards this result. His own descriptions of objects and buildings are direct and clear so far as they go, and he sometimes adds personal touches which give an air of sincerity and reality to his statements.² One gets the impression that he is telling us, to the best of his ability, what he has seen and heard. But he has many limitations. He has a rather poor sense of locality, according to modern standards of accuracy; for, though he often says that one thing is near to another, he generally mentions buildings without any indication of their situation, and sometimes his memory or his notes may have played him false. Apparently he was incapable of profiting to any great extent by the inscriptions from which he might so often have learned the history and the purpose of the monuments on which they appeared. The columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius tell him nothing of their real origin; and while he (or his informant) has got hold of a wrong explanation of one of them, he can only hope to discover the secret of the other and of similar structures by research on his return to his own country (25). In one case he confesses that he could make little or nothing of an inscription which he describes (33), but here there may have been special difficulties (see p. 29). Yet,

¹ H. Omont, *Les Sept Merveilles du Monde au Moyen Age*. Bibl. de l'École des Chartes, xliii (1882), pp. 43 ff. Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xc, 961 ff.

² I have called attention to most of these as they occur.

only some three centuries earlier, the pilgrim of Einsiedeln was capable of appreciating and of copying inscriptions of importance—a fact which illustrates the gulf separating the ninth century from the twelfth through the loss of tradition and culture which had their roots in the ancient world.¹ On the whole, though Gregory's attainments in learning and literature do not compare favourably with those of the best examples of his age, such as John of Salisbury and Vincent of Beauvais, he seems to have been a fairly well-equipped scholar for his time. His Roman history, indeed, contains a good many fabulous elements,² but in literature he makes a better show. Apparently his favourite author was Lucan, whom he quotes five times; and he seems to have been fairly well acquainted with Virgil, who appears in three quotations and two allusions.³ From Ovid comes one rather hackneyed quotation (19: *Met.* ii, 1: *Regia solis erat*, etc.), and one or two reminiscences.⁴ A couple of allusions suggest that he was acquainted with Horace,⁵ and we have suggested below (p. 35) that the 'Domus Frontoniana' mentioned in 19 is derived directly or indirectly from Juvenal.

Dr. James is inclined to place Gregory in the twelfth century. Let us see what evidence we can gather which may help to ascertain his approximate date. He copies (1) the opening lines of a poem on Rome by Hildebert of Le Mans, which must have been written between his visit to the city in 1106 and 1125 when it was quoted by William of Malmesbury in his *Gesta Regum*, the author being then alive and archbishop of Tours.⁶ As Gregory refers to him as *quidam*, he probably knew of him only indirectly; but, in any case, the inference is that he wrote later than the first quarter of the century. Another allusion carries us, perhaps, a little further. In describing the 'palace of Augustus' he says that its marbles had provided much of the material for building the Roman churches (17: *Hec autem domus tota marmorea pretiosam materiam et copiosam edificandis ecclesiis-*

¹ Cf. Huelsen, *La Pianta di Roma dell' Anonimo Einsidlense* (Atti d. Pontif. Accad. Rom. di Arch. Ser. ii. vol. ix, 1907), pp. 44: 'L'itinerario che per la cronologia sta più vicino all' Einsidlense, l'*Ordo Benedicti Canonici*, fa vedere gli enormi cambiamenti che la città aveva sofferti fra il secolo VIII ed il XII.' This inability to read Roman inscriptions, which seem so plain to us, may be illustrated by the remark of Dr. James in his *Wanderings and Homes of Manuscripts* (London, 1919; p. 31) that 'MSS. written in capitals or uncials . . . were uniformly despised and neglected by the readers of later centuries' as being useless and illegible.

² E.g. the sections about Fabricius (25), and Scipio Africanus and Hannibal (26). 'Marius Suetonius' (29) may be due to confusion with his continuator, Marius Maximus, whose name would be known from the references in the *Historia Augusta*.

³ The allusions are: *urbis opus* in 15 from *Aen.* v, 119; and *moritura pallescit* (of Cleopatra) in 22,

which seems to be derived from *pallentem morte futura* of *Aen.* viii, 709. See below, p. 40, n. 1.

⁴ *Iudicio nostro vincit utramque Venus* in 12 is evidently derived from *Ars Amat.* i, 248 (of Paris): *cum dixit Veneri 'vincis utramque Venus.'* The comparison of the bronze bull of the Castle of Crescentius to the group of Europa and the bull (3) is perhaps an allusion to the description in *Met.* ii, 851 sqq.: *mugit et in teneris formosus inambulat herbis*. Compare the words of Gregory: *mugituro et moturo similis*.

⁵ In the description of the reliefs on the Arch of Augustus (22) *bella detestanda* seems to be derived from *bellaque matribus detestata* of 1 *Carm.* i, 24; while *superba mulier* (Cleopatra) may well be a reminiscence of Horace's *superbo non humilis mulier triumpho*, the concluding words of the ode (I, xxxvii) on the victory of Actium, which, as we have pointed out elsewhere (p. 40, n. 1), lays stress on just the same episodes as those mentioned by Gregory.

⁶ *Gesta Regum*, iv, 351 (Rolls Series, ii, p. 403).

que Rome sunt prebuit). This seems to refer to the reconstructions and restorations of churches which marked the period following the devastation of 1084, when Rome was taken by the Normans, and of which San Clemente in its present form, dating from about 1125, is a conspicuous example.¹ Later in the century come the restorations of S. Maria in Trastevere under Innocent II (1130-43), S. Maria Nova (c. 1161), and other churches. When Gregory says (15) that he was told by the cardinals that each of the great columns in the Baths of Diocletian would take a hundred men a year to finish, we recall the fact that the school of Roman 'marmorarii' first comes into prominence about the middle of the twelfth century.

Hildebert's lines on the ruins of Rome suggest to Gregory the thought that this state of decay is an obvious portent of the end of the world (1 : *Cuius ruina ut arbitror docet evidenter cuncta temporalia proxime ruitura*), as is clear from the daily increasing failure and collapse of the world-capital (*presertim cum capud omnium temporalium Roma tantum cotidie languescit et labitur*). There was no lack of occasions during the twelfth century when this pessimistic view might have been taken by a witness of the disorders of Rome and the unstable position of the Popes. But on the whole it may be said that these difficulties increased after Rome achieved temporary political independence in 1143, and reached their climax in the violent struggles under Innocent III (1198-1218), who once more succeeded in re-establishing something of the Papal authority. Now Gregory mentions a building which perhaps enables us to find an approximate date somewhere in this period. Describing the 'temple of Pallas' (16), i.e. the temple of Minerva in the Forum of Nerva, he says that what is left of the building has been turned into the cardinals' granary or storehouse—*horreum est cardinalium*. As we hope to show later (p. 30), a natural explanation of a storehouse on this spot, connected with the Papal administration, is to be found in the neighbouring 'Tor de'Conti,' the fortress erected in the early years of the thirteenth century by the family partisans of Innocent III in order to dominate the city. In that case Gregory's visit must be moved forward from the twelfth to the beginning of the thirteenth century, and his gloomy view of affairs in Rome will be a reflection of the depression which prevailed at times in the Papal circles with which he was in contact.²

We know nothing about Gregory except what we can gather from his own words, and this, as Dr. James remarks (*E.H.R.* p. 542), amounts to very little. One of the most striking things about him is the almost purely secular and antiquarian nature of his interest in Rome. He had certainly not come as a pilgrim, and he refers to the pilgrims and the stories they brought back in a tone of contempt

¹ Lanciani, *Storia degli Scavi*, i, p. 5 ; *The Destruction of Ancient Rome*, pp. 162, 165.

² Cp. Gregorovius, v, p. 43.

(4, 27, 29). He mentions only three of the churches : the Lateran (4) and St. Peter's (27) merely incidentally, and the Pantheon (21) more fully because it is a converted ancient temple. His interest in the relics of antiquity goes so far that one can almost detect a tone of hostility to Christian iconoclasts.¹ And his admiration for an undraped statue of Venus (12) is such as one might have expected to find in an ecclesiastic of the sixteenth rather than of the twelfth century. On the other hand we note that his connexions are with the Papal officials, and we may perhaps conjecture that the business which brought him to Rome had to do with them. The interest which he shows in an inscription recording an ancient law (33) may be an indication, as Mr. Baddeley has suggested to me, that this business was of a legal nature, in which case he may have been a canonist. He tells us in his Prologue that he belonged to a learned community, apparently devoted to studies of a theological nature. The two members of it whom he mentions by name are referred to by their academical titles (*magister Martinus* and *dominus Thomas*), and this, together with the secular tone of the treatise, suggests that his society belonged to a university and not to a monastery. The facts that he is quoted only by an English writer (Higden), that the only known manuscript is English, and that the quotation from Hildebert is probably derived from William of Malmesbury, suggest, as Dr. James has pointed out (*E.H.R.* p. 542), that he may have come from England. Our curiosity would have been at least partly satisfied, had not a copyist failed to recognize the name of the country or place to which Gregory says he was returning (25), and consequently omitted it.²

In the following pages I have not attempted to write a complete commentary on the text. That must be reserved until it is possible, with increased knowledge, to produce an edition of the author. Consequently, many points of interest arising out of the text are passed over ; and I have generally confined myself to explaining Gregory's descriptions of what he saw and heard in Rome, and drawing attention to what is new or remarkable in them.

Gregory's description begins, with that personal note so characteristic of him, by a record of the impression made on his mind and memory by his first view of the city 'from the hill side'

¹ There are three references to Gregory the Great as a destroyer of statues (4, 6, 12). Notice also the reference to the temple of Pallas (16) : *multo sudore Chresticolarum deiectum*.

² It is just possible that there is a local allusion in his account of the temple of Pallas (16), where, he says, the Christian martyrs were condemned in the days of the persecutions (Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis*, i, p. 152). He goes on to mention one by name—Hippolytus ; and it is not obvious why he should have done so, unless he had some special interest in him. In the early Middle Ages it was

believed that the Abbey of Saint Denis possessed the body of Hippolytus, and his day (Aug. 13th) was kept there with peculiar solemnity. *Acta SS.* vol. xxxvii, pp. 8 ff. This allusion would be still more appropriate if we could believe that Gregory came from the ancient monastery of St. Hippolytus (Sankt-Pöten) in Lower Austria (Augustinian from the eleventh century), which, it may be noted, was taken under the protection of Alexander III, c. 1180, and of Innocent III in 1206. Felgel and Lampel, *Urkundenbuch* etc. (Vienna, 1891), i, pp. 18, 31.

(1: *a latere montis*). This must be the famous view from Monte Mario,¹ over which the road from Viterbo passed before descending to the Porta S. Peregrini (or S. Petri) of the Leonine City. Before the building of the dome of St. Peter's, no landmark connected with the city was visible till this point was reached. The words which describe the spectacle (*Ubi tanta seges turrium, tot edificia palatiorum, quot nulli hominum contigit enumerare*) give a vivid and, with some pardonable exaggeration, no doubt truthful picture of the medieval city with its forest of church and baronial towers, and the great masses of ancient buildings standing up among the modern houses, or towering over the abandoned spaces within the walls. Even the earliest panoramic views of Rome (middle of the sixteenth century) give no idea of the effect produced by the medieval towers, most of which had already disappeared.² The campaniles and towers which we see to-day are comparatively rare survivals, and now the city is dominated by the cupola of St. Peter's and, it may be added, the colossal Monumento Nazionale.

On reaching the city, he first of all gives the names of the gates. His list (2) as a whole does not agree with any other, and seems to be the result of his own notes made on the spot. In one point he agrees with William of Malmesbury,³ viz. that there are fourteen gates, though he differs as to the names; and while he gives fourteen names, three of these belong to one gate (Tiburtina, Aquileia, and S. Laurentii), so that his number is really twelve. Perhaps he was told that there were fourteen gates, and forgot the names of two. In all forms of the *Mirabilia* the number is fifteen.

The medieval descriptions of Rome show that there was great variety of popular names for the gates, and that, except in a few cases, the ancient ones had been forgotten or corrupted. The varieties in Gregory's list seem to be due to misunderstandings, rather than to any real tradition: something also may be due to corruption of his text. Of his fourteen names, eight are recognizable in their ancient forms: Aurelia (in the form Aurea,⁴ as in the *Mirabilia*), Latina, Salaria, Flaminia (the manuscript has *flammea*), Nomentana (in the form Numantia), Appia, Tiburtina, and Asinaria. As to the others, there was no ancient Porta Collatina, for the Via Collatina branched off from the Via Praenestina outside the city. The name

¹ A. Graf, *Roma nella memoria e nelle immaginazioni del medio evo* (Turin, 1915), p. 86, quoting Angilbert and Dante. This regular approach to Rome over Monte Mario (Mons Malus) is illustrated by Paschal II in 1111 sending his envoys to meet the emperor Henry V in *montem Gaudii qui et mons Malus dicitur* (*Annales Romani*, M.G.H. Script. v, p. 474; Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.* ii, p. 340. Cp. Gregorovius, iv, p. 338), and by Frederick Barbarossa's entry in 1155 (Gregorovius, iv, p. 539). The names 'Mons Malus' and 'Mons Gaudii'

first appear in the early middle ages, but Duchesne says that 'leur origine précise est inconnue' (op. cit. p. 262, n. 4). The latter is generally explained as the pilgrims' name for the spot whence they caught their first view of the city. It may, however, be due to the principle of euphemism, like Beneventum for Maleventum.

² Gregorovius, iv, p. 691.

³ *Gesta Regum*, iv, 352 (*R.S.* ii, pp. 404-408).

⁴ Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.* i, p. 152.

might come from some reminiscence of the Porta Collina in the Servian wall ; but a more probable explanation is to be found in the entry common to all the forms of the Mirabilia : *porta Collina ad castellum* (or *templum*) *Adriani*,¹ i.e. the gate of the Leonine City known as the Posterula S. Angeli. It occurs for the first time in the *Ordo* of Benedict the Canon (before 1143),² but the fifteenth century 'Solace of Pilgrimes' is alone in giving the alternative form *Colatina* like Gregory.³ As this was one of the gates leading to Monte Mario, Gregory may have entered by it.⁴ *Aquileia* as an alternative name for the Porta San Lorenzo (Tiburtina) is new. Perhaps it comes from a corruption or misunderstanding of *Porta Esquilina*, the gate in the old enceinte corresponding to the Porta Tiburtina of the Aurelian Wall, the site of which continued to be marked, as it is still, by the Arch of Gallienus. There remain three more names which are peculiar to Gregory—*Sacra*, *Marcia*, *Livia*. We might suppose that somehow they represent the more important gates so far unidentified in his list, viz. the Porta Praenestina (Labicana, Maior), the P. Ostiensis (P. San Paolo), and either the Porta Pinciana or the Porta Portuensis. There was a medieval road called the *via maior et sancta* between the Lateran and S. Clemente, known in the *Ordo* of Benedict as the *via maior* and *via sacra* ; but it led to the Lateran and the Porta Asinaria,⁵ and there is nothing to connect it with the Porta Maggiore. *Marcia* might be a corruption of *Maior*, and *Livia* of *Lavicana*, the alternative name of the P. Maior in the Mirabilia. Really, however, Marcia and Livia are such commonplace Latin names that one has the suspicion that (if they are not mere manuscript corruptions) Gregory forgot the names which he had been told, and substituted two familiar Latin names in order to conceal the fact. None of these names seem to have any connexion with the Porta San Paolo, which was, however, too important to have been overlooked by Gregory. A statement in section 28 reveals to us that his name for it was *Porta Latina*,⁶ for the *piramis Augusti* there described *prope portam Latinam* can be nothing but the pyramid of Gaius Cestius. As there appears to be no other trace of this transfer of the name, it is probably a mistake of Gregory's, perhaps made easier by the fact that the gate did lead in the direction of the ancient Latium.

¹ Ulrichs, *Codex Topographicus*, pp. 92, 115, 127 ; F. M. Nichols, *The Marvels of Rome* (London, 1889), p. 8. I have usually given the more important references to the Mirabilia from these texts, the second being a translation. There are also editions by Parthey and Jordan (*Topographie*, vol. ii).

² Ulrichs, p. 79 ; Nichols, p. 168.

³ *The Solace of Pilgrimes* (ed. C. A. Mills : Oxford, 1911), p. 12 : *porta colina v(e)l colatina*. One wonders whether the author, John Capgrave, got it, directly or indirectly, from Gregory.

⁴ Cp. in a late edition of the Mirabilia (Ulrichs, p. 142) : *Porta Collina . . . per quam itur ad eum qui bodie dicitur mons marus* [sic].

⁵ Nichols, p. 166, note 383. Ulrichs, p. 186. Cp. Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.* ii, p. 319, n. 21 ; Lanciani, *L'Itinerario di Einsiedeln* (Monumenti Antichi, i), p. 105 ; Huelsen, *Anon. Eins.* p. 30.

⁶ The real Porta Latina was open throughout the middle ages, and was not closed till 1808. Nibby, *Roma Antica*, i, p. 148.

Once inside the walls Gregory begins with an account of the principal surviving works of ancient sculpture, among which those of bronze take precedence. The first is a bull standing on the ramparts of the castle of Crescentius, in other words the Mausoleum of Hadrian (3). It may be noted by the way that this name, derived from the occupation of the structure by the Consul or Prefect Crescentius at the end of the tenth century, was the common one in the twelfth, though the name 'Castle of Sant' Angelo,' which, from the fourteenth century, became the ordinary one, occurs as early as the middle of the eleventh.¹ The bull is first mentioned by Petrus Mallius (middle of the twelfth century) in his account of St. Peter's, together with the gilt bronze peacocks which had been removed to adorn the *cantharus* in front of the basilica, and four bronze horses.² There is a similar statement in the *Mirabilia*.³ We hear nothing about the fate of the bull, nor is there any existing work, of Roman provenance, which recalls it, unless it be the fragment of a colossal bronze bull, now in the Palace of the Conservatori, which was discovered together with a bronze horse (apparently belonging to an equestrian statue) in the Trastevere,⁴ whither it is not difficult to imagine that they might have been carried from the Mausoleum. Gregory's description shows that the animal was in action (*mugituro et moturo similis*), and he compares it to some representation of the group of Europa and the bull, with which he assumes that his readers are acquainted (*in specie illius quo Iupiter Europam iuxta fabulam decepit*). The question is whether the representation which he has in his mind is artistic or literary. The story would be familiar enough in his day, and may well have occurred as a book-illustration or in carving; but, in the absence of definite contemporary instances, it is, perhaps, safer to suppose that he is thinking of the well-known description in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.⁵

Next comes an account of the well-known equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius, now (and since 1538) at the Capitol, but in Gregory's day standing in front of the Lateran Palace (4: *ante palatium domini pape*). The facts about it have been so often discussed that it will be sufficient to call attention to any peculiarities or novelties in Gregory's account. Higden had copied the statement that the statue originally stood on four bronze columns before the Capitoline temple, that Gregory the Great removed the columns to the Lateran Basilica, and that the people of Rome set up the overthrown

¹ Nibby, *Roma Antica*, ii, p. 501 ff.

² Nibby, l.c., p. 497.

³ Urlichs, pp. 106 and 119; Nichols, p. 79. Jordan (*Top.* ii, p. 430) says that Petrus Mallius borrowed his account from this source.

⁴ Helbig, *Führer* (3rd ed.), i, p. 543, nos. 954, 955. But it seems that these were found on the site of a large ancient building, to which they probably belonged.

⁵ ii, 851-875: *mugit et in teneris formosus inambulat herbis*, etc. For medieval references to the story see e.g. *Flores Historiarum* (R.S.), i, 16; Higden, *Polycricon*, i, 168 (citing Isidorus XIV, iv), 196; ii, 340. It was, apparently, a favourite subject with the Byzantine ivory-workers of the ninth-tenth centuries, for it appears twice on the Veroli Casket, and also on a fragment in the Salting Bequest, both in the Victoria and Albert Museum.

statue in front of the Lateran Palace (4). The columns meant are probably those which we hear of early in the ninth century as forming the chancel screen,¹ and which since the end of the sixteenth century have flanked the altar of the Sacrament in the transept. However, there seems to have been a tradition that they came from the Capitol,² though the mention of his great namesake is peculiar to Gregory. As we know that the statue did not come from the Capitol, we may regard the whole of this part of the account as fictitious.

After stating that the rider was called Theoderic³ by the pilgrims and Constantine by the Romans, but Marcus or Quintus Quirinus by the better informed cardinals and officials of the Curia, Gregory tells two stories to explain the latter names. The first reappears, more or less, in the *Mirabilia*, where, however, it has lost the name of the Roman hero Marcus, as well as that of the conquered nation, represented by the prostrate figure under the horse's feet—*rex Misenorum* (*Messenorum* in Higden). Marcus may be a tradition of the real name Marcus Aurelius, in which case *Miseni* might represent *Marcomanni*, the war with whom (166-175) was one of the great events of his reign. On the other hand, the story contains no suggestion that Marcus was an emperor (4 : *militem strenuissimum Marcum nomine*), and it is possible that *Miseni* may represent *Moesi* (sometimes *Mysii*), the people of Moesia, conquered by Marcus Crassus in 29 B.C. John of Salisbury, of whom we may suppose that Gregory was more or less the contemporary, draws attention to an anecdote connected with this war derived from Florus or some other epitomizer,⁴ so that it was evidently familiar to the learned world of the twelfth century. It need scarcely be said that there is nothing historical in Gregory's story, which is simply a myth to explain the 'dwarf' (*nanus*) under the horse's feet and the bird (*cuculus*, cuckoo : in the *Mirabilia* *cocovaia*, 'owl') on its head. The story explaining the name Quintus Quirinus is that of Marcus Curtius leaping into the chasm, which also appears in the *Mirabilia* in connexion, not with the statue, but with the site in or near the Forum called *Infernus* (i.e. the *lacus Curtius*), close to 'the palace of Catiline.'⁵ Jordan has suggested (*Top.* ii, p. 493) that this name, together with 'the house of Aurelia Orestilla' and 'the palace of Lentulus' got into the *Mirabilia* from Sallust's *Catiline*. When Gregory says that the chasm was in 'the palace of Sallust,' it is not difficult to suppose that he too means 'the palace of Catiline,' and by some misunderstanding has confused the names of the historian and his subject. The *Mirabilia*, indeed, knew of a 'palace of Sallust,' which in one of the

¹ Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.* ii, p. 236 (Sergius III), and n. 2.

² Marangoni, *Cose Gentilesche*, p. 337; Nibby, *Rom. Mod.* i, p. 257; and cp. Urlichs, p. 117.

³ The Castle of Sant'Angelo was sometimes called *domus Thiederici*. Jordan, ii, p. 430.

⁴ Jo. Saresberiensis, *Polycraticus*, vi, 15, ed. Webb, ii, p. 40. Florus, ii, 26 (iv, 12).

⁵ Urlichs, pp. 109, 121; Nichols, p. 97. Cp. Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*, p. 126.

latest editions is naturally identified with the well-known gardens on the Pincian.¹

The third work is the Colossus (6), represented, or believed to be represented, in Gregory's day by the bronze head and right hand holding an orb (*sphaera*), set on two marble columns in front of the Lateran palace, and preserved since 1471 (the orb has been detached) in the Palace of the Conservatori.² It will be enough to mention here the chief peculiarities of Gregory's account, which was copied by Higden. The height of the statue as given in our text, 126 ft., does not agree with either the ancient or the later accounts,³ but the figure is nearly the same in some versions of the Chronicle of Eusebius, which, directly or indirectly, must be the source to which Gregory refers (*ut scriptum repperi*),⁴ unless he simply took it from the 'Seven Wonders,' which makes the Colossus of Rhodes 136 ft. high, and one of the numerals has dropped out through the carelessness of some copyist. He goes on to say that it stood *in insula Herodii super Colosseum xv pedibus altior eminentioribus locis et urbe*, which shows that he had the pseudo-Bede's account of the Colossus of Rhodes before him; but at the same time it is clear that he believed himself to be describing a site in Rome. This was made easier for him by the frequent occurrence of *insula* (a block of buildings) in the ancient descriptions of Rome,⁵ and its survival in medieval documents as late as the twelfth century, and even in the *Mirabilia*.⁶ Thus he (or his informant) may have imagined that there was an *insula Herodii* in Rome near the Coliseum.⁷ The statement that the figure revolved with the sun seems to be an echo of Suetonius's description of the circular room in Nero's Golden House with its revolving astronomical decoration.⁸ Its destruction is characteristically ascribed to Gregory the Great and not, as in the *Mirabilia*, to Pope Sylvester.⁹ The account ends with one of those personal touches by which Gregory conveys the impression made on him by the lifelike appearance of the head and hand (*moturo et locuturo simillimum*).

Next comes a notice (7) of the famous bronze boy picking a thorn out of his foot ('il spinario'), now in the Palace of the Conservatori. It is new to us, and important as being the earliest mention of the

¹ Urlichs, pp. 93, 128; cp. 157; Nichols, p. 21.

² Michaelis in *Röm. Mitt.* vi (1891), p. 14; Helbig, i, p. 547, no. 959, and p. 548, no. 960.

³ Suetonius, *Nero*, 31; Plinius, *H.N.* xxxiv, 45; Urlichs, pp. 36, 98.

⁴ Urlichs, p. 194.

⁵ See the 4th cent. Regionary catalogues—the so-called *Curiosum* and *Notitia*—*passim*: sometimes with a name attached, e.g. *Insulam Felices* (Reg. ix; Urlichs, p. 14).

⁶ E.g. Urlichs, p. 55 (8th cent.): *Insulae qui inter vicos sunt horti*. Id. p. 80, l. 4, and 95, l. 18, etc.

⁷ By way of illustrating the confusion of 'Rhodes' and 'Herod,' Mr. G. F. Hill reminds me that the

legend ΠΟΔΙΟΝ (taken for [H]ΠΟΔΙΟΝ) on coins of Rhodes was perhaps one of the reasons why specimens were identified in the fifteenth century with the Thirty Pieces of Silver. See his article in *Archaeologia*, lix (1904), pp. 246–251, reprinted in *The Medallist Portraits of Christ* (Oxford, 1920).

⁸ Suetonius, *Nero*, 31: *praecipua caenationum rotunda quae perpetuo diebus ac noctibus vice mundi circumageretur*. Cf. Lanciani, *Ruins*, p. 361. The fanciful description of the Coliseum in the later editions of the *Mirabilia* (Urlichs, p. 136; Nichols, p. 62) seems to be derived from the same source; as also, probably, the story of the tower of Chosroes mentioned by Graf, p. 100.

⁹ Urlichs, p. 136; Nichols, p. 64.

figure that we possess. Hitherto it could not be traced beyond the formation of the Conservatori collection by Sixtus IV in 1471.¹ Even now it cannot definitely be said that Gregory supplies the missing notice of its provenance from the Lateran, demanded by Michaelis.² But though the palace is not actually mentioned, the way in which the figure is introduced—*Est etiam aliud eneum simulacrum*—immediately following the account of the bronze head and hand *ante palatium domini pape*, looks as if we were intended to understand that the bronze boy was in the same place, and probably set like the other pieces on a marble pillar. The name Priapus for the figure does not occur elsewhere. The reason given for it is frivolous and baseless, though characteristic of the popular medieval attitude to such things.

The account of the fabulous collection of statues known as the *Salvatio Civium* which follows (8), was derived by Gregory from the tract on the Seven Wonders, as has been mentioned above (p. 15). Though he does not say explicitly that it was in the Capitol (as in the more or less similar story of the Mirabilia), his description of the building seems to apply to the substructures of the Tabularium (*Huius autem domus magna pars parietum adhuc restat, et cripte eius horride et inaccessibiles apparent*). The legend, as is well known, is as old as the eighth century, and the similarity of the versions of Gregory and of the Mirabilia is due to a common source or sources, which have been explained by Graf.³ The iron Bellerophon suspended in the air by magnets (9), the last of the metal statues in Gregory's list, is discussed elsewhere (p. 43).

After a digression concerned with two more of the 'Seven Wonders,' the sulphur bath (10: see p. 33) and the theatre of Heraclea (11: see p. 44), he continues with a description (12-14) of the most notable surviving marble statues, nearly all of which, he says, were destroyed or defaced by Gregory I. The one that made the most vivid impression upon him, and which he therefore describes first, was a nude Venus in Parian marble, apparently perfect, and still retaining some of its original colouring. Higden gave only a very condensed version of the passage in Gregory, most of which is therefore new to us. After stating that Venus appears in the form in which she exhibited her unveiled beauty to the judgment of Paris, he records his impression of the perfection and realism of the figure: *erubescenti etenim nuditatem suam similis, faciem purpureo colore perfusam gerit. Videturque comminus aspicientibus in niveo ore ymaginis sanguinem natate*. He ends with an interesting personal touch, telling

¹ *Rev. Arch.* xliii (1882), p. 26.

² *Röm. Mitt.* vi (1891), p. 14.

³ Graf, p. 148 ff. For the Mirabilia see Urlichs, p. 99, etc.; Nichols, p. 46; Jordan, ii, p. 622. The idea of a collection of statues of the provinces may be derived from a tradition of the

existence of such series adorning the monuments of Imperial Rome. The most notable are the reliefs from the so-called Basilica of Neptune (Temple of Hadrian) in the Campus Martius, sixteen of which survive. Mrs. Strong, *Roman Sculpture*, pp. 243-246; Helbig, i, p. 503, no. 888.

us that the wondrous beauty and magical charm of the figure drew him irresistibly to it no less than three times, though it was a couple of miles distant from his hostelry.¹

Can this Venus be identified with any existing statue? Its locality is fairly accurately fixed for us by the words which immediately follow: 'Not far from this are the marble horses,' viz. the famous Horse-Tamers or Dioscuri of the Quirinal, which have never travelled far from their original position in or about the Baths of Constantine, and approximately stand to-day where Gregory saw them. If we suppose that his lodging was in the Borgo or the neighbourhood of St. Peter's, the regular pilgrim quarter, the distance to the Quirinal would be quite two miles. Nor would it be much less if we suppose him to have lodged in the foreign quarter just across the river, where the oldest inns we know of, the Orso and the Luna, were situated.² Now it was just in this Quirinal district that the Venus of the Capitoline Museum, the type, material, and condition of which are consistent with Gregory's description, was discovered in the seventeenth century in a garden nearly opposite to San Vitale.³ We may remember that the ninth century pilgrim's guide known as the Einsiedeln Itinerary connects S. Vitale and the horse-tamers.⁴ We might suppose that the Venus, deliberately concealed (as we know other statues were) to save it from Christian iconoclasts in the fourth or fifth century, was accidentally discovered in the twelfth; and, after arousing the admiration of such humanists as then existed, and, no doubt, the corresponding suspicion of the Church, lest the dangerous charm so characteristically alluded to by Gregory should exercise too much of its witchery, was once more safely walled up to await its rediscovery in days when the relics of the ancient culture could be looked upon as works of art and not as idols. The evidence, of course, is incomplete and far from amounting to proof. But the almost perfect condition of the Venus when discovered shows that it must have been deliberately concealed and protected from injury⁵;

¹ 12: *cum ab hospicio meo duobus stadiis distaret*. The ancient Greek measure cannot be meant, as this would make the distance the trifling one of a quarter of a mile. Gibbon suggested that in a Greek letter of Gregory III of the year 727 *stadia* means 'miles' (ed. Bury, v, p. 259, n. 34).

² F. Cerasoli, *Ricerche storiche intorno agli alberghi di Roma dal secolo xiv al xix*. Studi e documenti di Storia e Diritto, iv (1893), p. 383.

³ Helbig, i, p. 447, no. 803; H. Stuart Jones, *Catalogue of the Mus. Capitolino*, p. 183. Lanciani, *Storia d. Scavi*, i, p. 231, gives the passage from P. Sante Bartoli, *Memorie*, 27: 'Si cavo in tempo di Clemente X [1670-76] nell'orto de Signori Stazi ove si scoprisse gran parte delli bagni di Agrippina, nelli quali fu trovata una statua di Venere di altezza da 9 palmi [m. 2] quasi che intatta, e anche bella quanto la Venere de' Medici.' For the 'Orto degli Stazi' see Nolli, *Pianta di Roma* (1748), p. 20.

⁴ Huelsen, i, 11: *Sci. Vitalis in vico longo ubi cavall(i) opt(imi)*.

⁵ Though the authority for the statement repeated by the guide-books that the Venus was found walled-up may be wanting, as Helbig remarks (i, p. 447), that statement probably represents a fact, even if it were originally only an inference from the condition of the statue. It may be noted that an untouched Mithraic shrine, containing a perfect image of a lion-headed god, was found walled-up close by. Vacca, *Memorie*, p. 116, quoted by Lanciani, *Scavi*, iii, p. 200. Cumont, *Textes et Monuments relatifs aux mystères de Mithra*, ii, p. 196, no. 10. Graf (p. 670) refers to Gregory's description (as reproduced by Higden) as illustrating William of Malmesbury's Roman story of the bronze Venus and the ring (*Gesta Regum*, ii, 205, Rolls Series, vol. i, p. 256). The collection of pagan statues brought from Rome in 1151 by Bishop

and on this fact, together with the site of its discovery, and its agreement in all essentials with the description of Gregory, the identification here suggested must rely.

The short passage devoted to the Dioscuri or horse-tamers of the Quirinal is independent of the previously known accounts, though it contains no new fact. Instead of the story in the *Mirabilia* where the heroes are described as philosophers,¹ Gregory merely says that the figures represent *compotistae*, 'calculators,' of ancient times, and that the horses are symbolical of their quick-working intellects.

Of similar character is the following notice (13) of the two river-gods, now set in front of the Palace of the Senator on the Capitol,² which Gregory saw next to the horses, reclining under two arches or vaults (*Iuxta hos sub duabus fornicibus recubant*, etc.). This detail is new, but it is confirmed by Bufalini's Plan (1551) showing at the north-west angle of the Baths of Constantine two niches, in which the figures probably stood.³ In the *Mirabilia* they are merely mentioned as Saturn and Bacchus.⁴ Gregory gives a more detailed description of the old men, as he calls them, and while he says that the second figure was called 'Liber Pater' or 'Bacchus,' he is alone in telling us that the name of Solomon was given to the first, apparently because it held a sceptre in its hand, while the other had a vine branch. Both objects have disappeared (if they ever existed), and the right hand of the so-called 'Nile' has been restored with an oar. The cornucopia held by each figure (apparently not restorations) is not alluded to. Gregory further tells us that each figure was forty feet in length.

Gregory gives an account of one more collection of sculpture in the same neighbourhood. Hard by the Solomon and Bacchus, he says (14), was the extensive and still towering palace of the Cornuti containing numerous statues, all of which had horns (*multe ymagines . . . omnes cornute*). Conspicuous among them was a colossal figure known as 'Jupiter Arenosus.' The best authorities, he adds, believed that the palace had been the residence of a distinguished ancient Roman family, which had acquired the nickname of Cornuti from the proud and aggressive character of its members. They were no doubt right so far as the Roman family was concerned, for we know of several members of the highest official classes in Imperial times bearing the cognomen of Cornutus. Moreover, there is some reason to think that one family so distinguished had a house in this area, for the name was preserved by the medieval church of

Henry of Blois to adorn his palace at Winchester may be recalled as another rare instance of the appreciation of ancient sculpture in the Middle Ages. *Historia Pontificalis* (by John of Salisbury), xl (*Mon. Germ. Hist. Script.* vol. xx, p. 517). I owe this reference to Dr. R. L. Poole.

¹ Urlichs, p. 96; Nichols, p. 39.

² Helbig, i, p. 412.

³ Jordan, ii, p. 527: 'die Trümmer, welche damals "domus Corneliiorum" hießen, die beiden auf dem Bufalinischen Plan an der Nordwestecke (gegen SS. Apostoli) der Thermen Constantins eingetragenen Nischen sind, die zu diesen Thermen gehört haben müssen. Dort standen die jetzt vor der Treppe des Senatorenpalastes zu beiden Seiten der Roma angebrachten Flussgötter.'

⁴ Urlichs, p. 122, l. 28; Nichols, p. 109.

S. Salvator de Cornutis (destroyed in 1589 : the site was in the grounds of the Palazzo Rospigliosi), a title probably derived, not so much from tradition, as from surviving inscriptions in which the name Cornutus occurred.¹ One such is recorded as having come from this site.² As for the series of *ymagines cornute*, one would think the idea must have been derived from some decorative feature of the building or its ruins. The ox-skull (*bucranium*) and the ram's head were both used in Roman decorative art, the latter frequently at the angles or sides of marble cinerary urns or chests, and sometimes with a bearded human face.³ If we could suppose that there was a family tomb or columbarium connected with the mansion, still containing cippi decorated with rams' heads, this might have been the origin of Gregory's statement.⁴ It is difficult to believe that there were actual statues represented with horns as a sort of pun on the family name.⁵ The large Jupiter Ammon, however, may have been a kind of patron deity of the house, on account of the horns. *Arenosus* is a translation of 'Ammon' which the late Roman antiquaries supposed to be derived from ἄμμος, 'sand.' Gregory (or rather his informants) must have got the name, directly or indirectly, from Servius's commentary on the *Aeneid*, where the legend of a ram in the desert is told.⁶

In a sort of appendix at the end of his treatise Gregory describes three more pieces of sculpture, forgotten, perhaps, in his previous enumeration. The first (31), close to the Coliseum, was a figure, in the purest Parian marble, of the sow with her litter of thirty, the sign given to Aeneas by the prophetic Helenus by which he was to know that he had reached the site of the future city of Rome, as Virgil tells.⁷ This is a new piece of information. Both site and subject suggest that the sculpture, whatever its form, may have belonged to Hadrian's great double temple of Venus and Rome, which stood next to the Coliseum on the west. Though it is no longer possible to accept unreservedly the well-known relief, now

¹ De Rossi in *Bull. Arch. Crist.*, S. 5, i (1890), p. 87 and n. 2; Jordan, p. 527; Armellini, *Chiese*, p. 182. Later the name *de Cornutis* appears as *de Corneliis*, either because inscriptions were found belonging to that family (so De Rossi), or, perhaps, because the name was better known than that of the Cornuti.

² Kaibel, *Inscr. Gr. Sic. et It.* 1786 = *C.I.G.* 6506: Κορνούτου ἱατροῦ καὶ 'Ρουφίνης θυγατρὸς apparently the epitaph of a freedman or dependent of the family.

³ E.g. those in the British Museum, reproduced in Reinach, *Rép. de Reliefs*, ii, p. 511. They also appear at the angles of candelabra bases (*ibid.* pp. 468, 472).

⁴ The Greek epitaph just referred to (note 2) seems to show that there was something of the kind.

⁵ But De Rossi in *Bull. Comm.* xviii (1890), p. 280, connects a *forum Tauri* with the name *caput*

Tauri (Jordan, ii, 319), suggesting that it was built by one of the Statilii Tauri, and adorned 'as was usual at the end of the Republic' with objects derived from the name, e.g. perhaps a frieze of bulls' heads.

⁶ Servius on Verg. *Aen.* iv, 196 (*Hiarbas . . . Hammone satus*). When Bacchus was suffering from thirst in the Libyan desert, Jupiter sent a ram to point out a spring. *Undefactum est Iovis Hammonis ab arenis dicti simulacrum cum capite arietino*. There is a herm of Ammon in the Capitoline Museum (Stuart Jones, *Catalogue*, p. 114), but its history is not traced beyond the Cesi collection. An analogous herm (rather smaller) is in the Lateran Museum (Benndorf-Schoene, p. 266). See also Helbig, i, p. 42, no. 69. A herm of a god would, perhaps, be more appropriate for a private house than a statue, which would rather belong to a temple.

⁷ *Aen.* iii, 390; viii, 43.

divided between the Lateran and Terme Museums, as a representation of one pediment of that temple,¹ it is very probable that the subjects of the two pediments would be the story of Aeneas for the temple of Venus, and that of Romulus for the temple of Rome. In that case Gregory may have seen part of the former. It is less likely that a work in the round inside the temple survived as late as the twelfth century, whereas it is not inconceivable that Gregory might have seen part of one of the pediments still standing. Practically all the decorative marble work of the temple vanished in the later middle ages and afterwards, so that it is vain to ask whether any trace of what Gregory describes still survives.²

The two other figures stood at the entrance to the Lateran Palace. One was the bronze wolf (32), which is now, and has been since 1471, at the Capitol, but which can be traced at the Lateran as far back as the tenth century.³ Gregory gives us some new details about it. In the first place he says that it stood in the portico at the entrance to the palace (*In porticu etiam ante hiemale palatium domini pape*).⁴ Next, it is quite clear that he saw no figures of the twins being suckled by it, for, after rejecting that story for the rationalistic explanation that Lupa was the name of the woman who saved and brought them up, he goes on to tell us that the wolf was represented as if stalking a bronze ram, which was also in front of the palace. This is the first time we have heard of this ram, which, we are told, was used for a sort of *cantharus* at the entrance to the palace, with a stream of water coming out of its mouth for ablutions (*ante palatium prefatum aquam abluendis manibus ore emittit*). The wolf, too, had once formed a pendant to it for the same purpose, the water in this case pouring through the animal's teats. But in Gregory's day it had been broken off at the feet, and the body moved to where he saw it (*Lupa etiam quondam singulis mammis aquam abluendis manibus emittebat, set nunc fractis pedibus a loco suo divulsa est*). We may suppose that the pedestal with the feet or part of the legs was still standing in its old place in the open air in front of the entrance, while the body was put, perhaps for safety, under cover in the portico. The legs of the wolf as it now stands in the Palace of the Conservatori on the Capitol are clearly the result of a rather clumsy restoration.⁵ The present

¹ *Papers of the British School at Rome*, iv (1907), pp. 247 ff.; Reinach, *Rép. de Rel.* i, p. 380; Helbig, ii, p. 177, no. 1412. Cp. Lanciani, *Ruins*, p. 200 and fig. 75; Platner, *Ancient Rome*, p. 318.

² Lanciani, *Ruins*, p. 198; Middleton, *Ancient Rome*, ii, p. 223. The Parian marble sow in the Vatican Museum (Gall. d. Animal: Amelung, *Vat. Mus.* ii, p. 373; Helbig, i, p. 113, no. 176) does not agree with Gregory's description, for it has only twelve young ones, and it was found on the Quirinal, at a considerable distance from the Coliseum.

³ Ulrichs, p. 148. Cp. Graf, p. 75.

⁴ This was the principal entrance to the palace, on the north side. Cf. *Lib. Pont.* (Duchesne, i, pp. 502, 518): under Hadrian I one hundred poor were to be fed daily in *porticu quae est iuxta scalam quae ascendit in Patriarchio*.

⁵ Petersen's articles on the 'Lupa Capitolina' in *Klio*, viii (1908), p. 440 ff. and ix, p. 29 ff. make it highly probable that the wolf belonged to the group mentioned by Cicero in *Capitolio* as struck by lightning in 65 B.C., and that it had lost the twins long before it was set up at the Lateran. Cp. Helbig, i, p. 562, no. 983.

figures of the twins have, of course, long been recognized as modern additions; and there is reason to think that they, or their predecessors, were not added till after the transfer of the bronze to the Capitol in 1471.¹ The ram seems to have disappeared without leaving any trace.²

One more bronze object which he saw here is mentioned by Gregory, and, though it is not a statue, we may as well deal with it in this place. In front of the wolf—that is, we may suppose, on the wall of the portico facing it—was, he says (33), a bronze table inscribed with the most important commandments of the law. It was known as ‘the table forbidding what is wrong.’ Gregory says he read a good deal of it but understood little, because it consisted of ‘aphorisms,’ in which nearly all the words are understood. This law, which does not appear in any other source, cannot have been the *Lex de imperio Vespasiani* (now in the Capitoline Museum), mentioned as at the Lateran in 1350, and apparently in existence there at least fifty years before.³ Its contents are such that it could never have been described as a *tabula prohibens peccatum*. The purport of Gregory’s table was evidently of a very different nature, and his description suggests the compressed phrases and sometimes negative or prohibitive precepts of archaic Roman law, of which the fragments of the Laws of the Twelve Tables (e.g. Tab. x: *hominem mortuum in urbe ne sepelito*), and the so-called sacred law of Numa, are the best known examples.⁴ It is, of course, an exaggeration to say that nearly all the words are understood. ‘Afforismi’ can hardly mean the contractions or ‘compendia scripturae’ of e.g. dedicatory or honorary inscriptions, for the words of legal enactments are habitually inscribed in full.

We now pass to the buildings described by Gregory. Some of these are in existence or known to us from other sources, and therefore require only brief mention here. He begins with that comprehensive medieval term ‘palaces,’ the first of them, the palace of the Cornuti (14), forming a transition from the section about statues, on account of the collection of horned images which were its most remarkable feature, and have been described above. The next is the Palace, i.e. the Baths, of Diocletian (15). The account contains nothing new, though its general but well-deserved expressions of wonder at the vast extent of the building are varied by a kind of personal anecdote. Then, as now, the great feature was the tepidarium (S. Maria degli Angeli) with its high monolith columns of grey granite. Gregory says that they were so high that their capitals were out of reach of a stone’s throw (as a matter of fact the columns are not more than fifty feet high,⁵ but since Gregory’s time their bases have been buried by the

¹ *Röm. Mitt.* vi (1891), p. 13.

² Unless it be the ‘altra figurina di bronzo’ seen by G. Ruccellai in 1450 beside the ‘lupa pregna’ of the Lateran. Lanciani, *Scavi*, i, p. 61. Cf. *Annali*, xlix (1877), p. 379 ff.

³ *C.I.L.* vi, 930; Lanciani, *Scavi*, i, p. 37.

⁴ Bruns, *Fontes Juris Romani* (7th ed.), pp. 8, 35.

⁵ Middleton, ii, 179.

raised floor), and that the cardinals told him that it would take one hundred men at least a year to cut and polish one of them, a statement which we have already noticed (p. 17).

The account of the next building, the temple of Pallas (16), is more important. This is the temple of Minerva in the Forum of Nerva—a good instance of the survival of an ancient name into medieval times.¹ Gregory says that its ruined state was largely due to deliberate destruction by Christians, an idea which may have arisen from the fact, mentioned at the end of the section, that in the days of the persecutions many of the martyrs were condemned in the court of the City Prefect held in *Tellude ante templum Palladis* as the Acts put it.² The image of Pallas, which they were required to adore, Gregory identifies with a headless statue which he saw still in its place on the apex of the pediment (*armata ymago Palladis adhuc super altissimam testudinem exstans amisso capite truncata*).³ He also mentions a great heap of broken statues (*Ibi magna congeries est fractarum effigierum*), perhaps the remains of the ‘gallery of portrait statues’ which once adorned the forum.⁴ The remaining part of the temple (we may presume the cella), he says, had been converted into ‘the granary or storehouse of the cardinals’ (*horreum est cardinalium*). So far as I know, this is the first time that we have heard of this *horreum cardinalium*, but apparently we have all along been familiar with a picture of it, or rather of what was left of it in the sixteenth century, for the views of the Forum of Nerva by Hieronymus Cock, Étienne du Pérac, and other draughtsmen and engravers of that period, show the interior of the temple cella filled up with a vaulted structure in two stories which is obviously medieval, and this can be nothing else than ‘the Cardinals’ Granary’ (pl. 1).⁵ Quite appropriately we hear of a medieval market close by, near the Tor de’ Conti.⁶ But why was it called *horreum cardinalium*, and why did the name disappear? The answer to both questions is, perhaps, to be found in a suggestion provided by that colossal medieval tower just mentioned. The Tor de’ Conti was built in the first years of the thirteenth century by the brother of Innocent III (Lothaire Conti, 1198–1216), as the keep of the fortress from which the family

¹ In the *Mirabilia* (Urlichs, 109; Nichols, 93) the Forum of Nerva appears, but the temple is that of the deified Nerva, no doubt owing to the dedicatory inscription on its front. The survival of the name ‘temple of Pallas’ was, of course, due to the *Acta Martyrum*.

² Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.* i, p. 152, n. 11; Nichols, p. 31, n. 69.

³ The description makes it clear that this is not the figure of Minerva still to be seen on the attic of the surviving fragment of the wall of the Forum (‘le Colonnacce’), which is perfect and in relief.

⁴ Lanciani, *Ruins*, p. 311, referring to Lampridius, *Alexander Severus*, 28, 6.

⁵ The most important of these views are: H. Cock, *Praecipua aliquot Romanae antiquitatis ruinarum monumenta* (Antwerp, 1551), pl. v and x, reproduced by G. B. Pittoni (Venice, 1561, etc.), pl. 6 and 7 (reversed); E. du Pérac, *Vestige dell’ antichità di Roma* (Rome, 1575), pl. 6; B. Gamucci, *Le Antichità della città di Roma* (Venice, 1569), plate facing p. 52. Cp. Ashby, *Topographical Study in Rome in 1581* (Roxburghe Club, 1916) fig. 54, etc.

⁶ Urlichs, p. 140, from the *Polistoria* of Giov. Cavallini (14th cent.): *dicitur bodie a Romanis archa Noe ubi habetur bodie macellum prope turrim Comitum*.

and partisans of the pope dominated the city, just as his successor Honorius III, with his Savelli relations, dominated it from their castle on the Aventine.¹ The provisioning of this fortress and the neighbouring market will account for the *horreum*, and its name is naturally derived from the heads of the papal administration—the cardinals, three of whom, it may be noted, were at the time members of the Conti family.² When the Conti régime came to an end, the building, and perhaps its use, still remained; and I can feel little doubt that in this use as a granary or provision store we find the true origin of the name *Arca Noe* given to the Temple of Minerva in the later middle ages, a name too often transferred to the arch which flanked the temple on the right, and explained as a corruption of *Arcus Nervae*.³ ‘Noah’s ark’ would have no point as the popular name of an arch, but it would be extremely appropriate to a building which, like the ark, was a repository ‘of all food that is eaten,’⁴ and may even have been thought to resemble the medieval idea of Noah’s vessel, especially as this low-lying district was liable to be flooded, a fact recalled by the name given to the entrance of the Forum of Augustus close by—Arco de’ Pantani.

If this explanation of *horreum cardinalium* be accepted, it affords, as we have already pointed out, an important indication of the date of Gregory’s visit and description, which would thus be put forward to the beginning of the thirteenth century. His allusion at the beginning of his treatise (I) to the troubled and declining state of Rome will then be an echo or reminiscence of the violent internal struggles which marked the early years of the pontificate of Innocent III.⁵

I see no reason to doubt that ‘the Palace of Augustus’ next described (17) is primarily the well-known Flavian reconstruction of the Domus Augustana on the south-west part of the Palatine.⁶ The inscription which he says that he saw among the ruins: *Domus divi Augusti clementissimi*, may have belonged to Domitian’s rebuilding, though the epithet *clementissimus* was not used, apparently, for living emperors before Gallienus.⁷ It may therefore have been put up in the course of some later restoration. Gregory

¹ Gregorovius, v, pp. 41 ff, pp. 667 ff.

² De Mas Latrie, *Trésor de Chronologie*, col. 1189. The suggestion for the explanation of *Horreum Cardinalium* given above was provided by Mr. W. St. Clair Baddeley.

³ E.g. Lanciani, *Ruins*, 310. Jordan (ii, 469) saw that the name belonged to the temple, quoting Signorili’s (15th cent.) localization of Nerva’s inscription as *in oratorio Nervae in loco qui dicitur corrupto vocabulo arca Noe, ad honorem Nervae*. The similarity of Minerva and Nerva will account for the disappearance of the former.

⁴ *Genesis*, vi, 21.

⁵ Gregorovius, v, pp. 1–49.

⁶ Lanciani, *Ruins*, pp. 141 ff.

⁷ *C.I.L.* vi, 1106: inscription on the arch of Gallienus. Gregory goes on to say that Augustus refused the title of *dominus* (*Qui cum esset dominus urbis et totius orbis appellationem tamen domini omnino vitavit*), which may be an allusion to the legend of the vision of Augustus (*Graphia*, 20; Urlichs, p. 121: *Cum sim mortalis dominum me dicere nolo*), unless it is derived from the passage in Orosius (vi, 22): *eodemque tempore hic ad quem rerum omnium summa concesserat, dominum se hominum adpellari non passus est; immo non ausus, quo verus dominus totius generis humani inter homines natus est*, which Graf suggests (p. 245) may have been the germ from which the story sprang.

speaks of the palace as being much dilapidated, and stripped of its precious marbles for the benefit of the Roman churches. If the comparatively untouched condition of the Domus proper when re-discovered in the eighteenth century, as described by Lanciani,¹ be an obstacle to the identification, then we may suppose that Gregory included under the title, not only the peristyle of the Flavian palace with its surrounding halls, but also the so-called Stadium and other Imperial buildings to the east; and this is made more probable by Gregory's connecting with this 'Palace of Augustus' the branch of the Claudian aqueduct which entered the Palatine at this point.

It is noticeable that in the following section (18), which is devoted to the aqueduct, he describes the way in which the water used to be distributed by pipes connected with the various 'palaces.' Lanciani has drawn attention to the manner in which 'we have been able to follow the course of the water, not only across the valley, but through the various sections of the Imperial palace. The pipe supplying the house of Augustus bore the inscription *domvs AVGVSTANAE*' etc.² It almost looks as if these arrangements were still visible, if not in working order, in Gregory's time. It is true the pipes are of lead and not of bronze, but that is a small matter. In any case, it seems that the main channel of the aqueduct was still intact and bringing water to the city—*per quem amnis . . . urbi illabitur*,³ as opposed to *palatiis quondam influebat* of the distributing pipes. The Tiber water, he goes on to say, is good enough for horses, but is not wholesome for human beings to drink. Various opinions about the Tiber water can be quoted, but, on the whole, this is just the view that has always been taken of it, whenever Rome enjoyed an artificial water supply. It is inferior, though not actually unwholesome; and it was not resorted to when there was a chance of getting something better. It was used before the aqueducts were built,⁴ and again after they were ruined; but its use was abandoned when they were restored in modern times, and evidently it was looked on with suspicion in Gregory's time, when a partial supply from the hills was still provided (see p. 34).⁵

A note at the end of this section brings us to one of the most

¹ *Ruins*, pp. 141 ff.

² *Ruins*, p. 186, with reference to his *Comentarii di Frontino*, pp. 211, 234. Cp. *C.I.L.* xv, 7246.

³ The words *a montanis fontibus per spatium unius diei* mean that the sources of the aqueducts were a day's journey from Rome. The *diei* seems to have been reckoned as twenty miles (see Ducange), which is approximately the distance from Rome to the hills.

⁴ Lanciani, *I Comentarii di Frontino*, pp. 3 f. Frontinus, *Aq.* i, 4: *Ab urbe condita per annos CCCCXLI contenti fuerunt Romani usu aquarum quas aut ex Tiberi aut ex puteis aut ex fontibus hauriebant.*

⁵ See the life of Hadrian I (772-95) in the *Liber*

Pontificalis (Duchesne, i) for his restorations of the Aqua Sabbatina (p. 503), Iovia (a branch of the Marcia, p. 504), Claudia (or Lateranensis, p. 504), and Virgo (p. 505), the four ancient aqueducts which were more or less maintained during the earlier Middle Ages (P. Adinolfi, *Roma nell' età di Mezzo*, i, p. 158). There seems to be an allusion to this in Gregory's words: *quare a quatuor partibus urbis per artificiosos meatus Romani ueteres aquas recentes uenire fecerunt.* But it is not clear whether the antithesis between *ueteres* and *recentes* means that the Romans of ancient times brought fresh (i.e. spring) water to the city, or (as I am inclined to think) that the Romans (of medieval times) have caused the ancient aqueducts to run afresh.

puzzling descriptions in Gregory, viz. that of what he calls 'the bath of Apollo Bianeus,' which he has already described in section 10. Two things are clear: (1) that he derived the notice from the tract about the Seven Wonders, the sixth of which is a hot spring (locality not mentioned) miraculously created by Apollonius of Tyana¹; (2) that he identified this with a warm sulphur bath which he actually saw at Rome. He tells us (10), with one of those personal touches which we have noticed before, that he visited the spot, tested the water with his hands, paid the charge which the bath attendant was authorized to make; but the disgusting smell of the sulphur was too much for him, and he left without entering the water. What spring or bath does he mean? We may begin by remarking that his identification of it with the bath of Apollonius² may have been based in part on some dedication to (or even image of) Apollo, which he saw at the Roman bath he describes. It is well known that most thermal or medicinal springs were sacred to Apollo. A familiar instance in the neighbourhood of Rome was the *Aquae Apollinares* at Vicarello near the Lake of Bracciano, which are warm and sulphurous, and might easily have been seen by Gregory on his way to or from the city.³ But the most striking sulphur springs in the Roman district are the *Aquae Albulae*, now represented by Bagni, five miles from Tivoli on the road from Rome. Even the passer-by is made conscious of the strength of the sulphur fumes such as those which Gregory found so unpleasant. No inscription mentioning Apollo seems to have been discovered there, but the colossal statue of the god with a lyre, now in the Capitoline Museum, came from the site of the ancient baths which stood by the pool now known as the 'Lago della Regina.'⁴ Its temperature of 80° Fahrenheit is consistent with Gregory's description.⁵ Can we in any way bring these important sulphur springs into connexion with Gregory's story? We may dismiss the idea that Gregory visited the *Aquae Albulae* themselves,⁶ and that, when he came to write down his account after leaving Rome, by some confusion in his memory or his notes he placed the bath inside the city. When he returns to the

¹ Gregory's story that Apollo (or Apollonius) set the bath alight *cum una candela consecrationis* partly recalls the story in Gregory of Tours about the spring at Grenoble (*M.G.H. Script. Rer. Meroving.* i, p. 862); *Quod si cereum vel tedas admoveas protinus ut flammis adtigerint, comprehenduntur.*

² I leave open the question whether the change of *Apollonius Tyaneus* into *Apollo Bianeus* be due to Gregory's copy of the 'Seven Wonders,' or to corruption of his own text. As far as I know, Apollonius left no traces in Rome. It was in the eastern half of the empire that his legend flourished.

³ According to Murray's *Handbook for Rome* (17th ed.), p. 543, the water is sulphurous, with a temperature of 113° Fahrenheit.

⁴ Stuart Jones, *Catalogue*, Glad, no. 7; Helbig, i, p. 494, no. 878; Ashby in *Papers of the British School at Rome*, iii (1906), pp. 117-119.

⁵ Smith, *Dict. of Grk. and Rom. Geography*, i, p. 94. Pliny (*H.N.* xxxi, 10) calls the *Aquae Albulae egelidae*, but perhaps this only refers to the phenomenon mentioned by Pausanias (iv, 35, 10).

⁶ In the Middle Ages the Campagna was far too unsafe for the existence of bathing establishments. The *Aquae Albulae* seem to have been abandoned all through the Middle Ages, and were first restored (temporarily) to use in the sixteenth century. A. Bacci, *Discorso delle acque albule* (Rome, 1563), reprinted in A. Capello's article on the same subject in the *Giornale Arcadico* (Rome), lxxi (1837), p. 67 ff. Cp. Lanciani, *Ruins*, pp. 36, 37.

subject of the 'Bath of Apollo Bianeus' in section 18, he is precise as to its locality: it was 'by the wall of the aqueduct which comes down past the Porta Asinaria' (i.e. the Porta San Giovanni. *Iuxta murum aque ductus qui per¹ portam Assinariam descendit*). He no doubt has in mind the great arches of the Claudian Aqueduct (the *arcus Neroniani* of Frontinus, i, 20), the remains of which are still a prominent feature opposite to the Porta San Giovanni. There is no thermal spring there, nor have we any reason to think that there ever was one. This identification of the locality is confirmed by the additional statement at the beginning of the next section (19) that the bath was not far from certain buildings on the Esquiline. Is it possible that the solution of the problem is to be found in the fact, preserved for us by Suetonius, that Nero somewhere in his 'Golden House,' the grounds of which extended to the Esquiline, had a bath supplied with water from the *Aquae Albulae*?² The channel or pipe through which it was conveyed may well have followed within the city the line of the *arcus Neroniani*. Having been once established, there was no reason why the supply of this precious water should have been lost, even though Nero's palace and park disappeared; and I am therefore inclined to believe that the bath, or another supplied from the same source, remained in use through the rest of the ancient period and as late as the time of Gregory.³ We may remember that the continuity of the Claudian aqueduct was maintained above all others till far on in the Middle Ages, on account of its importance for the water supply of the Papal palace at the Lateran.⁴ Whether this was Nero's original bath,⁵ or another made in later times at a different point in the channel, is a matter of indifference.⁶

Near this bath, says Gregory at the beginning of the next section (19), is the 'Domus Aquilea' and the 'Domus Frontoniana.' The presumption is that we are moving away from the Lateran towards the Esquiline, and it would not be unreasonable to connect the Domus Aquilea with the 'Domus Aquilii Iureconsulti,' which appears

¹ This medieval use of *per* meaning 'by,' 'alongside of,' 'in front of,' occurs regularly in the *Ordo* of Benedict. Cp. Nichols, p. 167, n. 384. See also Ducange.

² Suetonius, *Nero*, 31: *balineae marinis et albulis fontes aquis*.

³ The credit for this suggestion belongs to Mr. St. Clair Baddeley. The bath may have been a small affair, and therefore not noticed by ordinary writers. If it existed, it will have been one of the nameless *balnea* of the second or third Regions recorded by the fourth-century Regionary Catalogues. The charge made for using it seems to show that it was private property.

⁴ Hence it appears as the *forma Lateranensis* in the Einsiedeln Itinerary.

⁵ As the domain of the Golden House extended to and probably included the Gardens of Maecenas (Sueton., *Nero*, 31: *a Palatio Esquilias usque*. Cp. Lanciani, *Ruins*, p. 361), the site of the bath mentioned by Gregory may have been within it. See the beginning of the next section.

⁶ Dr. Ashby has pointed out to me that a serious objection to this explanation of Gregory's statement is the probability that the duct would have been choked by the sulphur deposit long before the twelfth century. Against this I can only appeal to the realism and obvious sincerity of Gregory's description. Mr. Baddeley suggests as an alternative source of the sulphur water the spring of *Acqua Bollicante* (sulphuretted hydrogen), less than two miles from the Porta Maggiore.

under the Fifth Region (the Esquiline) in P. Victor's edition of the Regionary Catalogue.¹ But we have already met with *Aquileia* as the name of the Porta San Lorenzo (2); and if *Porta Aquileia* stands for *Porta Esquilina* (as suggested above), the real name of the house may have been Domus Esquilina.² What building in the region of the great villas was intended, is another matter.³ The Domus Frontoniana seems to be derived from Juvenal's (i, 12)

*Frontonis platani convulsaque marmora clamant
semper et adsiduo ruptae lectore columnae.*

The scholiast's remark on this: *in Horatiana domo in qua poetae recitabant*,⁴ shows acquaintance with the fact, which we know from a remark of the tutor of Marcus Aurelius and also from evidence found on the spot, that the Gardens of Maecenas on the Esquiline (or part of them) passed later into the possession of the family of the Frontos.⁵ Inscriptions may well have preserved a record of this as late as the twelfth century, a time, too, when the learned were specially familiar with Juvenal.⁶ In this way we might identify the Domus Aquileia with some ruin between the Arch of Gallienus (Porta Esquilina) and the Porta San Lorenzo, and the Domus Frontoniana with the supposed remains of the Villa of Maecenas, to the south. And both could fairly be described as not far from the course of the Aqua Claudia (Arcus Neroniani).⁷

The rest of this section (19) is devoted to what is little more than a list of other Roman 'palaces.' Their names might be rather misleading if we were not acquainted with the local usage of the twelfth century. Thus the 'palace of Tiberius' is probably not the ancient Domus Tiberiana on the Palatine, for in the *Mirabilia* it is mentioned among the buildings on the Quirinal, and is said to contain the *templum deorum*.⁸ As Gregory calls it *opus mirandum et immensum*, one might think of the great temple in the Colonna Gardens⁹ or the Baths of Constantine. In the *Einsiedeln Itinerary* the 'Palace of Nero' is on the line of the Via Sacra, and Lanciani

¹ Ulrichs, p. 36.

² On the analogy of the (unidentified) Domus Pinciana of Cassiodorus, *Variae*, iii, 10. Jordan, ii, p. 402.

³ One might think also of S. Prisca on the Aventine, with its tenth-century inscription beginning: *Haec domus est Aquilae seu Priscae virginis almae* (De Rossi, *I.C.R.* ii, p. 443); or of the Horti Aciliorum on the Pincian (Lanciani, *Ruins*, p. 421). But the locality of either is irreconcilable with any interpretation of Gregory's statement.

⁴ Mayor, *Juvenal*, i, p. 92.

⁵ Fronto, *Ep.* i, 8=ii, 1, ed. C. R. Haines (Loeb Classics, i, p. 122): *Horatius Flaccus memorabilis poeta, mibique propter Maecenatem et Maecenatianos hortos meos non alienus*. In buildings connected

with the so-called 'Auditorium Maecenatis,' leaden pipes have been found inscribed with the names *Cornelius Fronto* (probably the orator, and a brother), *Cornelius Quadratus*: *C.I.L.* xv, 7438; Lanciani in *Not. Scav.* iii (1877), p. 85; *Forma Urbis*, t. 23.

⁶ Friedlaender, *Juvenal*, p. 91. The passage from *Sat.* i, 12, is quoted by John of Salisbury, *Pol.* VIII, xiii (Webb ii, p. 320).

⁷ Compare the maps in Lanciani, *Ruins*, figs. 19 and 150.

⁸ Ulrichs, p. 111; Nichols, p. 109.

⁹ Probably the Temple of Serapis. Jordan-Huelsen, i, 3, p. 423; Platner, p. 492. Cp. Lanciani, *Ruins*, p. 430. The ruin of its front pediment was known as 'mensa imperatoris.' Jordan, ii, pp. 425, 527.

suggests that it is the Basilica of Constantine.¹ But in the *Mirabilia* it is at the Vatican, attracted by the legend of St. Peter.² 'The wondrous edifice of Nerva' seems to have been either the Forum of Augustus, which in the twelfth century was known as the Forum of Nerva, or the temple of Antoninus and Faustina, called in the same period the temple of Nervia.³ The 'Palace of Octavian' was on the Capitol, as the legend of the Araceli suggests. Gregory finally mentions the Septizonium by its usual medieval name of the 'Septem solia' ('the seven floors' as Nichols translates it), and quotes two lines of Ovid which were believed to refer to it.⁴ It was, no doubt, far more perfect in his day than at the date of the earliest drawings extant.

The Palace of the Sixty Emperors (20) is a new name to us. Probably this is what Higden's summary of Gregory mentions as the *palatium maius*,⁵ the name used in the *Mirabilia* to describe Domitian's State Palace on the Palatine.⁶ Gregory's title seems to mean the Imperial Palace 'par excellence,' the palace of all the emperors, as contrasted with those called after particular emperors (Augustus, Tiberius, Severus, etc.). The question is, how is the number sixty arrived at? We are not likely to get a satisfactory answer by making a list of legitimate emperors, in order to see whether the sixtieth was the last to be recognized in Rome. Rather we must endeavour to find some enumeration which was current in learned or literary circles about the twelfth century. We meet with such an enumeration, e.g. in Giraldus Cambrensis, when he speaks of Tiberius II (578-582) as the fiftieth Roman emperor.⁷ This would make Theodosius III (716-718) the sixtieth; and, as it was the iconoclastic policy of his successor, Leo the Isaurian, which brought about the revolt of Rome and Byzantine Italy in 728, Theodosius was practically the last Eastern emperor to be recognized without question in Rome. At any rate, a later age may well have thought so.⁸

Next follows a description of the Pantheon (21), which he knows

¹ *L'Itinerario di Einsiedeln*, p. 62 (494).

² Urlichs, p. 105; Nichols, p. 21; Jordan, ii, p. 429.

³ Duchesne, *Mélanges*, ix (1889), p. 354; Lanciani, *L'Itin. Eins.* p. 96.

⁴ The almost identical passage in a late manuscript (16th cent.) of the *Mirabilia* given by Urlichs (p. 136), to which Dr. James has called attention (*E.H.R.* p. 541), may have been copied by the writer from Gregory, whose text would therefore be known to him. But as Gregory introduces the quotation from Ovid by *ut aiunt*, both may have come from a common source.

⁵ *Polychron.* (Rolls Series), i, p. 212. Quoted in *E.H.R.* p. 533.

⁶ Urlichs, pp. 93, 115, 128, 157; Nichols, p. 19. Cp. Graf, p. 89.

⁷ *De Principis Instructione*, Dist. I (Works, Rolls

Series, viii, p. 98). The same system seems to be followed in the Waverley Annals (*Annales Monastici*, Rolls Series, ii, p. 129 ff), the succession after Valentinian I, the thirty-eighth (p. 142), being traced through Valens and the Eastern emperors. This reckoning does not seem to agree exactly with that mentioned by Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire* (ed. 1904), pp. 64, 269.

⁸ As Prof. Bury remarks (*History of the Later Roman Empire*, ii, p. 499), 'it is hard to define at what period the Roman see ceased to be a part of the Roman Empire.' The process of dissolution was not complete till the coronation of Charles the Great in 800. It is unnecessary here to dwell on the history of the palace in the early Middle Ages, and it is enough to recall the facts that Heraclius was the last emperor to be crowned in it (629), that Constans II was the last to visit Rome (663), and

by its ancient name as well as its modern one of Santa Maria Rotunda. In the account of so well-known a building we cannot expect anything very new, but the following points may be noticed. Gregory says he measured the diameter (*latitudinem*) himself, and found that it was (according to the MS.) two hundred and sixty-six feet. The actual internal diameter of the rotunda is only about one hundred and forty (English) feet, but the explanation of the discrepancy must be found in Nibby's statement that the total length of the building including the portico is two hundred and sixty feet.¹ He knows nothing of the plunder of its gilded bronze tiles by Constans II, and attributes their loss to the cupidity of the Roman people—an obvious echo of his intimate relations with the cardinals. He further notices the collection of ancient sarcophagi, baths, and figures, set in front of the portico, where some of them remained till the sixteenth century. In the views of that period they are reduced to the two grey granite lions now in the Vatican (Egyptian Museum), a porphyry bath now the tomb of Clement XII in the Lateran Basilica, and a porphyry basin taken to Ferrara in 1592.² In Gregory's time the collections must have been larger, for he mentions 'baths (*conche*) and other marvellous receptacles (*vasa*) of porphyry, and lions and other figures of the same material.'³

The next section (22) contains new and important information. Gregory says that near the Pantheon was a triumphal arch of Augustus, erected to commemorate the victory of Actium, the triumph of 29 B.C. and the inauguration of the principate in 27 B.C. Such, at any rate, seems to be the inference from the inscription which he records, and the subjects of the reliefs which he describes. The only arch near the Pantheon was the Arcus Pietatis of the Mirabilia, the foundations of which were apparently discovered in the seventeenth century in the middle of the square before the Pantheon, opposite the entrance.⁴ The legend of Trajan and the widow, transferred from the Forum of Trajan to this arch by the time when the Mirabilia was composed,⁵ shows that among its reliefs was one

that, as late as 687, Plato, the father of Pope John VII, still held the office of *curator palatii* (De Rossi, *I.C.R.* ii, p. 442). The explanation suggested above would seem to be the origin also of the sixty kings and sixty queens in Rome mentioned in the Venetian version of the romance of Flore and Blancheflore, to which Graf (p. 108) calls attention.

¹ Middleton, *Ancient Rome*, ii, p. 130. Nibby, *Roma Antica*, ii, p. 691: 'Questa mole [viz. rotunda and portico] ha 260 piedi di profondità, compresa la grossezza de' muri, et 190 di diametro maggiore.'

² Ashby, *Topographical Study*, p. 131, with refs.

³ Lanciani (*Bull. Comm.* xi (1883), p. 56) and Huelsen (*Röm. Mittb.* vi (1891), p. 125) think that the lions probably came from the temple of Isis; but Marucchi (*Bull. Comm.* xviii (1890), pp. 322 ff.) points out that they were rediscovered in front

of the Pantheon under Eugenius IV (c. 1444, and Clement VII, 1531-34: Lanciani, *Scavi*, i, p. 51, ii, p. 30), has argued that they were set up at the entrance of the temple by Augustus or Agrippa to emphasize the fact that, among other things, it was a monument of the conquest of Egypt and the foundation of the Empire. In any case, this mention by Gregory, the earliest we have, shows that they were there in the twelfth century.

⁴ Urlichs, p. 129; Nichols, p. 14; Lanciani in *Not. Scav.* ix (1881), p. 275; Jordan-Huelsen, i, 3, p. 590.

⁵ Nichols, p. 15, n. 29. I note that Boni (*N. Antologia*, 1st Nov. 1906, 'Leggende,' p. 36) has tried to connect Dante's famous description (*Purgatorio*, x, 73 ff.) with a relief on the Arch of Constantine.

of subject peoples imploring the emperor's clemency, and so far confirms Gregory's account. But he shows no knowledge of the popular name, which was, perhaps, not yet in vogue in his time, and in any case, would be ignored by him and the learned circles he represents. The position of the arch shows that it was intimately connected with the general plan of the Pantheon and its surroundings, the work of M. Agrippa; and when we remember that the Pantheon was finished in 27 B.C. and that its primary intention was the cult of the ancestral gods of the Julian family, not to say the glorification of Augustus himself,¹ we begin to see the appropriateness of the site for a triumphal arch in memory of his victory and elevation to the principate. Dio Cassius says (li, 19) that the triumphal arch decreed for Augustus in 30 B.C. was to be in the Forum. There certainly was an arch of Augustus in the Forum, flanking the temple of the deified Julius on the right. But it is clear that this was the arch erected to commemorate the recovery of the standards from the Parthians in 18 B.C.² When Jordan wrote in 1885, he suggested that the earlier arch might have flanked the temple on the other side. But the area of the Forum has been thoroughly explored since then; and, though the foundations of the arch of 18 B.C. have come to light, there is no trace of and, it may be added, no place for a second arch of Augustus.³ After all, Dio Cassius only records the decree or resolution for the erection of an arch, not the erection itself. Before that took place the site may have been changed.⁴ It may have been realized that a more imposing and better seen monument could be erected in Agrippa's new open space in front of the Pantheon than in the already crowded Forum. Or, again, Augustus may have wished to bring together the two monuments so intimately connected with his own glory—the arch and the temple. In the last resort it comes to putting the unconfirmed statement of Dio Cassius against the detailed description of an eye-witness (corroborated, as we shall show, by internal evidence) who, even though he belonged

¹ See the remarks of Marucchi in *Bull. Comm.* xviii, p. 324, referred to above (p. 37, n. 3).

² Jordan, *Topographie*, i, 2, p. 211 and n. 45, quoting the Veronese scholiast on Virgil, *Aen.* vii, 605 (*Paribosque reposita signa*): *huius facti nicae representantur in arcu qui est iuxta aedem divi Iulii*. Cp. Mommsen, *Res Gestae d. Aug.* (2nd ed.), p. 125.

³ The foundations of the triple arch discovered in the Forum confirm the representation on the reverse of a coin of 19 B.C. (Cohen *Médailles*, i, p. 75, no. 82; Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* vi, p. 101). The other arch appearing on coins of Augustus, presumably that of 30 B.C., is a single one (Cohen, i, p. 82, no. 123). Yet Lanciani (*Ruins*, p. 270; *Scavi*, ii, p. 200) identifies the foundations in the Forum with the arch of 30 B.C., and has suggested

(*Not. Scav.* x (1882), p. 343) that the inscription *C.I.L.* vi, 873, in honour of Augustus *republica conservata*, came from it. But the slab (now lost) was too small, being only about 2.70 m. long, whereas the central passage of the arch discovered in 1883 was over 4 m. wide (Platner, *Ancient Rome*, p. 253). Its original position is quite uncertain. Cp. Huelsen in *Jahrb. Inst.* iv (1889), p. 231, n. 7; *C.I.L.* vi, 31188a; *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*, ii (1902), p. 239.

⁴ Cp. Jordan, i, 2, p. 211: 'Ob der andere Bogen [of 30 B.C.] wirklich zur Ausführung gekommen ist, ist unbekannt.' n. 45: 'Dass er jemals gebaut worden ist, sagt Niemand.' It might be suggested tentatively that the inscription *C.I.L.* vi, 873, belonged to a substitute monument in the Forum, intended to give some effect to that part of the decree of 30 B.C. which referred to the place of the memorial.

to the twelfth century, was in touch with a learned world to which the incidents of Roman history were familiar.¹

Let us now examine the details of Gregory's description, in order to see whether they are consistent with an Augustan origin of the arch. He begins with what professes to be a transcript of the dedicatory inscription : *Ob orbem devictum Romano regno restitutum et rempublicam per Augustum receptam populus Romanus hoc opus condidit.*² It is difficult to accept this as a literal transcript of an Augustan inscription. The Roman people would never have been mentioned without the senate as the State authority erecting such a monument, nor would *regnum* have been used instead of *imperium*. The concluding phrase, too, is superfluous and unparalleled in such inscriptions. We may, then, assume that these expressions are due to the medieval observer, and that we have here, not the actual words, but a summary of the inscription, perhaps given to Gregory by one of his learned Roman informants. He shows no ability or desire to copy inscriptions literally, as the Einseideln pilgrim had done some three centuries earlier. In fact his remarks about the bronze table of archaic law, which we discussed above (p. 29), suggest that he felt himself rather helpless before them.

On the other hand, with these qualifications, the most important phrases of the transcript have an unmistakable Augustan ring. *Ob orbem devictum Romano regno restitutum* recalls the title of the Ancyran monument : *Rerum gestarum divi Augusti quibus orbem terrarum imperio populi Romani subiecit*, and the opening words of the third chapter : *Bella terra et mari civilia externaque toto in orbe terrarum suscepi victorque*, etc. And *rempublicam per Augustum receptam* seems to be an echo either of the *republica conservata* of the Forum inscription in honour of Augustus mentioned above,³ or more probably of the *restitutio reipublicae*, the familiar phrase used to describe the inauguration of the constitutional Principate in 27 B.C.⁴ These are coincidences which are not likely to have been invented by any one in the twelfth century. Through these phrases of the summary we seem to see a genuine Augustan inscription of 27 B.C., the year in which the Pantheon was finished. And in the new open space connected with it the triumphal arch to which the inscription belonged found, I suggest, an appropriate site.

In the description of the arch, Gregory begins with the figures

¹ Lanciani discussing the discovery of the foundation of the Arcus Pietatis recorded by P. Sante Bartoli (*Mem.* 113), expresses the opinion that it commemorated the triumph of some fourth or fifth century emperor. If it had belonged to an emperor 'dei buoni tempi,' it would without fail have been mentioned by the historians (*Not. Scav.* ix (1881), p. 276). But such an important Augustan monument as the Ara Pacis is not mentioned in ancient literature, and it was not till the nineteenth century that its remains were connected with the

contemporary notices in the Ancyran Monument (Mommsen, *Res Gestae*, p. 49) and the Calendars (*C.I.L.* i, p. 320). Cp. *Röm. Mitt.* ix (1894), p. 171.

² For the form compare the concluding phrases of the inscription on the arch of Severus in the Forum (*C.I.L.* vi, 1033) : *ob rem publicam restitutam imperiumque populi Romani propagatum*, etc.

³ *C.I.L.* vi, 873. See p. 38, note 3.

⁴ Mommsen, *Res Gestae*, p. 145 sqq.

of Augustus (on a larger scale than the rest) and his generals. It is not quite clear whether these were statues standing on the top of the structure, or whether they appeared in the reliefs, but I think the former is intended. The subjects of the reliefs described are the victory of Actium, the flight and death of Cleopatra, and the triumphal procession of Augustus. The form of the description seems to suggest some literary source in which Gregory, or his informants, had verified the subjects; and though these contain nothing to arouse suspicion, in only one detail (so far as I know) can we control the account by an ancient authority, and that is the representation of Cleopatra's death, which, as we learn from Dio Cassius, actually figured in the triumph. No doubt the episode on the arch was modelled on the plastic group which was carried in the procession.¹

Gregory does not, as one might expect, describe other well-known triumphal arches, such as those of Titus and Constantine, but sums them up in a general statement to the effect that, when you have seen one, you have seen all (23). However, he makes an exception in favour of what he calls the arch of Pompey (24), connected with the triumph of 61 B.C. for his victory over Mithradates and conquests in the East. Though confirmatory ancient evidence is lacking, there is no valid reason for distrusting this statement. Such an arch would have been an appropriate adjunct to the group of great public buildings erected by Pompey in the Campus Martius, in some such way as the arch of Trajan formed part of the design of that emperor's Forum. The only other mention of this arch of Pompey seems to be a reference in a letter of Petrarch, about the middle of the fourteenth century; and this may be taken as a confirmation of Gregory's statement, belonging as it does to an age when Roman inscriptions were once more understood and appreciated.²

Gregory, apparently as an afterthought, describes one more triumphal arch, which he says was erected in honour of Scipio and his victory over Hannibal (26). There appears to be no other reference to an arch of this name; but if the 'temple of Scipio' mentioned in the *Mirabilia* was, as seems probable, near S. Gregorio,³ it might be suggested that the arch described is that of Constantine.

¹ Dio Cass. li, 21. I have already called attention (p. 16, n. 3) to the reminiscence of Virgil's *pallentem morte futura* (*Aen.* viii, 709) in the words of the description *superba mulier moritura pallescit*, whether due to Gregory or to his authority. Horace's famous ode on the same subject (1 *Carm.* xxxvii) emphasizes just the same two episodes, the flight and pursuit, and the death of Cleopatra; and his closing words, *superbo non humilis mulier triumpho* may have suggested the *superba mulier* of our account.

² Petrarch, *Epistolae de rebus famil.* VI, ii (ed. J. Fracassetti, Florence, 1859, i, p. 313: letter to Giovanni Colonna): *hic Pompeii arcus, haec porticus*, quoted by Nibby, *Roma Antica*, ii, p. 616. The

name of Pompey and the identity of his theatre were too well preserved during the Middle Ages (see Nibby, l.c.) to make it likely that there has been any confusion with the arch of Tiberius *iuxta Pompei theatrum* (Sueton. *Claud.* 11). For the same reason we may reject the arch of Severus with its long train of wagons laden with spoils (Reinach, *Rép. de Reliefs*, i, 268), recalling a similar representation to which Gregory calls special attention in describing the arch of Pompey (*immensum pondus auri et argenti . . . quod longo ordine Pompeiano triumpho prelatum est*).

³ Urlichs, p. 111, l. 5; Nichols, p. 106. Cp. Jordan, ii, p. 515.

Apart from this, the scenes on that arch do seem to provide illustrations for the somewhat fanciful history which, Gregory says, was sculptured on the monument. The application of the battle scenes, whether of Trajan or of Constantine, is obvious; and the warning of Hannibal's 'domestic demon' might easily be connected with the medallions of a dedication to Silvanus or scenes of sacrifice, all of which take place before the image of a deity.¹ Again, in some of these or other medallions we might find the 'colloquy' between Scipio and Hannibal; and I know of no Roman relief which would more readily connect with the two great dogs which, in Gregory's story, followed Hannibal to one of the conferences, than the first of Trajan's, or rather, as is now thought, Hadrian's hunting scenes.² And when Gregory says that Hannibal died asleep after taking poison carried in his ring,³ we may note at the beginning of one of the battle reliefs a dead Dacian lying almost in an attitude of repose.⁴

Next comes an account of the triumphal columns (25), of which he says there were five, all alike. As the one which he describes under the name of Fabricius must evidently be either the column of Trajan or that of Marcus Aurelius, the only two columns of the type in Rome, his statement is clearly wrong. But it is possible that in his day a number of isolated memorial columns were still standing; e.g. the column of Antoninus Pius, eight which, we know, encroached on the open space of the Forum in the age of Constantine, five which appear behind the Rostra on a relief of that emperor's arch, and the column of Phocas, the only one which has survived to modern times. This may have been the foundation for his calculation. How are we to decide which it is of the two great *columnae cochlides* that he ascribes to Fabricius? He says that it is the tallest structure in Rome (*qua, ut arbitror, nil alcius habet Roma*). As a matter of fact the columns of Trajan and Marcus are each exactly 100 (Roman) feet high; but the *Mirabilia* (which knows the ancient names) states that the height of the latter was 175 ft. and that of the former only 138 ft.⁵ We must remember that in the Middle Ages the base of Trajan's column was buried, whereas that of Marcus seems always to have stood free. If we can believe that the view from the top of the Aurelian column was one of the regular sights for visitors to Rome,⁶ this would be quite enough to account for Gregory's statement that it is the highest structure in the city. As for his account of the sculptures, we may note that in the later Middle Ages the historical identity of the

¹ Reinach, *Rép. de Reliefs*, i, pp. 250, 251.

² Reinach, *Rép. de Rel.* i, p. 251, no. 5; *Fabrb. Inst.* xxxiv (1919), p. 144.

³ This detail seems to come from the *Liber de viris illustribus* (printed with Aurelius Victor), 42, 6: *hausto quod sub gemma anuli habebat veneno absumptus est*. Gregory says that Hannibal took refuge with king Lircus (not Prusias, as one would

expect). Sir J. E. Sandys suggests that possibly the name conceals that of Seleucus, son of Antiochus III, who received Hannibal on his arrival at Antioch.

⁴ Reinach, *Rép. de Rel.* i, p. 252, no. 1.

⁵ Urlichs, p. 98; Nichols, p. 25.

⁶ This is an inference from the fact that the column brought in a rent to its owners. Lanciani, *Ruins*, p. 509; *Destruction of Ancient Rome*, p. 166.

column was even more completely lost than that of Trajan's.¹ In any case, the reliefs of the Aurelian column contain episodes of captives brought before the emperor, which are sufficient to explain Gregory's story of the traitor physician of Pyrrhus.²

The following sections (27-29) treat of the 'pyramids' of Rome, which Gregory describes as 'the sepulchres of the mighty.'³ Under this term he includes monuments of two different kinds. In the first place he describes the two best known examples of the type of tomb imitated (on a smaller scale) from the Egyptian pyramid. One of these, standing by the road between the Castle of St. Angelo and St. Peter's, was known all through the Middle Ages as the Meta, or as Gregory calls it, the Tomb of Romulus, Sepulchrum Romuli, and did not disappear till the end of the fifteenth century. We know nothing of its original destination or occupant, but apparently, in Gregory's time, it still contained its sarcophagus. Like other objects along one of the most frequented pilgrim routes, it gave rise to various legends, one of which is mentioned with some contempt by Gregory, viz. that it was St. Peter's heap of corn, confiscated by Nero, and turned into stone. I think St. Peter's corn must have been grown on the *arvagia* which the *Solace of Pilgrimes* mentions in connexion with the Tomb of Romulus, and derives from *arvus*.⁴ With the Meta Romuli went, in popular medieval nomenclature, the Meta or Tomb of Remus, viz. the pyramid of Gaius Cestius by the Porta S. Paolo. Hence it is probable that the other pyramid mentioned by Gregory as the pyramid of Augustus (28) is that of Cestius; and this is confirmed by his remark about its perfect condition, which it retains more or less to the present day, and, of course, owes to the fact that it is incorporated in the Aurelian wall. Either by a slip or a misunderstanding Gregory says it was near the Latin Gate.⁵

The other objects included by Gregory under the term 'pyramids' are the obelisks, of which, he truly says, Rome contained many. He selects for description the most remarkable one, in his opinion, viz. the Vatican obelisk, now standing in front of St. Peter's, but in

¹ Thus, in the 'Solace of Pilgrimes' (p. 140) the subjects of the Antonine column are 'the stories of the batail of troye.' We may note that Giovanni Cavallino, about the middle of the fourteenth century, believing that the column was erected by the emperor 'Antonius' to commemorate the great Romans of the past, includes Fabricius in the list of those whose images and exploits were sculptured on its surface. Graf, p. 114. For Cavallino see Graf, p. 56, and Urlichs, p. 139, who does not include the passage among his extracts.

² e.g. Reinach, *Rép. de Reliefs*, i, p. 302, no. 34.

³ For the name of the geometrical figure to which he compares the 'pyramids'—*in summitate acute, figuram b'ecnoidis referentes*, see note by Sir T. L. Heath on p. 58.

⁴ Cap. xxi, p. 47 and note 2, where Huelsen derives *arvagia* by corruption from the *Almachia* of the 15th cent. Anonymus Magliabecchianus (Urlichs, p. 161), itself a corruption of *Naumachia* of the earlier Mirabilia (Urlichs, 106; Nichols, 75). But the legend told by Gregory suggests that the word is not a late corruption.

⁵ There is no record of a pyramid near the Porta Latina. The connexion of the name of Augustus with the pyramid of Cestius does not appear elsewhere. The Mausoleum of Augustus cannot be meant, for it was not near any gate. There was another sepulchral pyramid near the Porta Flaminia (Lanciani, *Destruction* etc. p. 210), but there is no reason to think that it is the monument referred to by Gregory.

Gregory's day in its original place on the *spina* of the Circus of Caligula hard by. The gilt bronze ball on its summit, he tells us, contained the ashes of Julius Caesar; a tradition which can be traced as far back as the middle of the eleventh century,¹ and was no doubt derived partly from the account in Suetonius of the memorial column erected on the spot where Caesar's remains had been cremated in the Forum, and partly from the first words of the dedicatory inscription on the obelisk in honour of Augustus and Tiberius: *Divo Caesari Divi Iulii*.² The height reported on hearsay by Gregory—250 ft.—has no relation to the true dimensions, the total height of the existing structure from the ground to the top of the cross being only a little over 130 ft. Two epigrams are connected with this monument in the *Mirabilia* and other medieval accounts. The one which is quoted by Gregory in the form:—

*Si lapis est unus, dic qua sit arte levatus ;
Si lapides plures, dic ubi congeries.*

does not appear till the fourteenth century edition of the *Mirabilia*,³ and he seems to be the earliest authority for it. He does not quote the other one:—

*Caesar tantus eras quantus et orbis,
Sed nunc in modico clauderis antro.*

which was taken from the epitaph of the Emperor Henry III (d. 1056)⁴; but the passage with which he concludes his account of Caesar's death: *Caesar itaque dominator et dominus orbis terrarum . . . in paruum redactus cinerem predicta enea spera clauditur*, shows that he knew of it. The four bronze lions, on which he says the obelisk rested, are mentioned in other medieval accounts.⁵

A few words may be added about those items from the tract on the Seven Wonders of the World which were incorporated by Gregory in his treatise, though he realized that they were not to be found at Rome. Among these may be included the iron Bellerophon suspended in the air by magnets (9), for, though he says that it was once at Rome, he regularly speaks of it in the past tense as a thing that was no longer there. Perhaps he was misled by some such corruption of the

¹ Lanciani, *Ruins*, p. 552; Urlichs, p. 221. The ball is now in the Palace of the Conservatori (Bronzi, no. 4). Cp. Lanciani, *Scavi*, ii, p. 92.

² Suetonius, *Divus Iulius*, 85. *C.I.L.* vi, 882. Cp. Nichols, p. 71, n. 129; Graf, p. 228.

³ Urlichs, p. 132; Nichols, p. 73, with *contigui* instead of *congeries*, thus missing the rhyme. A version quoted by Graf (p. 231, n. 97) from the Harleian MS. 562 shows that the word came from a third line (coming second in the epigram): *Si lapides bini dic ubi contigui*.

⁴ William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum*, II, xii. Cp. Graf, p. 232; Jordan, ii, p. 373. Others attributed it to Lothair II (d. 1137); Burmann, *Anthol.* ii, p. 153.

⁵ Nichols, p. 72, n. 130; A. Neckham, *laud. div. sap.* (R.S.), 320 (quoted by Dr. James, *E.H.R.* p. 542). Dr. Ashby points out that when the obelisk was moved in 1589, its supports were no longer in the form of lions (Fontana, *Della trasportazione dell' obelisco vaticano*, p. 15).

text : *in summa civitate* for *in Smyrna civitate*, as appears in certain manuscripts.¹ S. Reinach has traced the probable development of the legend from some actual bronze at Smyrna, ingeniously poised so as to suggest the moment when Pegasus was about to take flight in the air.²

The theatre at Heraclea, the fifth of the wonders, is introduced by Gregory (II) immediately after the account of the sulphur bath of Apollonius, and without any very special connexion. Apparently Heraclea *ad Latmum* near the mouth of the Maeander is meant, where the actual remains are those of a theatre excavated in the rock, which, of course, is what Gregory means by saying that the building was formed out of one solid stone. I have been unable to ascertain whether there are any traces of the curious acoustic properties attributed to it, or of the six crabs on which it is said to have rested.³ The idea of these crabs reappears in the case of the second of the wonders, the Pharos of Alexandria, introduced by Gregory immediately after his account of the supposed monument of Julius Caesar (30), and apparently, as Dr. James suggests (*E.H.R.* p. 539), as a parallel to its inexplicable construction. Here the structure is said to rest on four crabs of glass under the sea. In the version of the Seven Wonders edited by Gregory of Tours⁴ the Pharos is also said to rest on four crabs; but they are not described as of glass or under water, and it is only their size which made them remarkable. As Dr. Krusch has remarked,⁵ the Pseudo-Bede and Gregory of Tours must have derived their accounts of the Pharos and the theatre of Heraclea from some common source, though there is apparently no trace of any earlier form of the legend. But, so far as the crabs are concerned, it may have had some basis of fact, for when preparations were being made in 1877 for the removal of the so-called Cleopatra's Needle and its fellow obelisk at Alexandria, it was discovered that the still erect obelisk (and originally, no doubt, the other as well) had rested on four copper crabs, one of which partly survived (now in the Metropolitan Museum, New York), with a dedicatory inscription by P. Rubrius Barbarus, prefect of Egypt, of the year 13 B.C.⁶ As these obelisks stood on the quay of the port, facing the Pharos, and were objects of much notoriety, it is not impossible that some old description of them with their supporting crabs may have been confused by a later or medieval compiler with the Pharos itself.

¹ H. Omont in *Bibl. de l'École des Chartes*, xliii (1882), p. 49, from the 12th cent. MS. of the Sorbonne.

² *Revue Archéologique*, 4 S, xx (1912), p. 330. G. Deonna (*Rev. Arch.* xxiv, 102) thinks that it may have been an oscillating statue. Cp. Plin. *H.N.* xxxiv, 75.

³ Choiseul-Gouffier, *Voyage pitt. de la Grèce*, i (1782), p. 177: 'On distingue encore dans ses ruines qui sont considérables, les vestiges . . . d'un théâtre creusé dans la montagne.' The theatre is

barely mentioned in Th. Wiegand's *Latmos* (Bd. iii, Heft i of *Milet*, Berlin 1913), p. 13, but a monograph on Heraclea is promised (cp. p. vii). One might suggest that here the 'crabs' are not unconnected with the medieval use of *cancer* for an arch or vault (Ducange).

⁴ *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum* (*Mon. Germ. Hist.*), i, p. 859.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 855.

⁶ *B.C.H.* ii (1878), p. 175 ff. *C.I.L.* iii, Suppl. i, 6588.

The text of Magister Gregorius here printed is for the most part a reproduction of that published by Dr. M. R. James in the *English Historical Review*, xxxii (1917), pp. 543-554; but the Rev. H. J. Chaytor, Librarian of St. Catharine's College, has been good enough to collate it with the MS., and has made a few corrections. A number of corrections and suggestions have been kindly supplied by Prof. C. H. Turner of Oxford, and these are distinguished by an accompanying T in the notes. A few notes of my own are marked R.

*Incipit prologus magistri Gregorii de mirabilibus que Rome quondam fuerunt vel adhuc sunt, et quorum uestigia presens memoria hodieque retinet.*¹ 190 a.

Multo sociorum meorum rogatu et precipue magistri Martini et domini Thome et aliorum plurium dilectissimorum meorum cogor que apud Romam maiori admiracione digna didici scripto assignare. Ceterum ualde uereor parum conferenti relatione sacrum studium uestrum et lectionis diuine interpolare delicias, et aures summorum doctorum sermonibus assuetas rudi oratione offendere erubesco. Quis enim deliciis assuetos conuiuas aride et rusticane cene presumat inuitare? Hinc est quod cunctabundam² manum operi promisso coactus inpono. Quoniam dum incompositi sermonis mei nuditatem attendo, sepe sumpturus calamum mentem a proposito reuoco. Sed uicit tandem apud me uotum consodaliu uerecundiam meam, qui ne ueritati promisse obuiarem sumpto calamo in³ manu rudi et minus perita opus promissum quo melius potui in hunc modum persolui. *Explicit prologus.*

Incipit narracio de mirabilibus urbis Rome que uel arte magica uel humano labore sunt condita.

1. Uehemencius igitur admirandam ce<n>seo tocius urbis inspectionem. Vbi tanta seges turrium, tot edificia palatiorum, quot nulli hominum con|tigit enumerare. Quam cum primo a latere montis a longe uidissem, stupefactam mentem meam illud Cesarianum subiit, quod quondam uictis Gallis cum Alpes superuolaret inquit magne miratus

menia Rome
*Tene deum sedes non ullo Marte coacti
Deseruere uiri! pro qua pugnabitur urbe?
Dii melius, etc.*

Lucan iii.
90 sqq.

Paulo post: *Ignauae manus liquere urbem capacem turbe humani generis si coiret*; et Romam inuocans *instar summi numinis eam* appellat. Cuius incomprehensibilem decorem diu admirans deo apud me gratias egi, qui magnus in uniuersa terra ibi opera hominum inestimabili decore mirificauit. Nam licet tota Roma ruat, nil tamen integrum sibi potest equiparari. Unde quidam sic ait:

*Par tibi, Roma, nichil, cum sis prope tota ruina:
Fracta docere potes integra quanta fores.*

Hildebert,
P.L. clxxi.
1409.

¹ retinet] manet. Dr. James also omits the que, but the form hodieque is found in post-Augustan Latin. See *De Vit.* T.

² cunctabundam] contaliundam.
³ calamo in] calamoni.

Readings
of the MS.

Cuius ruina ut arbitror docet euidenter cuncta temporalia proxime ruitura, presertim cum capud omnium temporalium Roma tantum cotidie languescit et labitur.

2. Huius urbis porte .xiii. sunt, quarum hec sunt nomina :

Porta aurea. Porta Latina. Porta sacra. Porta Salaria. Porta Marcia. Porta Liuia. Porta Collatina. Porta Flaminea.¹ Porta Numantia. Porta Appia. Porta Ti[r]burtina. Porta Aquileia que nunc sancti Laurentii dicitur. Porta Asinaria.

191 a. 3. Et primum quidem de signi<s> ereis huius | urbis disseram.

De primo signo eneo. Primum signum ereum taurus est in specie illius quo Iupiter Europam iuxta fabulam decepit. Hoc² autem signum eminens a uallo castris Crescentii tanto pollet artificio ut inspicientibus mugituro et moturo similis uideatur.

4. *De secundo signo.*

Aliud signum eneam est ante palatium domini pape, equus uidelicet immensus et sessor eius, quem peregrini Theodericum, populus uero Romanus Constantinum dicunt. At cardinales et clerici Romane curie seu Marcum seu Quintum Quirinum appellant. Hoc² autem memoriale mira arte perfectum super iiii^{or} columnas ereas antiquitus ante aram Iouis in capitolio stabat : set beatus Gregorius equitem et equum suum deiecit, et quatuor columpnas prefatas in ecclesia beati Iohannis Lateranensis posuit. Romani uero equitem cum equo ante palatium domini pape posuerunt. Eratque equus et eques et columpne optime deaurate, set pluribus in locis partem auri³ Romana abrasit auaricia, partem uero uetustas deleuit. Sedet autem eques manum dexteram dirigens tanquam populo loquens uel imperans. Sinistra manu frenum retentat, quo capud equi in dexteram partem obliquat, tanquam alio diuersurus. Auicula etiam
191 b. quam cuculam uocant inter aures equi sedet, | et nanus⁴ quidam sub pede equi premitur, miram morientis et extrema patientis speciem representans. Hoc autem opus admirabile sicut diuersa sortitum est nomina, sic et diuersas compositionis⁵ causas suscepit. Ceterum peregrinorum et Romanorum super hac re uanas fabulas penitus declinabo, eamque originem huius operis assignabo quam a senioribus et cardinalibus et uiris doctissimis didici.

Qui Marcum appellant, hanc compositionis causam assignant.

Rex Misenorum corpore quidem nanus⁴ peritie uero artis nigromantie pre⁶ cunctis mortalibus inbutus, cum finitimos sibi reges subiugasset, regnum Romanorum aggressus est, cum quibus facili euentu⁷ plurima bella gessit. Quippe et robur hostium et

¹ porta flammea.

² Hos.

³ corr. from auro.

⁴ manus.

⁵ compositionis] compositio. Cf. compositionis. causam *four lines below.* T.

⁶ pre] praua.

⁷ euentui.

aciem armorum arte magica ita prestrinxit quod hostes uirtutem ferendi et arma usum secandi penitus amiserunt. Vnde facile superior factus in omni certamine Romanos tantum castris coegit confidere. Ad ultimum autem eos arta obsidione¹ circumdedit. Obsessi itaque Romani nullum subsidium sibi reperire potuerunt. Magus etenim ille memoratus singulis diebus ante lucis | ortum^{192 a.} extra castra solus egrediebatur, aisque a castris quantum clamor auditur appellantis, artem magicam solus in agro exercuit. Ibiue uerbis quibusdam secretis et prestigiis potentibus obtinuit ne Romani ullam uirtutem uictorie contra eum possent exercere. Quod cum a Romanis compertum esset, et ex multa consuetudine didicissent eum ita a castris exire, quendam militem strenuissimum² Marcum nomine adierunt. Cui summum honorem promiserunt si se uellet periculo opponere ut urbem ab illa obsidione liberaret. Dominiumque ei liberate urbis pepigerunt, et memoriale sempiternum promiserunt. Quibus cum prono fauore paruisset, sanccto federe³ protinus murum et ante murale⁴ ex ea parte qua rex predictus exire solebat noctu perforauerunt ubi miles memoratus cum equo suo transire posset. Deinde ei consilium suum apperunt, uidelicet ut nocte exiens regem Misenorum a castris egredientem non armis aggrediretur, quibus minime ledi potuisset, set manu raptum intra muros reciperet. Quorum consilio omnino paruit, et de nocte media murum exiuit. Cumque auroram uigili animo exspectaret, cuculus ut assolet cantum emisit, | signum scilicet lucis orientis. Quo eques^{192 b.} admonitus ascenso equo regem tunc primum frustra magica arte occupatum conspexit. Et eo uasto inpetu raptus inprouiso casu magum⁵ manu raptum infra murum recepit. Quem in conspectu populi, metuentis <ne> si capto fandi moram concederent, se per artem magicam liberaret, sub pedibus equi sui contritum occidit. Non enim armis ei quisquam nocere potuit. Deinde portis apertis rege perempto exercitum perturbatum et in fugam conuersum inuadunt et occidunt, maximaque copia in ea pugna capta et cesa est. Nec ulla spolia tantum Romanorum ditauerunt erarium; et ob huius beneficii commodum pretaxatum ei memoriale statutum est. Cui equum adhibuerunt, quod ueloci cursu profuit, auem, quod nuncia lucis exstitit. Nanum autem sub pedibus equi posuerunt, quod protritum occubuit.

5. *Alia causa composi<ti>onis huius signi.*

Qui uero Quintum Quirinum dicunt, hanc causam assignant.

Tempore quo Quintus Quirinus r. p. rexit, in palatio Salustiano terra magno hiatu dissiliit. Vnde ignis sulphureus et aer corruptus exiuit, quibus orta grauissima pestilencia magnam partem | Roman-^{193 a.}

¹ obsidi esse.

² strenuissima.

³ fidere.

⁴ antemurale] anum murale. T. Cf. *Vulg. Isaia*, xxvi, 1: murus et antemurale.

⁵ magnum.

orum deleuit. Cumque tabe moriencium pestilencia cotidie sumeret incrementum, Febo consulto didicerunt quod numquam cessaret nisi aliquis Romanorum se sponte hiato prefato precipitaret, preferens salutem populi sue proprie saluti. Itaque¹ quendam ciuem Romanorum, generose quidem stirpis, set etate et ignauia inutilem sibi et urbi uitam degentem, exorauerunt ut se uictimam pro salute universe urbis faceret. Ea quidem condicione, quod progeniem eius totam ditarent et in numero potentum susciperent. Qui id omni<n>o renuens respondit sibi nichil prodesse posteritatis gloriam suscipe<re si ipse>² uiuus regionem intraret tartaream. Deinde uero cum in tota urbe nullum penitus inuenirent qui ad ullam conuentionem huiusmodi uictimam uelle<t> persolvere, Quintus Quirinus coram contione tocius urbis sic ait : Sepe in ancipiti casu bellorum pro re publica periculum subiui mortis. Nunc autem cum nemo reperitur qui salutem populi sui preferat proprie saluti, princeps ego orbis e<t> urbis huius dominus paratus sum pro salute ciuium uiuus tartareum ingredi aditum. Idque coniugi mee et liberis et toti posteritati mee inconcusse seruari uolo quod ignauis promissum est. Et ascenso equo^{193 b.} coram cuncti<s> alacer et intrepidus, tanquam | conuiuium aditurus, se cursu ueloci in aditum prefatum precipitauit. Et protinus quedam auis in specie cuculi inde exiuit,³ et ilico hiatus os suum compressit, et omnis pestilencia habiit. Liberati itaque a tanta peste Romani ob summum beneficium memoriale ei statuerunt sempiternum. Cui equum quod eo uectus pro cunctis mactatus est adhibuerunt, auem uero que a specu exiuit inter aures equi statuerunt, et nanum qui cum uxore eius concubuit pedibus equi supposuerunt.

6. De tercio signo eneo.

Tercium signum est imago Colosei, quam quidam statuam solis existimant, alii Rome effigiem dicunt. De qua hec admodum miranda sunt. Videlicet quomodo tanta⁴ moles fundi potuit uel quomodo erigi aut stare mirum est. Fuit enim longitudo eius, ut scriptum repperi, c. xx. vi pedum. Stabat autem hec imago tam immense magnitudinis in insula Herodii super Colosseum .xv. pedibus altior eminentioribus locis et⁵ urbe. In manu dextera⁶ speram gerebat, et in sinistra gladium. Per speram mundum et per gladium <uim>⁷ bellicam significabat. Gladium autem ideo Romani sinistre et speram dextre commiserunt quod minoris uirtutis est querere quam quesita seruare : unde quidam familiaris philosophie sic ait :

^{194 a.}
Lucan i.
^{510.}

O facile<s> dare⁸ | summa deos, eademque tueri
Difficiles !

¹ Itaque] In
² ipse add. T.
³ inde exiuit] nō exiuit. qu. in specie cuculina
exiuit. T.
⁴ tanta] canta.

⁵ qu. in. R.
⁶ altera dextera.
⁷ uim add. T. Dr. James supplied uirtutem
after significabat.
⁸ dare] dere.

Quare non ob aliam causam firmiori parti¹ commisere speram et infirmiori gladium, nisi quia minori uirtute orbem sibi subiugauerunt quam subiugatum seruauerunt. Hec autem imago enea tota auro imperiali deaurata per tenebras irradiabat. De qua longe ante omnia monstruosum fuit quod continuo et equali motu cum sole circumferebatur, semper solari corpori faciem gerens oppositam. Qua de causa multi² solis imaginem credebant. Hanc dum Roma floruit quicumque Romam ueniebat flexis genibus adorabat, Rome scilicet deferens honorem, cuius suplex uenerabatur imaginem. Hanc autem statuam post destructionem omnium statuarum que Rome fuerunt et deturpacionem beatus Gregorius hoc modo destruxit. Cum tantam molem multa ui et graui conamine non posset euertere, copiosum ignem idolo supponi iussit, et sic inmensum illud simulacrum in antiquum chaos et rudem materiam redegit. Ex quo tamen caput et manus dextera cum spera tanto superfuere incendio. Que nunc ante palatium domini pape duabus marmoreis erecta columpnis mirandum spectaculum cunctis spectantibus exhibent. Nam cum horrende magnitudinis sint, mira tamen³ laus ar<ti>ficis in his apparet.⁴ Nichil quippe habet perfecte | pulcritudinis humanum capud uel^{194 b.} manus quod his ulla parte desit. Miro enim modo ars fusilis in ere rigido molles mentitur⁵ capillos. Quod si quis defixis⁶ luminibus attentius inspexerit, moturo et locuturo simillimum uidetur. Nullum namque signum, ut aiunt, tanta cura uel in pensis in urbe conditum fuit.

7. De ridiculoso simulachro Priapi.

Est etiam aliud eneum simulacrum ualde ridiculosum quod Pria<pum> dicunt. Qui demisso⁷ capite uelud spinam calcatam educturus de pede, asperam lesionem patientis speciem representat. Cui si demisso⁷ capite uelut quid agat exploraturus suspexeris, mire magnitudinis uirilia uidebis.

8. De multitudine statuarum.

Inter uniuersa opera monstruosa que Rome quondam fuerunt, magis miranda est multitudo statuarum que Saluacio ciuium dicebatur. Hic arte magica fuit consecratio statuarum omnium gentium que Romano regno subiecte fuerunt. Nulla etenim gens siue regio subiecta fuit Romano imperio cuius imago in quadam domo ad has <conservandas>⁸ consecrata non esset. Huius autem domus magna pars parietum adhuc restat, et cripte eius horride et inaccessibiles apparent. In hac quondam domo predictae imagines ex | ordine stabant, et quelibet imago nomen gentis illius cuius^{195 a.} imaginem tenebat in pectore scriptum habebat, et tintinnabulum

¹ parte.

² Qua de causa multi] Quare nisti causa.

³ tamen] cum.

⁴ apparet.

⁵ mentitur] inrētitur.

⁶ defexis.

⁷ dimisso.

⁸ add. T.

argenteum, quod omni metallo sonorius est, unaqueque in collo gerebat. Erantque sacerdotes die ac nocte semper uigilantes, qui eas custodiebant. Et si qua gens in rebellionem consurgere conabatur in inperium Romanorum, protinus statua illius mouebatur, et tintinnabulum in collo eius sonuit et statim scriptum nomen illius ymaginis sacerdos principibus deportabat. Erat autem supra domum hiis ymaginibus consecratam miles eneus cum equo suo semper concordans motui imaginis, lanceamque apud illam gentem dirigens cuius ymago mouebatur. Hoc itaque non dubio indicio premoniti Romani principes sine mora exercitum ad rebellionem illius gentis reprimendam direxerunt. Qui sepius hostes antequam arma et impedimenta parassent preuenientes facile et sine sanguine eos sibi subiugauerunt. Fertur autem in eadem domo ignem inextinguibilem¹ inesse.¹ De hoc autem mirando opere artifex sciscitatus quam diu duraret, respondit illud duraturum donec uirgo pareret. Dicunt autem ingenti ruina militem prefatum cum domo sua corruisse ea nocte qua Christus natus fuit de uirgine, et lumen illud ficticium et magicum | extinctum est, iure, cum lux uera et sempiterna oriri cepisset. Credibile est et malignum hostem potenciam fallendi homines deseruisse cum deus homo esse cepisset.

9. *De ferreo simul<acro> Belloforontis* [sic].

Fuit etiam ingens miraculum Rome, ferreum simulacrum Belloforontis cum equo suo consistens in aëre, nec tamen ulla cathena superius appensum, nec inferius ullo stipite sustentatum. Set magnetes lapides in arcus inuolsura² circumquaque habebantur,³ et hinc et inde in assumptione proporcionali trahebatur, et sic in mensura equiparata constabat. Erat tamen existimacio ponderis huius circiter xv. m.⁴ librarum ferri.

10. *De balneo Bianei Appollinis.*

Est etiam ualde mirandum balneum Bianei Appollinis quod Rome adhuc est. Hoc autem balneum Bianeus Apollo confectione quadam sulphuris et nigri salis et tartari arte miranda eneo uase inclusa perfecit. Perfectasque termas cum una candela consecrationis incendit, et perpetuo igne calentes effecit. Hoc quidem balneum ipse uidi et in eo manus laui. Datoque precio balneari renui ob fetorem odoris sulphurei.

11. *De theatro in Eraclea.*

Theatrum autem admirabile in Eraclea de monte marmoreo inter
196 a. monstrosa | non pigebit referre. Quod⁵ quidem ita scu<l>ptum

¹ inesse] inc'e' qu. incendere or incendi. R.

² arcus inuolsura (qu. inuoltura)] artus imolsura, i.e. there are four down strokes before o. Read in arcus uoltura 'in the groining of the vault.' R.

³ habebantur bis.

⁴ m.] iiii.

⁵ Quod] Quid.

est ut omnes cellule mansionum et sedilia uniuersa per girum et exitus omnes et antra ex uno solidoque lapide¹ sculpta sint. Uniuer-<sum> etiam hoc opus super .vi. cancos ex ipso monte sculptos innititur. Ubi nullus tam secrete aut solus aut cum alio loqui potest quod omnes qui in circuitu sunt non audiant.

Hactenus de iis que maiori admiratione digna sunt diximus.

12. Nunc uero pauca subiciam de signis marmoreis, que pene omnes a beato Gregorio aut delete aut deturpate sunt. Quarum unam propter eximie pulcritudinis speciem primum referam.

Hec autem ymago a Romanis Ueneri dedicata fuit in ea forma in qua iuxta fabulam cum Iunone et Pallade Paridi in temerario examine dicitur Uenus se nudam exhibuisse. Quam temerarius arbiter intuens inquit

Iudicio nostro uincit utramque Uenus.

Ovid *Ars Amat.* i. 248

Hec autem ymago ex Pario marmore² tam miro et inexplicabili perfecta est artificio ut magis uiua creatura uideatur quam statua: erubescenti etenim nuditatem suam similis, faciem purpureo colore perfusam gerit. Videturque | comminus aspicientibus in niueo ore 196 b. ymagine sanguinem natare. Hanc autem propter mirandam speciem et nescio quam magicam persuasionem ter coactus sum reuisere,³ cum ab hospicio meo duobus stadiis distaret.

Non longe inde sunt equi marmorei mirande magnitudinis et artificiose compositionis. Hii autem ut fertur priorum conpotistarum ymagine fuerunt. Quibus ideo equi assignati sunt quia uelocis ingenii fuerunt.

13. Iuxta hos sub duabus fornicibus recubant due seniorum imagines ex marmore, quarum utraque porrigitur in longitudinem .xl. pedum. Harum alteram Salomonis effigiem dicunt, alteram uero Liberi Patris ymaginem asserunt. Set qui Bacus dicitur uiteam stipitem gerit in manu. Qui uero Salomon appellatur sceptrum tenet in manu.

14. *De palat<i>o Cornutorum.*

Prope has est palacium Cornutorum ampla quidem et altissima domus, in qua quidem multe ymagine sunt, set omnes cornute. Inter quas quedam ymago que longe ceteris maior est Iupiter arenosus dicitur. Set alii quibus magis credendum arbitror dicunt Cornutos quandam familiam fuisse qui illud palatium edificauerunt: hii⁴ | 197 a. autem in urbe uiri magni et clari⁵ quoniam⁶ in hostes et ciues⁷ superbi fuere et feroces, [et] Cornuti sunt a ciuibus appellati.

¹ lapidem.

² marmorie.

³ sum reuisere] siue uisere. *corr.* T.

⁴ hii bis.

⁵ clari] clarei.

⁶ quoniam] quoniam. *Dr. James corrected to quondam, but better to retain quoniam and omit et before Cornuti.* T.

⁷ ciuius.

15. *De pallacio Diocleciani.*

Palatium etiam Diocleciani preterire non possum, ubi urbis opus habetur. Cuius amplissimam magnitudinem et artificiosissimam et admirabilem compositionem scribere non sufficio. Hoc autem tam spaciose magnitudinis <est> quod illud in maiori parte diei exacte per totum uisere non potui. Ubi tante altitudinis columpnas repperi quod nemo lapillum usque ad capitale potest proicere. Quarum quamlibet, ut a cardinalibus accepi, centum uiri uix per annum secare, polire, atque perficere potuerunt. De quo loqui refuto, quoniam si uerum dixero, ueritati obuiare uidebor.

16. *De templo Palladis.*

Templum etiam Palladis opus quondam insigne fuit. Set multo sudore Christicolarum deiectum et longo senio dirutum, cum totum deleri non possit, pars que residua est horreum est cardinalium. Ibi magna congeries est fractarum effigierum: ibi etiam armata ymago Palladis, adhuc super altissimam testudinem exstans, amisso capite truncata, <spectaculum> mirandum intuentibus exhibet. Hoc¹ ydolum in maiori ueneratione erat apud ueteres Romanorum. Huic adducebantur Christicole, et quicumque flexis genibus Palladem
 197 b. non | adorabat, diuersis penis uitam terminabat. Ad hoc ydolum uel simulacrum² Ypolitus cum familia sua adductus, quod illud neglexit, equis distractus martirium subiit.

17. Pallacium autem diui Augusti non pretereo. Hec quidem amplissima domus admodum excellebat, iuxta excellentiam conditoris Augusti. Hec autem domus tota marmorea pretiosam materiam et copiosam edificandis ecclesiis que Rome sunt prebuit. De qua quoniam parum restat pauca dixisse sufficiat. Restat autem in<de> quedam particula solii ubi hec scripta repperi: *Domus diui Augusti clementissimi*. Qui, cum esset dominus urbis et totius orbis,³ appellationem tamen domini omnino uitauit.

18. Iuxta hoc palatium est murus quidam ex latere coctili⁴ descendens a summis montibus. Qui immensis fornicibus aque ductum sustentat per quem annis⁵ a montanis fontibus per spacium unius dietae urbi illabatur. Qui ereis fistulis postmodum diuisus uniuersis palatiis quondam influebat. Fluuius etenim Tiberis qui urbem prelabitur equis utilis est, set hominibus inutilis et nocuus⁶ habetur. Quare a quatuor partibus urbis per artificiosos meatus Romani⁷ ueteres aquas recentes uenire fecerunt. Quibus dum r. p. floruit quicquid libuit licuit.⁸

¹ Hoc] Hoo.² simulacri.³ orbis] urbis.⁴ coctilis.⁵ annis.⁶ qu. nociuus. T.⁷ Romani] Romam. corr. from Polychron. I, xxv (R.S. i, p. 222).⁸ Polychron (loc. cit.) inserts consummare before licuit.

Iuxta murum | aque ductus, qui per portam Assinariam descendit, ^{198 a.}
est balneum Bianei Apollinis, quod una candela consecrationis semel
accendit, et perpetuo, ut prediximus, calentes effecit.

19. Prope hoc balneum est domus Aquilea et domus Frontoniana.¹
Set cui contigit uniuersa palatia urbis Rome sermone persequi, cum
nemini, ut arbitror, uniuersa uidere contingat? Nunc itaque
palacium Tiberianum, opus quidem mirandum et immensum,
pretereo. Neronis etiam palatium, et diui Nerue mirabile edificium,
et Octauiani² palatium transeo. Septem etiam solia mire artis et
altitudinis sileo. Vnde ut aiunt Ouidius inquit

*Regia solis erat sublim[in]ibus alta columpnis³
Clara micante auro flammisque ymitante pirope.⁴*

Ov. Met.
ii. 1.

20. *De palatio .lx. inperatorum.*

Palatium etiam .lx. inperatorum describere quis poterit? Quod
cum ex maiori parte lapsum sit, fertur tamen omnes Romanos huius
temporis quod in<de> adhuc superest pro tota substantia sua non
posse dissoluere.

21. *De Pantheon.*⁵

Pantheon autem breui transitu pretereo, quod quondam erat
idolum omnium deorum, immo demonum. Que domus nunc
dedicata ecclesia in honore omnium sanctorum sancta Maria Rotunda
uocatur, antonomastice⁶ quidem a prima et pociori parte, cum sit
omnium sanctorum ecclesia. Hec quidem habet porticum spaciosam
multis et mire altitudinis columpnis marmoreis | sustentatam. Ante ^{198 b.}
quam conche et uasa alia miranda de marmore porfirico et leones et
cetera signa de eodem marmore usque in hodiernum diem perdurant.
Huius domus latitudinem ipse mensus sum, habetque spacium
.cc. lx. vi. pedes in latitudine. Cuius quondam tectum deauratum
fuit per totum. Set inmoderatus amor habendi et *auri sacra fames* <sup>Virgil,
Aen. iii, 57.</sup>
Romani⁷ populi aurum abrasit et templum deorum suorum detur-
pauit. Qui ob inexplabilem cupiditatem, dum aurum sitiuit et
sitiit, a nullo scelere manum retraxit aut retrahit.

22. *De archu triumphali Augusti.*⁸

Prope hoc templum est archus triumphalis Augusti Cesaris, in quo
hoc epigramma scriptum repperi: *Ob orbem deuictum Romano regno
restitutum et r. p. per Augustum receptam populus Romanus hoc opus
condidit*: uidelicet tante uictorie tantique triumphii perpetuum
posteritatis monumentum. Est archus ipse marmoreus et multiplex,
in quo super extantes longe tabulas lapideas erecte sunt imagines

¹ frontomiana.

² octauiam.

³ This line has strayed from its place and has been
inserted after detestanda (22, note 1).

⁴ pirope.

⁵ corr. from Panthaleon.

⁶ antonomastice] antonoma site. Polychron I,
xxv (R.S. i, p. 214) has antonomastice.

⁷ Romani] roma in.

⁸ augusti.

illorum qui principes milicie fuerunt aut qui strenue pugnando perempti sunt uel aliquid memorandum in hostes gesserunt. Inter quas imago Augusti maior ceteris mira arte celata precellit, et ubi triumphat, et ubi hostes | superat, ab omnibus in pictura cognoscendus. 199 a. Preterea in arcu prefato exercitus undique celatus et undique bella detestanda,¹ que cum intencius aspicias, uera bella uidere existimes. Ibi opere mirabili Actiacum² bellum simulatur, in quo Cesar preter spem uictorie superior factus in certamine Cleopatram³ biremi quadam fugientem persequitur, capturoque similis⁴ Cleopatra subducitur, et appositis aspidibus mammis⁵ suis in Pario roarmore superba mulier moritura pallescit. De hoc bello Cesar Augustus summum honorem attigit, et hoc modo triumphauit. Quatuor albi equi currum aureum in quo⁶ sedebat togam auro et gemmis intextam indutus trahebant, quos iiii^{or} nobilissimi Romanorum direxerunt. Et ante eum longo ordine reges, duces, ac principes captiui, manus post terga uincti, et innumerabiles alii celeberrime pompe preducebantur. Erantque bella eius et actus strenui lingua omnium gentium que Rome habitabant composita, que legere et cantare in triumpho populus non cessabat. Preterea autem et in tabulis uictoria eius depicta fuit ut hii qui laudem eius audire non possent, eam cernerent. Celebri itaque cantu et inenarrabili ioconditate ipsum in Tarteram⁷ rupem 199 b. usque ad Capitolium perduxerunt, ubi ipse arma quibus | in bello usus fuerat, et que hosti manu propria detraxerat, obtulit et in tolis signum tante uictorie suspendit. Ibique a senatu et patribus [et] conscriptis et populo Romano sibi prouincia ultima dabatur, ut fama triumphi et laus tante uictorie per uniuersum orbem claresceret. Hanc rem gestam ut presenti relacione docui arcus pretaxatus sculptis ymaginibus per omnia representat.

23. Uidi etiam alios archus triumphales plures, set huic opere et sculptura ualde similes. Quare et de qualitate aliorum dictum est, ubi archus iste triumphalis⁸ descriptus est. Vnusquisque etenim bellum uictoris et actus eius egregios arte miranda celatus, inmensum decus priorum presentibus representat.

24. *De archu Pompeii.*

Est etiam arcus triumphalis Magni Pompeii, ualde mirandus, quem habuit de uictoria quam obtinuit uicto Metridate et filio eius Pharoace.⁹ Hi Romanis per .xl. annos rebelles fuerunt. Qui ad ultimum pirates effecti Sillam contra¹⁰ eos missum superauerunt et in fugam conuerterunt. Ad quos postmodum missus Pompeius ante mensem¹¹ ultra spem Romanorum felici usus fortuna memoratum

¹ See p. 53, note 3.

² Atticum.

³ deopatram.

⁴ A stop after similis is wanted, and perhaps a word or two has dropped out.

⁵ mannis.

⁶ quos.

⁷ sc. Tarpeiam.

⁸ corr. from triumphales.

⁹ sc. Pharnace.

¹⁰ contra] intra.

¹¹ A numeral may have dropped out before or after mensem, e.g. tercium. Cp. Plutarch, Pomp. 18. R.

Metridatem cum filio suo et copiis omnino deuicit. Postea autem antequam Romam redisset, magnam partem orientis deuicit et Romanis tributarios effecit.¹ Vbi inmensum pondus auri et argenti quesiiuit: quod longo ordine Pompeiano triumpho prelatum² est. Quod sculptura arcus triumphalis eius usque in hodiernum diem representat.

25. De columpna triumphali Fabricii.

Uidi etiam columpnam triumphalem Fabricii quam sibi deuicto Pirro rege Epirotarum Romani statuerunt. Qua ut arbitror nil alcius habet Roma: est enim columpna ista rotunda et caua ad instar epicaustolii. Sunt etiam alie ⁱⁱⁱⁱ^{or} ad similitudinem istius, quas Romani fistulas uocant marmoreas. Que cum admodum grosse sint, uidentur tamen gracillime ob nimiam altitudinem. Set in quorum honore fuissent edite nondum potui cognoscere. At cum fauente deo in [†] ex hac peregrinatione rediero, denuo que nunc ambigua sunt et que penitus latent adhuc maiori mora et exercitatori indagatione perscrutabor, et perscrutata gratanter amicis partibor.

Nunc autem ad cognita redeo et columpnam clari Fabricii redeo. Qui ab hoste Pirro approbatus hoc³ est eulogio descriptus. Cum Fabricius quendam Philippum Pirri medicum⁴ domino suo uinctum mitteret, quod uitam domini sui secum pro⁵ auro habuit, Pirrus legatis Fabricii respondit: Nimirum hic est | ille Fabricius, qui non facilius^{200 b.} diuelli potest ab honestate quam sol a cursu suo. Remisitque uniuersum aurum suum quo Romam emere proposuerat, cum eam uiribus capere non posset. Vnde Lucanus

*Quo te Fabricius regi non uendidit auro.*⁶

Lucan iii.
160.

Hec omnia et multa alia egregia facta Fabricii celata sunt in pretaxata columpna.

26. De arcu triumphali Cipionis.

Est etiam ibi arcus triumphalis Cipionis, qui sibi perempto Hannibale a Romanis est conditus. Hic cum durissimo hoste Romanorum Hannibale equo certamine⁷ dimicauit et h'. uinci primus specie Romanis tribuit.⁸ Habuitque Hannibal⁹ domesticum demonem qui illum <cum> Cipione monuit pacem facere. Inde datis induciis ut sepelirentur interfecti, sancito federe per triduum, Hannibal¹⁰ colloquium singulare habuit cum Cipione. Cum autem conuenissent die ⁱⁱⁱⁱ^{to}, duo mire magnitudinis canes¹¹ ad locum colloquii Hannibalem¹² sunt secuti. Quod cum Cipio¹³ nouisset, ad colloquium uenire

¹ effecit] effectus.

² prelatum] prelectum.

³ corr. from hoc approbatus. R.

⁴ medico the o being expunctuated.

⁵ qu. secundam pre. T.

⁶ auro] aurum.

⁷ certamino.

⁸ et h'. uinci etc. sic: h' is for Hannibal. Read et Hannibalis vincendi primus spem. R. and T.

⁹ Hannibal] hec.

¹⁰ Hannibal] h'.

¹¹ canis.

¹² Hannibalem] hec.

¹³ Cipio] c'.

noluit. Deinde inito prelio grauiter utrinque <dimicatum est>, et¹ coactus est Hannibal² de castris suis confugere. Sequenti autem die grauissimo uictus certamine ad Lircum regem confugit. Cum quo iterum uictus Hannibal² a Cipione,³ cum se uideret non posse euadere, hausto ueneno quod gestabat⁴ in anulo, dormiendo obiit.

201 a. Liberati | itaque a grauissimo hoste Romani, quem usque hodie detestantur et odiunt, uictori Cipioni⁵ arcum hunc triumphalem maximo sumptu statuerunt, in quo omnia supradicta et plura sculpta sunt.

27. *De pyramidibus sepulcris potentum.*

Nunc autem de pyramidibus pauca subiciam. Sunt autem pyramides sepulcra potentum, mire magnitudinis et altitudinis, in summitate acute, figuram h'ecnoidis⁶ referentes. Quarum prima quam uidi Romuli est. Hanc autem ante castellum Crescentii⁷ sitam prope ecclesiam beati Petri peregrini mentiuntur fuisse acruum segetis Petri apostoli, quam cum Nero sibi rapuisset, in lapideum collem pristinae quantitatis fuisse conuersam. Quod omnino friuolum est, quo peregrini multum habundant. Habet autem piramis quelibet concam marmoream undique celatam inter se clausam, in qua corpus defuncti sepelitur.

28. *De piramide Augusti.*

Uidi etiam pyramidem Augusti prope portam Latinam ex quadris lapidibus ferro⁸ compactis constructam, unde adhuc nulla uetustas lapidem unum diuellere potuit.

29. Sunt autem Rome pyramides multe, set omnium maior<i> admiracione digna est piramis Iulii Cesaris, que ex uno solidoque lapide porf<ir>ico condita est. De qua ualde mirandum est quomodo secari aut erigi aut stare potuit tante altitudinis moles. Est enim ut

201 b. asserunt altitudo eius cc. l. pedes. | Habetque in summitate speram eneam, in qua cineres et ossa Iulii Cesaris condita sunt. De qua mirando quidam sic ait :

*Si lapis est unus, dic qua sit arte leuatus ;
Si lapides plures, dic ubi congeries.*

Stat autem eo loco, ut aiunt, quo quidam Iulio occurrit concionem adeunti, deferens ei litteras facte in se coniurationis dolum denudantes. Ubi inter cetera continebatur ipsum crudeliter obiturum⁹ si eo die contionem aut Capitolium intraret. Qui cum litteras suscepisset, latori sic ait : Nunc cum astronomico hoc sermonem habebo, post contionem litteras uestras uidebo. Vocauit itaque obuium sibi

¹ add R. Dr. James bad [et].

² Hannibal] h'.

³ a Cipione] accip'.

⁴ gestabat] gestiebat.

⁵ Cipioni] c'.

⁶ h'ecnoidis or h'ecuoidis cod. hemic[o]noidis
Sir T. L. Heath, whose note see on p. 58.

⁷ Crescentii] crescentis.

⁸ ferro] fo ferro.

⁹ obiturum] obit[urum].

astronomicum, qui Cesarem moriturum in kalendis predixerat, et inquit ei: Hodie Kalende sunt et adhuc uiuo. Cui astronomicus inquit: Sunt quidem kalende, sed nondum transierunt, et utinam mendax reperiatur. Et confestim Cesar inde diuertens Capitolium ingreditur. Ubi a Bruto et Cass<i>o et eorum fautoribus¹.xx. iiii. stibiis confossus, in Capitolio obiit. Dicit tamen Marius Suetonius, cui magis credo, quod capulis gladiatorum fuerit interemptus, unde et uulnus in eo non apparuit. Quare in numero deorum eum raptum dicebant. Unde Maro in epitafio eius ita inquit:

*Candidus insuetum miratur lumen Olympi.
Dafnis ego in siluis hinc usque ad sidera notus,
Formosi custos pecoris, formosior ipse, etc.* | ²

Virgil,
Ecl. v.
56, 43, 44.

Littere etiam prefate in se coniurationis inuente sunt in sinistra^{202 a.} manu eius. Cesar itaque dominator et dominus orbis terrarum, qui primum libertate depressa sibi usurpauit imperium, primo rogem³ in paruum redactus cinerem predicta enea spera clauditur. Hanc autem piramidem peregrini <acum>⁴ beati Petri appellant. Sub quo magno labore reptant ubi super .iiii. eneos leones saxum fundatur. Mentiunturque mundum a peccatis et ueram perfecisse penitentiam qui sub saxo repere potuerit.

30. *De faro Alexandrino.*

Ingens etiam miraculum est farum Alexandrinum, quomodo super .iiii. cancos uitreos in mari⁵ fundatum est, uidelicet quomodo tam magni cancri ex uitro fieri potuerunt, et quomodo in mare portati et non fracti, et quomodo cement<iti>a fundamenta sub aquis cancris supposita durare possunt. Est etiam ualde mirandum, quomodo sub aqua durare potest cementum, et quare cancri non frangantur in mari, et quare non lubricat sub tanto pondere cementi fundamentum, quod magnum mirum est. Set dicit Ysidorus [a] puluerem quendam^{Etymol.} huius nature esse, quod aqua mixtum si soli aut igni apponitur, in^{XVI, i, 8.} pristinum puluerem redigitur. Si uero aqua⁶ mergatur, solidatur et lapidescit. Set non est huius operis causas aperire mirabilium. | ^{202 b.}

31. Colosseum⁷ autem palacium Titi et Uespasiani transeo. Quis enim artificiosam compositionem eius et magnitudinem sermone exequi poterit? Iuxta hoc palacium est imago suis⁸ quam Eneas fetam iuxta uaticinium Priamidis Eleni⁹ legitur reperisse, signum

¹ fātoribus.

² Thus given: Dafnis e. i s. h. u. a. s. n. for c. p. f. i.

³ sic: qu. paruo rogo. R. Dr. James suggested primus regum.

⁴ acum] supplied from Polychronicon.

⁵ mare.

⁶ aque.

⁷ Doloseum.

⁸ suis] scis.

⁹ Piramidis elene.

videlicet ciuitatis eo loco edificande quam fata sibi dederant orbi toto inperaturam. De hoc signo Uirgilius sic ait :

Aen. iii.
290, 2 ;
cf. viii.
43.

*Inuenta sub ilicibus sus
Alba solo recubans, albi circum ubera nati.*

Est autem hoc signum ex Pario marmore candidissimo mira arte perfecto. Reptantque circum ubera eius nati numero .xxx.

32. In porticu etiam ante hiemale palatium domini pape est imago enea illius lupe que dicitur Remum et Romulum aluisse. Set hoc quidem fabulosum est. Nam Lupa¹ quedam mulier eximie pulcritudinis antiquitus Rome fuit. Hec Remum et Romulum in Tiberi proiectos inuenit, et pro suis aluit. Que ideo Lupa dicta est, quoniam pulcritudine sua et illecebris suis homines in² amorem suum rapiebat. Hec autem lupa enea arieti eneo insidiatur,³ qui ante palatium prefatum aquam abluendis manibus ore emittit.⁴ Lupa etiam quondam singulis mammis aquam abluendis manibus emittebat, set nunc fractis pedibus a loco suo diuulsa est.

33. Ante hanc enea tabula est, ubi pociora legis precepta scripta sunt. Que tabula prohibens | peccatum dicitur. In hac tabula plura legi, set pauca intellexi. Sunt enim afforism<i>, ubi fere omnia uerba subaudiuntur.

[*The remainder of f. 203 is cut away, leaving only a small slip at the top: the verso is blank, and probably the remainder of the recto was also blank.*]

¹ lupam.

² in]et.

³ corr. from insideatur.

⁴ emittit] remt.

⁵ afforissm.

NOTE ON H'ECNOIDIS (27).

Sir T. L. Heath has kindly written the following note on this puzzling word. 'It is a fact that translators of the period very commonly confused *pyramids* and *cones*, and also no doubt *conoids*, where these came in question. It occurs to me that *h'ecnoidis* may mean *hemic[o]noidis* simply. But why *half* a conoid? One branch of the hyperboloid of revolution might perhaps be called half a conoid: but Gregorius is not likely to have thought of this. On the other hand, half of an elongated ellipsoid or prolate spheroid would give approximately what is wanted -θ-; and it would not be surprising if the word *conoid* were used in error for *spheroid* in this case.