The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Recent Excavations in Rome

Thomas Ashby

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 2 / Issue 02 / April 1908, pp 142 - 150

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800005565, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800005565

How to cite this article:

Thomas Ashby (1908). Recent Excavations in Rome. The Classical Quarterly, 2, pp 142-150
doi:10.1017/S0009838800005565

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

RECENT EXCAVATIONS IN ROME.

(See *C.R.* 1906, pp. 379 *sqq.*)

SINCE the date of my last report upon this subject there has been little to chronicle in regard to the excavations in the Forum. The work of clearing the superficial strata which cover the remainder of the site of the Basilica Aemilia is proceeding somewhat slowly, and the level at which interesting discoveries may be expected has not yet been reached. Nor is the Forum Museum as yet ready. New discoveries have been confined to small excavations on the S.E. and the S.W. sides of the Arch of Titus, where large blocks of travertine, which originally belonged to some other building, and floors in concrete and *opus spicatum*, with foundations and drains below them, have been found, orientated more or less in correspondence with the older Sacra Via. Two parallel walls at a lower level, however, of large blocks of tufa may well be connected with the earlier temple of Jupiter Stator, which preceded the massive concrete foundation of the temple as we have it, which is orientated with the temple of Venus and Rome and the Arch of Titus.

Close by are scanty traces of what seems to be another prehistoric necropolis.

The official reports in the *Notizie degli Scavi* continue to deal with the prehistoric necropolis near the temple of Antoninus and Faustina (1906, 5 *sqq.* 253 *sqq.*); but the description of the tombs found is not yet complete, though since the report on the *sacrarium Iuturnae* appeared in 1906 (*ibid.* 41 *sqq.*), we have had no description in detail from Comm. Boni's pen of any other part of the Forum.

Further, some of the as yet undescribed tombs have been uncovered, and their contents left *in situ*, being thus exposed (though the whole necropolis is covered with a roof) to alternations of heat and cold, and latterly to the overflow of a drain. It seems that the interest, great as it is, of being able to see the contents of these tombs *in situ* is being purchased at too high a price: for certainly the objects will not be the better for their long exposure.

A caution should be given to readers of the craniological portion of the two reports referred to. Prof. Mosso, who is responsible for the first report (pp. 46 *sqq.*), only had the skull from tomb B before him, which he pronounced to be that of a man of from 40 to 45 years of age. In the second report, on the other hand, which deals with tomb B as a whole and with tombs X and Y also, tomb B is pronounced by Prof. Tedeschi, who had the opportunity of examining the whole skeleton, to be that of a woman (pp. 259 *sqq.*). No reference, however, to the first report is given, though the most remarkable divergence, that in the cephalic index, given by Mosso as 73, 3, and Tedeschi as 75, 5, may well be due to a misprint.

The discoveries made by Comm. Boni in connexion with the Column of Trajan up to June 1906 were described in *C.R.* 1906, 379 *seq.* Further investigation showed that immediately to the north-west of the column, 4½ feet below the level of the time of Trajan, lay the pavement of a road, flanked by a concrete wall faced with broken tiles (cf. *Papers of the British School at Rome*, iv. 99), attributable to the 1st cent. A.D., and below this a drain; while below it again, 13 feet below the level of the Forum, was a pavement of rammed tufa fragments, and between the two a considerable amount of pottery (see my article in *Builder*, Dec. 15, 1906, p. 679, and the detailed report by

Boni in *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1907, 361 *sqq.*, which contains many interesting details as to the structure of the column, and some admirable drawings). Remains of earlier concrete foundations were also discovered in the north-eastern *exedra* of the Forum. It is noticeable that similar discoveries were made in 1812-14, and were described by Nibby in his edition of Nardini's *Roma Antica* (1818), ii. 351; but though their importance was at the time appreciated, they have since been forgotten.

It is now clear that the opinion of many writers that the column denotes the actual height of a ridge connecting the Capitol and the Quirinal, can no longer be held, and that some other interpretation must be given to the last phrase of the inscription, 'ad declarandum quantae altitudinis mons et locus tantis operibus sit egestus.' The first question is, whether we are to abandon the traditional rendering of the inscription, or whether we can still translate it as Dio Cassius did.¹ Comm. Boni himself is in favour of the former course. He (*Nuova Antologia*, Nov. 1, 1906; cf. March 1, 1907) interprets it as a statement that the column had been erected to show to what height the mountain (the Quirinal) and the valley had been raised by such great buildings as those of Trajan. But to this rendering there are many objections. In the first place, *ad declarandum* is explained by Comm. Boni to mean that the column had been erected as a belvedere, *i.e.* that one would see from the top the height and magnificent proportions of the edifices erected—in which case one would expect to find the inscription at the top, not at the bottom, of the column. Next, the rendering of *egestus* as 'raised' has no parallels, except the somewhat remote one of Plin. *H.N.* ii. 82, where it is used of a volcanic upheaval (*alibi egestis molibus, alibi emissis amnibus*); and though analogy may be quoted in its support, Mau (cf. *infra*) is probably right in maintaining that with so common a word usage must be decisive as to the meaning. And further, as he says, *quantae altitudinis* must belong to *mons*, not to *egestus*, *i.e.* given that Boni's interpretation of *egestus* were correct, the reference must be to a newly raised *mons*, not to the raising or elevation of an already existing one.

Locus too is taken in a somewhat strained sense as meaning valley. Nor would matters be improved if *mons* were taken to refer to the 'mountain-high' buildings erected by Trajan. In short, while Boni's interpretation of the facts is perfectly correct (except in regard to the remains which he attributes to the 'Servian' wall), his rendering of the inscription has not met with general acceptance. Another, proposed by Comparetti (*Rendiconti dei Lincei*, xv. (1906), 575 *sqq.*), does not commend itself any more than the last. He supposes that the height of the column indicates the side of a cube equal to the total mass of the stone quarried for these works (*mons egestus tantis operibus*).

Among the latest suggestions in regard to the interpretation of the inscription, is one made by Mau in *Römische Mitteilungen*, 1907, 187 *sqq.* He returns to Dio Cassius' interpretation of the text, which he translates 'in welcher Höhe der Berg und der Platz für die Bauten abgetragen würde,' taking *locus tantis operibus* in close conjunction,² and noting that Hülsen agrees with this rendering. He attributes the ambiguity of the expression simply to lack of space upon the tablet intended for the inscription. He comes to the conclusion that, as there is no room for it either to the north (outside) of the line of the Servian wall as prolonged eastward to the Quirinal in the straight line of its course (as indicated in Lanciani's *Forma Urbis*, 22) at the point where it leaves the east side of the Capitol, or to the south of the wall (for here the Fora of Caesar and Augustus come too close), the *mons*

¹lxviii. 16. παντὸς γὰρ τοῦ χωρίου ἐκείνου ὀρεινοῦ ὄντος κατέσκαψε τοσοῦτον ὅσον ὁ κίων ἀνίσχει, καὶ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐκ τοῦτου πεδιὴν κατεσκεύασε.

²I think Costa in *Rivista di Storia Antica*, xi. 482, is quite right in pointing out that *mons et locus* should be taken to be a hendiadys (χωρίον ὀρεινόν, as Dio has it): this is why we have the singular *sit egestus*.

Tantis operibus he too takes as a dative. He points out in detail that Boni's interpretation will not hold from the philological point of view, and suggests that the *mons* should be sought further to the N.E. on the site of the temple of Trajan and the E. side of the Basilica Ulpia—whether rightly, I rather doubt.

can only be identified with the *agger* of the Servian wall, which would have been necessary to reinforce it at this point, where it crossed a natural line of access to the centre of the ancient city. It is difficult, if not impossible, to believe that the *agger* can ever have been so high: and Mau supposes that either the measurement is an exaggerated representation of the truth, or that the height of the *mons* was in reality only that of the base of the column (some 8 mètres with plinth and steps).

But if the obstruction in the valley were comparatively so small—for an *agger* hardly 200 mètres long and perhaps 25 to 30 thick would not have offered by any means an insuperable obstacle—one hardly understands how it was that the solution of what must have been one of the greatest traffic problems of ancient Rome (as it certainly is in modern days) was not adopted long before. Cicero indeed, in a well-known letter (*ad Att.* iv. 16) gives us an account of Caesar's plans in that direction (cf. *C.R.* 1906, 282). But it is quite possible that here, as elsewhere, Caesar intended to do much more than he was actually able to do: for, now that it is clear that the valley between the Capitol and the Quirinal already existed, there does not seem much reason for supposing that the site of the *atrium Libertatis* was at all far from the N.E. hemicycle of the Forum of Trajan, which is represented in a fragment of the *Forma Urbis* (Jordan, 25) with the inscription *LIBERTATIS* (HülSEN, *Röm. Mitt.* 1889, 241). In short, it is possible that Caesar intended to do what Trajan eventually did: though we are still met by the question, why the solution of the difficulty was so long deferred. That the Forum of Trajan was begun by Domitian (Boni, *Not. Scavi cit.* 415, following Nichols, *Roman Forum*, 271) seems improbable. The true reading in Aurelius Victor, *Caes.* 13, seems to be 'adhuc Romae a Domitiano coepta atque alia multa plusquam magnifice coluit,' *fora* being interpolated. We may ask again, why the Via Flaminia did not leave Rome at the lowest possible point, *i.e.* by an aperture in this *agger*, instead of doing so by a gate placed part of the way up the slope of the Capitol, the site of which, at the highest point of the Via di Marforio, is indicated on sheet 22 of Lanciani's *Forma Urbis* quoted above. Why should it have climbed up the hill and down again?

Mau is obviously not prepared to accept Boni's attribution of two blocks of tufa, resting upon a foundation of concrete (*Not. Scavi cit.* 401 *sqq.*), found a little to the west of the Column of Trajan, to the 'Servian' wall;¹ and I must say that I too do not consider the evidence as yet obtained to be at all sufficient. The position of this supposed fragment too, does not in the least fit in with the position of the Porta Ratumena (?) and of the fragments of wall adjacent to it; and it is to me quite incomprehensible that, supposing Boni's attribution to be correct, the wall should not have turned to cross the valley at the Tomb of Bibulus, instead of following the east slope of the Capitol for some 125 yards. (Cf. Mau, *op. cit.* 192.)

The conclusion of the whole matter to my mind is this—that, provisionally, it is safest to return to the traditional translation of the inscription, which, with the variation suggested by Costa, would then run 'to show to what a depth the hilly site was removed for so great buildings,' and to adopt HülSEN's interpretation of its meaning. He explains it (*Roman Forum*, p. 21) thus: 'The very site (of the Forum of Trajan) had to be obtained by a vast piece of engineering; the most southern point of the Quirinal hill, which had hitherto extended very close to the Capitoline, was excavated by working in from the plain until so much of the shoulder had been cut off that the height of the side thus laid bare was one hundred Roman feet [the height of the column without the base].'

The great objection to this view is, that a hundred feet is a considerable overstatement of the truth. Boni's diagram (*Not. Scavi cit.* p. 362) shows clearly enough that the difference between the level of the Forum of Trajan (16.06 mètres above sea-level) and that of the Quirinal behind the north-eastern hemicycle at the point where some remains of the 'Servian' wall are visible in the Via Nazionale (37.44 mètres) is

¹ This would of course bring its line considerably further N. than Mau is inclined to do.

considerably less—21.38 mètres are roughly 72 Roman feet. (The column itself without the pedestal has recently been accurately determined to measure 29.77 mètres, giving the length of the Roman foot as 0.2977 metre.) But the objections to the other theories propounded seem to me stronger still.

Important and interesting excavations have recently been begun upon the Palatine, at the top of the so-called *Scalae Caci*, but are for the moment at a standstill. Pinza deals with the remains at the S.W. (more strictly W.) angle of the hill, as known before these excavations, in a lengthy and very complicated memoir, entitled *L'angolo sudovest del Palatino* (more strictly the west angle), reprinted from the *Annali della Società degli Ingegneri ed Architetti Italiani* for 1907. Still, a summary of the article may be interesting.

The remains of walling of the earliest period (A in Pinza's classification), formed of small thin blocks of gray lamellar tufa, are far too scanty at present to justify Pinza's reconstruction, according to which they were coextensive with the various walls of blocks of brown granular tufa. Pinza, on the other hand, despite the considerable differences of level, connects all these fragments, and supposes that they formed the substructions of a large trapezoidal area, enclosing the space occupied by the temple of Cybele and the buildings to the E. of it as far as the house of Livia.

He assigns them to a date not much anterior to the last century of the Republic (p. 11 *fin.*), and is not inclined to believe the substruction to be of a defensive character. The access to the upper terrace he places somewhat to the W. of the *Scalae Caci*, at the point where the wall forms a right angle to the S. To the next period (H) belongs the substruction in concrete which supports the portico of *opus quadratum* and *reticulatum* below the temple to the S. This portico took the place of the previous means of access to the upper level of the hill (p. 19 *init.*).

Further restorations of the substructions took place early in the imperial period (K, L), and again later on under the empire (N, O). He also considers, and apparently rightly, that the so-called *Scalae Caci* are the rock-cut foundations of a comparatively late 'cordonata' or paved path.

Pinza is inclined (pp. 45 *sqq.*) to seek the Porta Romanula or Romana of the primitive Palatine city not at the N.W. angle of the hill (as many topographers have done), but at the S.W. angle, reading in Varro, *L.L.* v. 164, 'alteram (portam) Romanulam, ab Roma dictam, quae habet gradus in Navaliam ad Volupiae sacellum.' The reading *in nova via*, generally adopted by the editors, and first of all by Scaliger (whom Pinza on p. 46 manages to transform into a manuscript!), is not found in the MSS. which have *novalia* (except b, which has *ovilia*), whence the Vulgate *navalia* arose; and this Pinza proposes to revive. The phrase *in navalia* would have to be translated not 'into' but 'towards' the Navaliam, which were at some distance off, near the mouth of the Cloaca Maxima.

The placing of the gate at the W. angle has the additional advantage that the description of it as *infimo clivo victoriae* (Festus, p. 262, Müll.) is better satisfied. And the other passage of Varro, *L.L.* vi. 23, 'Angeronalia ab Angerona, cui sacrificium fit in curia Acculeia, et cuius feriae publicae is dies. . . . Hoc sacrificium fit in Velabro, qua in novam viam exitur, ut aiunt quidam ad sepulcrum Accae, ut quod ibi prope faciunt diis manibus servilibus sacerdotes; qui uterque locus extra urbem antiquam fuit non longe a porta Romanula,' where there is no suspicion of any variety in the reading, does not oblige us to suppose that the Porta Romanula was at the N. angle of the Palatine: for the Nova Via 'encircled the hill on its north-east and north-west sides, and finally ended in the Velabrum under the Porta Romana (in the neighbourhood of S. Teodoro)' (Hülsen, *Roman Forum*, 206 and *reff.*).

Pinza would thus make the *Scalae Caci* a short cut leading down from the W. part of the hill to the Porta Romana, and this in view of Varro's description (v. 164) of the Palatine as having two gates, without mention of the *Scalae Caci*, seems not unreasonable.

The last excavations were begun in April 1907, and, with laudable promptitude, four interim reports, from the pen of Prof. Vaglieri, who, with Conte Cozza, has been responsible for the excavations, have already appeared. A wall of well laid tufa blocks, six feet wide, and resting on the natural tufa of the hill, was found for a length of about 30 feet, running N.W. towards the W. angle of the hill. It was found to be covered with 'Etrusco-Campanian' pottery of the third and second century B.C., and the blocks taken from it had been made use of in some of the surrounding buildings, which were erected upon a stratum of similar pottery. The wall, on the other hand, was found to have been partly built over a tomb 'a fossa' which lay on its S.W. side: the tomb was covered with a slab of tufa, and in it was a *scyphos*, apparently of local manufacture, attributable to the fourth century B.C.; the paste is reddish, and the black varnish leaves only a red decorative band, with black splotches, at the level of the handles. The wall was at once assumed to be part of the fortifications of the Palatine, constructed after the invasion of the Gauls—which would of course put the so-called wall of Romulus later than it (as the wall of Romulus is outside it, running as it does halfway down the hill) and the so-called Servian walls later still. But I do not think, despite the authority of Prof. Pais and others, that there is as yet at all sufficient evidence of its fortificatory character.

To the N.W. of this wall a level surface of rock was found with various small holes cut in it, to contain wooden posts: these were thought to have supported some roof or covering for a much earlier tomb 'a pozzo.' It is therefore supposed that there were two successive primitive settlements. The conical cistern in front of the house of Livia would belong to the second period, its walls being 'packed' on the outside with material of the earliest period.

Thus far the first report (*Not. Scavi*, 1907, 185 *sqq.*). It has already met with some sharp criticism from Prof. Pigorini (*Rendiconti dei Lincei*, 1907 (xvi.)). He points out, and, I think, justly, that the evidence for considering the holes alluded to as the remains of tombs is insufficient, considering that nothing was found in them, and that the pottery that was found cannot be affirmed to be sepulchral in contradistinction to ordinary pottery. Further, that the supposition that fragments of Villanova ossuaries were found is erroneous—they were merely some of the many pieces of Latin pottery. This goes back to the eighth century B.C. According to the report, one fragment of proto-Corinthian ware was found, and above the 'tombs' was a stratum of black earth, which contained no objects later than the sixth century B.C. There thus seemed to be a gap until the fourth century B.C., to which the inhumation tomb belonged. Gatti states indeed (*Bull. Com.* 1907, 202) that some of the sepulchral pottery found on the Palatine is as late as the second century B.C.; but this, as Pigorini points out, is probably erroneous.

The second report (*ibid.* 264 *sqq.*) deals with the continuation of the excavations towards the N.E., *i.e.* towards the interior of the hill. Several drains were found here, at different levels and in different directions, which can be divided into three groups, one previous to the fourth century B.C., the second, at a higher level, later than the demolition of the fortification of large blocks (third century B.C.?), while the third belongs to the end of the Republic, when the ground was again and for the last time considerably raised. The total artificial elevation of the level in front of the house of Livia is estimated at about 25 feet (p. 185), the material having, it is supposed, been obtained from the S.W. slope, which would account for the destruction of the upper portion of the 'tombs of the earliest period.'

There are also three types of walling traceable in the foundation which fronts on the approach by the *Scalae Caci*. The earliest, running N.W., consists of small blocks of *cappellaccio*, resembling the wall in the Comitium which forms the front of the *suggestus* (Hülsemann in *Röm. Mitt.* 1905, 30; cf. *C.R.* 1906, 133 *fin.*); the next is a well built wall of

blocks of brown tufa, with masons' marks, forming a part of the fortifications (not earlier, therefore, according to Vaglieri, than the invasion of the Gauls), cutting through the conical cistern in front of the house of Livia, and running N.E.; while the third, going N.W. again, is formed of blocks from various places. It obstructs the road from the *Scalae Caci*, having been constructed to support a building (a temple perhaps), the second wall being also used for this purpose after it had ceased to serve for its original use, and continues to the N.W. and N.E.: in places it is no less than 16 blocks high, and rests on the solid rock. A portion of similar walling is found in the centre of an earlier circular cistern, some 20 feet in diameter, formed of thin slabs of *cappellaccio*, and coated externally with clay. In this clay were found four proto-Corinthian vases (sixth century), which should therefore give the date of this cistern. The fact that a winding staircase descends into it renders it improbable that it was roofed; and in other respects the construction is quite different to that of the conical cistern nearer the house of Livia.

The third and fourth reports (*ibid.* 444 *sqq.*, 529 *sqq.*) deal mainly with the portion of the site to the N.W. of the first part excavated, and describe some cuttings in the rock—narrow channels which enclose three roughly rectangular areas, probably huts of brushwood, the channels serving to support their sides. These huts, too, are supposed to have been, not for habitation, but the coverings of tombs; and the pottery found, some Latin, some Etruscan in character, is again considered not to invalidate this hypothesis: some small *foculi* were found, but they have, it is stated, hardly any traces of use. In view of Pigorini's criticisms, it may be well to reserve one's judgment concerning this point.

The remainder of the reports deals with the various *terra-cottas* discovered further to the N.E., and which belonged apparently to the decorations of a temple—cf. also the second report, pp. 273 *sqq.* The earliest of them belong to the sixth century B.C.

As will be seen, the excavations have already produced results of considerable importance, though it is as yet too early—nor has the work gone far enough—to pronounce with certainty as to their results. It has now been decided that the excavations on the Palatine shall for the future be, with those of the Forum, under the charge of Comm. Boni. We may perhaps be allowed to express a hope that their continuance may not be long delayed and may lead to further interesting discoveries.

The interest of excavations in the heart of ancient Rome is so paramount, that a certain impatience is perhaps excusable—and not altogether unjustified by the delays in publication which have taken place both in Rome and elsewhere in Italy. Perhaps one of the most striking cases is that mentioned by Prof. Orsi in *Atti del Congresso Internazionale delle Scienze Storiche*, Rome, 1903, vol. v. (*Archeologia*), p. 201, who informs us of what many scholars very likely do not know, that after the first campaign of excavations at Locri in 1889–90 (in which an Ionic temple, the only one in *Magna Graecia*, was discovered) two others followed in 1890–1, in which a large number of archaic *terra cottas* and some large 'fosse' containing over 14,000 *scyphoi* arranged in rows were discovered near the temple, and the walls of the city traced for a perimeter of nearly five miles, the city being divided into three parts, and very strongly fortified. The results of these important excavations are still unpublished!

Returning to the Palatine, we may note that the Villa Mills has at last passed into the possession of the Italian Government. The demolition of parts of the Villa has already been carried out, but, as it has largely incorporated the walls of the central portion of the *Domus Augustana*, as restored by Domitian (cf. Hülsen—Jordan, *Topographie*, i. iii. 93 *sqq.*), it will not be necessary to remove the whole of it; and it will probably serve as a local museum. In one of its chambers some badly preserved frescoes have been found, attributable to the fourth or fifth century A.D., and belonging no doubt to the ancient oratory of S. Cesario, the first Christian place of worship established on the Palatine. In another chamber are later

frescoes of the twelfth or thirteenth century, connected with the Greek monastery which we know to have been founded here in the eighth or ninth century. (Cf. Bartoli in *Nuovo Bull. Arch. Crist.* 1907, 191 *sqq.*)

The clearing of the site for the new hall of the Chamber of Deputies at Monte Citorio has resulted in the discovery of a square area enclosed by six travertine *cippi* on each side, with an iron railing between them: within this area are fragments of a marble plinth moulding, some of them *in situ*.

It appears to have been an *ustrinum* similar to that of the Antonini discovered a little to the S.W. in 1703 (Jordan—Hülse, *Topographie*, i. 3. 604; *Not. Scavi*, 1907, 525).

Another interesting discovery made in July 1906 only became widely known in the course of last spring, that of several inscriptions and other fragments belonging to the *Lucus Furrinae*, the grove, on the right bank of the Tiber, below the Janiculum, where Gaius Gracchus sought his last refuge from his pursuers, and when they pressed him close, ordered his slave Philocrates to kill him (ὁ δὲ φθάνει μικρὸν εἰς ἱερὸν ἄλλος Ἐρινύων καταφυγών, κακεῖ διαφθείρεται, τοῦ Φιλοκράτους ἀνελόντος ἐκείνον, εἶτα ἑαυτὸν ἐπισφάξαντος: Plut. *C. Gracch.* 16). The finds were made at a depth of about fifteen or twenty feet, in sinking the foundations for a house in the garden of the former Villa Sciarra, now the property of Mr. G. Wurts.

The discoveries are described by M. Gauckler in *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1907, 135 *sqq.*, and *Bull. Com.* 1907, 45 *sqq.*, and by Prof. Hülse in *Röm. Mitt.* 1907, 225 *sqq.*

The objects discovered consist of (1) a group of finely sculptured architectural fragments, all of white marble, three of which are blocks bearing fragmentary inscriptions in Greek; (2) a block of white marble 4 feet square, 1 foot thick at the edges and about 5 inches thick elsewhere: in the centre is a hole 7 inches in diameter at the top, and only $2\frac{1}{2}$ at the bottom.

The upper surface of the block bears the inscription

δεσμός ὅπως κρατερὸς θύμα θεοῖς παρ[έ]χοι | ὃν δὴ Γαιωνᾶς δειπνοκρίτης ἔθετο.

Gauckler considers the block to have served as the orifice of a fountain: on the under side, indeed, in the interior of the cavity, there were traces of mortar, as though it had covered a solid foundation, with the fountain pipe in the centre. Hülse, on the other hand, compares it with the lid of a stone chest for offerings in money, found on the island of Thera,¹ and considered that this block had originally served for the same purpose, while admitting that the calcareous deposit which covered the surface of the stone showed that it had been for a long time under water.

The inscription is brief and somewhat ambiguous. M. Gauckler renders it 'by this mighty conduit [*δεσμός* = *captation* in French] Gaionas the master of the feast has enchained the spring to make it serve for sacrifices to the gods.' M. Clermont-Ganneau (*C.R. Acad. Inscr. et B.-L.*, 1907, 256) suggests the translation 'that the powerful charm may furnish a victim to the gods, Gaionas the *δειπνοκρίτης* has placed it,' supposing that the hole served for the insertion of lead tablets with *defixiones* written upon them. Hülse, on the other hand, treats it as incomplete, the main sentence being omitted, and translates '. . . that a strong fetter may keep the sacrifice for the gods, which Gaionas the *δειπνοκρίτης* has made.' In any case the Greek is not very correct nor clear.

Three inscriptions relating to Gaionas have already come to light, including his tombstone (now lost), the text of which ran thus: *D(is) M(anibus) S(acrum)*. ἐνθάδε Γαιωνᾶς, ὅς κίστιβερ ἦν ποτε 'Ρώμης, καὶ δείπνοις κρέινας πολλὰ μετ' εὐφροσύνης, καίμαι [*sic*] τῷ θανάτῳ μηδὲν ὀφειλόμενος. *Gaionas animula*.

¹ See F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Thera I. Die Insel Thera in Altertum und Gegenwart*, 258 *sqq.*

M. Gauckler, considering that the banquets at which Gaionas presided must have been sacred, wishes to interpret *cistiber* as an equivalent of *cistifer*, i.e. a bearer of the *cista mystica*: he pronounces against the obvious sense of *cistiber* = *quinque vir cis Tiberim*, i.e. one of a committee of five officials who were responsible for the safety of the streets and were subordinate to the *tresviri capitales*, holding that Gaionas was too rich a man to have held, and still less to have been proud of, so subordinate a post. I must confess, on the other hand, that even the lowest official position at Rome would probably have seemed to an Oriental (as a government post to a Babu to-day) of considerable importance. Hülsen (*op. cit.* 244) refuses to accept Gauckler's rendering. (3) Fragments of a dedication carved on the lintel of a door (?) to Belus, the well-known Babylonian deity. (4) An altar dedicated to Adad, a Syrian divinity, with the epithets $\Delta\iota\beta\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\omega\tau\eta\varsigma$ and $\text{'}\text{Α}\kappa\omega\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\eta\varsigma$ ¹ (perhaps = 'adored on the summits of the mountains,' as M. Gauckler suggests). (5) An Altar bearing the following dedication: *Sac(rum) Aug(usto) | Iovi Maleciabrudi | M. Oppius Agroecus | et T. Sestius Agathange [lus d(onum) d(ederunt)]*. Clermont-Ganneau in *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 1907, 250 *sqq.*, maintains that the reading *Maleciabrudi* is contrary to analogy, and that *Malec Iabrudi(tano)* is better. The city of Iabruda was to the east of Heliopolis, and it is natural that we should have dedications to the Jupiter (Baal) of both cities. The provenance of *C.I.L.* vi. 420 = 30764, is not known, but *ibid.* 432 (cf. *add.* p. 3005), another dedication to Jupiter Heliopolitanus, was found in 1803, near S. Cosimato, immediately below the Villa Sciarra. It is a high square base with a representation of the Dea Syria on the top of it; while *ibid.* 422, seen by Fra Giocondo and others in the sixteenth century in the church of the Santi Quaranta (now S. Pasquale Baylon), near S. Cosimato, runs thus:

I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) H(eliopolitano) Sac(rum) Genio Forinarum et cultoribus huius loci Terentia Nice cum Terentio Damarione filio sacerdote et Terentio Damarione iun(iore) et Fonteio Onesimo filio sacrorum signum et basim voto suscepto de suo posuit lustro eiusdem Damarionis.

That this *Genius Forinarum* had any connexion with the archaic Roman Furrina² was denied by Mommsen and doubted by Hülsen (in Jordan, *Topographie*, i. iii. 625 n. 8), but a recent discovery in the Villa Sciarra decided the question in the opposite sense. This was (6) an altar bearing the following inscription:

$\Delta\iota\iota$ Κεραννίφ Ἀρτεμῖς ἡ καὶ Σιδωνία Κυπρία ἐξ ἐπιταγῆς ἀνέθηκεν καὶ Νύνφες (*sic*) Φόρριβες (*sic*).

The *rapprochement* between the Forinae, the Νύνφες Φόρριβες, and Furrina is obvious; while that with the Erinyes came from a supposed connexion between Furia and Furrina or Furina (Cicero, *de nat. deor.* iii. 18. 46), and, as Hülsen conjectures (*op. cit.* 249), may well have been the origin of the *caput Gorgonis* (probably a street name) which appears in the Regionary catalogues of the fourth century A.D.

In Piazza Dante, S. of the site of the Porta Esquilina and E. of the line of the 'Servian' wall, in constructing the foundations for a new savings-bank, a group of buildings has been brought to light, belonging to the Horti Lamiani; and here was discovered a statuary group composed of two girls, one carrying her companion on her shoulders, a representation of the game of ἐφεδρισμός as it was called (Mariani in *Bull. Com.* 1907, 34 *sqq.*). It has been placed in the municipal Antiquarium.

A statue of Hercules, representing an Attic type of the fourth century, was found at about 30 feet below ground level, among remains of an ancient villa near the Ponte Margherita (*ibid.* 41 *sqq.*).

The statue of a daughter of Niobe found in June 1906, in property belonging to

¹ The inscriptions are on three sides of the altar:

(1) ΘΕΩΑΔΑ | ΔΩΑΝΕΘΗ (incomplete).

(2) ΘΕΩΑΔΑΔΩ patera ΑΙΒΑΝΕΩΤΗ.

(3) ΘΕΩΑΔΑΔΩ urceus ΑΚΩΠΕΙΤΗ.

² Her name appears in the calendar, the *Furrinalia* being celebrated on July 25th.

the Banca Commerciale Italiana, on the site of the Horti Sallustiani, may also be noted (Lanciani in *Bull. Com.* 1906, 157; Rizzo in *Not. Scavi*, 1906, 434).

In making the foundations for the new Ministry of Agriculture on the N.W. side of the Via Venti Settembre, portions of the 'Servian' wall were brought to light, consisting of remains of the outer wall of the *agger*, and of a few blocks of an inner wall, one stone high only, which formed its inner limit. Within this again, there was, as at the Villa Spithoever, a piece of walling of smaller blocks about a foot high, and under this was found an inhumation tomb. Similar tombs were also found in the Villa Spithoever, though, according to Pinza (*Mon. Lincei*, xv. 248, 748), not under the original *agger*, but below a later enlargement of it. Between the two outer walls was found pottery of the early Latin type (eighth to sixth century B.C.). Considerable remains of structures of the Imperial period were also found. (*Not. Scavi*, 1907, 504.)

A very interesting suggestion, and, I think, a correct one, is made by Prof. Tomassetti in *Bull. Com.* 1907, 82 *sqq.*—that the well-known fable of Pope Joan (which first makes its appearance at the end of the thirteenth century, referring to an event supposed to have occurred after the death of Leo IV. in 855), originated from the existence of a statue, supposed vulgarly to represent the female Pope with her son, and an inscription relating to the event. Stephen of Bourbon, the first to mention the fable, wrote in 1283, *ibi mortua fuit ibi fuit sepulta, et super lapidem supra ea positum scriptum est versiculus:*

P. P. P. P. P. P.

In the *Mirabilia* of the thirteenth century (Parthey, p. 56) we read *in platea iacet ymago que dicitur papa femina cum puero cuius corpus ad sanctum Petrum in bonio (?) est sepultum.*

The statue Tomassetti identifies with the Juno suckling Hercules of the Museo Chiaramonti, which is known to have been brought to the Vatican from the garden of the Quirinal,¹ constructed by Sixtus V., to whom is due the restoration of the direct road (Via di S. Giovanni in Laterano) past S. Clemente to the Lateran—which during the Middle Ages, and up to his time, was abandoned, so that the papal procession in the ceremony of the *posse* (or taking possession of the papal dignity) passed by the church of the SS. Quattro Coronati.

In the comparative ignorance of the Middle Ages, the statue was misinterpreted, and the inscription taken to mean (as the chroniclers tell us) *parce pater patrum papissae proderet partum*, or *papa pater patrum peperit papissa papellum*. And the abandonment of the direct road past the statue was taken as a protest against the scandal.

Yet another reason for the acceptance of the legend was the custom of the Pope's taking his seat in one or both of the two marble seats (really seats for the bath, but supposed, from their form, to be *sellae stercorariae*) which stood in the *platea* of the Lateran, with the bronze wolf, the statue of M. Aurelius, etc., while the singers intoned the versicle *et de stercore erigens pauperem*.

The ceremony is first traceable in the case of Paschal II., in 1099, and recurred until Hadrian VI. refused to submit to it. It, too, was misinterpreted, so that we find the *Mirabilia* (*ed. cit.* p. 51) saying 'supra palatium ante sancta sanctorum sunt duae sedes in quibus consideratur papa an masculus sit an femina.'

THOMAS ASHBY.

¹The original provenance given by Amelung, *Sculpturen des Vaticanischen Museums*, is Otricoli, quoted from Clarac, 423, 748; but this statement, which does not occur elsewhere, e.g. in Visconti, *Museo Pio Clementino*, i. pl. 4 and text (where one would have expected it), is probably incorrect:

for the statue is spoken of as already in the Quirinal gardens by Winckelmann, *Mon. Ined.* i. xiv. p. 14 (1st edition, 1767), whereas the Papal excavations at Otricoli began in 1775. (Guattani, *Mon. Antichi Inediti per l'anno 1784*, 1.)