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SUMMARY

After tracing the survival and manifestation of interest in the antiquities of Rome from the 5th to the 14th centuries, an attempt is made to show in what ways Petrarch is the precursor of the humanist antiquarians of the early Quattrocento. His writings on Rome, and those of his followers, cannot be isolated from the political realities of 'Babylonish Captivity' and Schism, which for so long frustrated any concerted attempts to rejuvenate Rome, or investigate its antiquities.

But the return of Pope Martin V to his native city in September 1420 paved the way to its recovery, and inaugurated a decade of intensive exploration of its ancient remains, undertaken by the artists and humanists who came to Rome from Tuscany and Northern Italy to work for the Pope, or his Cardinals. This study, at the source of rinascita, was to decisively change the course of both Italian art and humanism.

Intellectually pre-eminent among the humanists who entered the Curia under Martin V, Poggio Bracciolini, it is argued, was the effective founder in modern times of both field-archaeology and classical epigraphy: disciplines which give the description of Rome inserted into Book I of his De varietate Fortunae its distinctive and original tone. The rival claims made on behalf of either Cola di Rienzo or Nicolò Signorili as founders of epigraphy are shown to be mistaken. The latter, in his own treatise on Rome, commissioned by the Pope, attempted unsuccessfully, it is suggested, to wed the Roman tradition of communal antiquarianism to the humanistic approach recently introduced into the Curia by Poggio.
The death of Martin V in February 1431 precipitated renewed hostilities, which forced Eugenius IV, his successor, into exile, and interrupted the course of archaeology in Rome for over a decade. The *Roma instaurata*, the treatise composed by his secretary Flavio Biondo, coincides with the Pope's eventual return to the city in September 1443, and reflects his attempts to restore it; its commemoration of the Pope's *instauratio* accompanies its recovery of *Roma antica*. The first sustained attempt at a humanist topography of ancient Rome, Biondo's work draws on a wealth of disparate, and in many cases newly discovered, source material. In its erudition, and in its restoration of what had come to be corrupt, it must rank, it is claimed, as a major contribution not only to Roman topography, but to the historiography of the Renaissance, and the European revival of learning.
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The research embodied in this thesis began in the form of a projected re-edition of the *Roma instaurata* of Flavio Biondo, but, at an early stage, was transformed into a general survey of the humanistic study of the antiquities of Rome during the periods of residence in the city of Popes Martin V and Eugenius IV. The survey rests principally on a description of three Latin treatises of the period: those of Nicolò Signorili, Poggio Bracciolini, and Flavio Biondo. I have not felt obliged to include an analysis of Leon Battista Alberti's *Descriptio urbis Romae*, since its cartographic character is beyond the scope of my essentially literary inquiry, and, more especially, since I am persuaded that the work, in any case, dates to the later 1440's and falls outside my period (see infra, Chapter IX).

In the main, the texts are approached in an expository and descriptive fashion. My main aim has been to dispel ignorance of, rather than postulate theories about, works which have seldom been read, let alone studied with the sustained attention they deserve. What ancillary material has been assembled — urbanistic, art-historical, and epigraphic — is necessarily slight, and makes no claims to originality; it is included to complement general observations, or to reinforce general conclusions, about the growth of humanistic interest in the antiquities of Rome during the period 1420-1447, of which the texts under review constitute the chief literary evidence.
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INTRODUCTION

Though the study of Western attitudes to the ruins of antiquity belongs essentially to the 19th century and after, the intellectual climate in which it could prosper may be traced back two centuries earlier, when, in the wake of the Cartesian revolution, historians began to look more sceptically at the literary sources at their disposal: what but caprice, self-interest, sectarianism, or ignorance could have shaped them? But no such scruples need attach to the material remains of antiquity. To coins, inscriptions, and antiquities in general one could apply just the kind of mechanistic laws which the Cartesian spirit demanded, and which, to the entrenched Pyrrhonist, rendered even the most seemingly unprejudiced literary sources tainted.

To this drastic revaluation of the source-materials of history may be attributed the gulf which, in the later 17th and 18th centuries, progressively separated the respective terrains of historians and antiquaries. While the former discovered a haven from the scepticism (and the pedantries) of the érudits in philosophical history, the latter developed the potentialities for accuracy of the auxiliary sciences, among them, numismatics, epigraphy, iconography, diplomatics and palaeography. In the process, they made at least two contributions contingent on our subject; one was the collection of antiquarian treatises about Rome, including those of the Renaissance, into thesauri (most influentially those of Graevius and Sallengre), and the other was the outcome of

1. J. G. Graevius, Thesaurus antiquitatum Romanares, III (1696), contains texts of the Regionaries, Marliani, Panvinius, Pancirolli,

Continued
the *voyages littéraires* to Italy, associated, above all, with the great Maurist scholars of the 17th century. The pioneer of the latter enterprise was Jean Mabillon (1632-1707), a man whose intelligence irradiated practically the whole spectrum of the auxiliary sciences of history. In the record of his Italian journey, the *Iter Italicum*, he looked back appreciatively to the 15th century revival of learning, including the study of the ruins of Rome, 2 and later in his *Vetera Analecta* published the first printed edition of the Carolingian *Itinerarium Einsidlensis*.

In Mabillon's footsteps came another distinguished Maurist scholar, Montfaucon (1655-1741), whose erudition, equally wide-ranging, even more conspicuously embraced the study of pagan antiquities. 4 To it he devoted his *magnum opus*, *L'Antiquité expliquée et représentée en figures*, first published in 1719, 5 which was to have such a decisive influence on the development of classical archaeology; its essentially iconographic approach was later elaborated by Caylus, and refined by Winckelmann. 6 Montfaucon's great work was inspired, as he explains in its preface, by the three years he had spent in Rome (1698-1701). 'During my stay there,' he recalls, '...I employed all the spare time I had from books and

---


5. 2nd edition, 1721; in 1724 five supplementary volumes were added.

libraries, in viewing the monuments of the city. The journal describing these perambulations is included in his *Diarium Italicum* (1702). It ends in a lucid résumé of the development of archaeology in Rome from Biondo to Nardini, and recommends that

"...the authors also of the first, middle, and latter ages, are to be consulted, who either purposely, or else transiently, and, as occasion offers, mention the Roman monuments."

Montfaucon himself implemented this precept both by publishing the first printed edition of the *De Mirabilibus Civitatis Romae*, and by quoting extensively from Flaminio Vacca, a Roman sculptor of the later 16th century, whose diary records many finds of antiquities in Rome.

One historian who came under the influence of Montfaucon's *L'Antiquité expliquée* was Edward Gibbon, who, though a votary of philosophical history in the manner of Montesquieu and Voltaire, made considerable attempts to come to terms with the methods and interests of the *érudits*. Signs of this are evident throughout *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, but the reconciliation of *philosophe* and *érudit* is most striking at its close. There, in chapter LXXI, returning to the scene of his initial inspiration, Gibbon describes, as a final gloss on his thesis, the melancholy disintegration of the

---

7. Montfaucon 1725, 72.
8. Montfaucon 1702, chapters VIII-XX; Montfaucon 1725, 72-216. On the antiquarian pursuits of both Mabillon and Montfaucon in Rome, see Bunsen in Platner et al. 1830, I, XLII-XLIII.
10. Montfaucon 1702, 283-298; cf. CTR, III, 178, and infra, chapter II. 2 (b).
11. Vacca's *Memorie di varie Antichità* (1594) is printed in Nardini 1818, vol. IV.
monuments of Rome themselves. He does so in the words of Poggio Bracciolini, who, almost three centuries previously, had contemplated 'the wide and various prospect of desolation' from the Capitoline hill. 13

What happened in historiography in the century between Gibbon and Burckhardt could be philosophically interpreted in terms of a shift from rationalism to positivism. The shift is great. Gibbon, who could quote Poggio as a kindred spirit, and whose Decline and Fall is indeed in the synoptic tradition of Biondo's Decades, is at one with the humanists, whereas Burckhardt, separated by the 1848 revolutions, the Romantic movement, the Hegelian system, and the school of Ranke, belongs indubitably to the modern world. Poggio, to him, is no kindred spirit, but, like Galeazzo Maria Sforza or Savonarola, a symptom of the Italian Renaissance, a cultural epoch as discrete as the age of Pericles. In his Cultur der Renaissance of 1860 Burckhardt opened out an incomparably sweeping but always sharp-focussed panorama of culture and society in Renaissance Italy - one which includes a brilliant survey of Rombetrachtung from the time of Dante to that of Raphael and Leo X. 14 Though this survey, which contains tributes to both Poggio and Biondo as antiquaries, 15 more than anything helped to

15. Ibid., 109-110.
chart Renaissance archaeology as a fertile field for study, it should be noted that it was preceded by one year by Voigt's *Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums*, and, earlier still, by Bunsen's *Vorrede* to the *Beschreibung der Stadt Rom* (1830), a concise survey of archaeology in Rome from the early Middle Ages into modern times.

Burckhardt, like Bunsen, gives only an impression. It was left to more diligent scholars to investigate more comprehensively the sources on which it was based. Conspicuous among them were the German historian, Gregorovius (1821-1891), and the Italian epigraphist, Giovanni Battista De Rossi (1822-1894). The former began work on his monumental *Geschichte der Stadt Rome im Mittelalter* in 1855 and completed it on his fiftieth birthday. On leaving Rome three years later, he declared in his journal:

"Can say of myself what Flavius Blondus said of himself, "I created that which did not exist"; threw light on eleven dark centuries in the city, and gave the Romans the history of their Middle Ages."

He left, like Biondo, not only a political history of the Middle Ages, but also a description of the city's antiquities during the Renaissance.

In his description of the origins of archaeology, and its ancillary disciplines, in Trecento-Quattrocento Rome, Gregorovius owed

---


17. Bunsen in Platner et al 1830, I, XIV-LXVII


19. Ibid., 458.

20. On the beginnings of archaeology, see Gregorovius, VII, 584-606, and on the aspect of the city c. 1500, Ibid., 726-793.
some obligation to the pioneering studies into the origins of epigraphy made by De Rossi, and to his publication of the earliest known syllogai of the Renaissance. 21

The investigations of De Rossi typify how the whole range of classical studies, from textual emendation to field-archaeology, was being methodically transformed in the mid-century. The age of the dilettanti was over: Forschung was in full spate. In the universities of Germany the colleagues, or epigones, of Mommsen were turning their critical resources also to the problems of Renaissance archaeology. Henzen collaborated with De Rossi in editing the volume of the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum devoted to the inscriptions of Rome (1876), noting, where possible, their transmission through the Quattrocento syllogai. 22 Meanwhile, Henri Jordan (1833-1886), a friend of Mommsen, and professor at Königsberg, after first visiting Rome in 1861, was amassing the knowledge of the medieval and early Renaissance topography of the city, which he was to display so authoritatively in the second volume of his Topographie der Stadt Rom im Alterthum (1871). Jordan's work was eventually completed by Christian Huelsen, 23 who himself made several distinguished contributions to archaeology and topography in 15th century Rome. 24

While the classical scholars were methodically investigating the origins of archaeology in Italy, historians and art-historians were evaluating their wider cultural implications for the history of humanism and art. In France Eugène Müntz was turning his prodigious

22. C.I.L., VI, Pars 1.
24. See bibliography under Huelsen.
knowledge of Roman archives to the study of the growth of antique-
collections during the Quattrocento, while Duchesne was relating the
topographical literature of Rome to the history of the city during the
central Middle Ages. And in Italy, at the close of the century,
Rodolfo Lanciani was collecting the great corpus of documents and
literary sources describing the history of archaeology in Rome, and of
its ancient monuments, from the central Middle Ages to the close of
the Renaissance, which he published in his *Storia degli Scavi di Roma*
(1902-1912).

Beside the monumental achievements of Gregorovius, De Rossi,
Jordan, Huelsen, Münzt, Duchesne, and Lanciani, more recent
contributions seem puny. The comprehensive study of Italian humanism
in the first half of the 15th century, initiated by Voigt and his
school, has, however, been pursued in Walser's biography of Poggio,
Nogara's of Biondo, and in the various studies of Sabbadini; all
have something to say about the archaeological aspect of humanism. And
the corpus-collecting tradition of the 19th century persists, at least,
in the collection of medieval and Renaissance topographical treatises on
Rome attempted by Valentini and Zucchetti (1940-1953). The idea of

25. See bibliography under Münzt.
26. See bibliography under Duchesne.
27. Lanciani 1902-12, vols. I-IV. Lanciani combined distinction as a
classical archaeologist with a complete mastery of the Renaissance
source-material relevant to the antiquities of Rome. See also
Lanciani 1899, and, for a vivid history of the Renaissance city,
Lanciani 1906.
28. E.g. Voigt's brief survey of Biondo's life (Voigt 1893, II, 34-36)
was extended in the monograph of Masius 1879.
29. Walser 1914.
30. Nogara 1927, XIX-CLXXXIII.
31. See bibliography under Sabbadini.
32. CTR, vols. I-IV.
the venture had characteristically been conceived by De Rossi in 1851, and already anticipated in Urlichs' limited corpus of 1871. The Codice Topografico of Valentini and Zucchetti is more comprehensive: it reaches from the Itineraries and Mirabilia of the Middle Ages to the more systematic treatises of the Quattrocento down to Francesco Albertini's Opusculum of 1506-1509.

It is only proper to bring this brief survey of the literature up to date with a mention of the contribution of the English scholar, Roberto Weiss. In a series of papers, of individually minor but cumulatively major significance, Weiss enlarged our knowledge of the antiquarian preoccupations of the early Italian humanists. His studies culminated in the posthumously published Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity (1969), which can safely claim the distinction of being the first monograph on its subject. Its synthesis of the material necessarily informs the following research.

33. CTR, I, IX.
34. Urlichs 1871, containing texts of the Regionaries, medieval Itineraria and Mirabilia, and, among the Quattrocento opuscula, the letters of Manuel Chrysoloras on the ruins of Rome, and Poggio's description from Book I of the De varietate Fortunae.
35. See bibliography under Weiss.
CHAPTER I

MEDIEVAL INTEREST IN THE ANTIQUITIES

OF THE CITY OF ROME

1. **Imperial**

An interest in the antiquities of Rome is hardly a novelty in the Renaissance. Quickened by the peculiar fascination which the city, in its dual status as capital of the Empire and seat of the apostolic succession (*caput fidei et caput orbis*), has exerted over Western Europe, it enjoyed, throughout the Middle Ages, almost uninterrupted existence.¹

The interest goes even deeper. It was propagated in antiquity. A cursory study of the great monuments of Roman literature would reveal the importance attached to the aetiology of Rome: the elucidation of its divine origin and primeval history. This fertile area, where myth, legend and history intertwined, was patriotically cultivated by successive Roman writers (as in Vergil's *Aeneid*, Ovid's *Fasti*, Livy's *ab urbe condita*), and round its periphery

¹ There is no general survey of the growth of the antiquarian and archaeological spirit in the Middle Ages; see the remarks of Momigliano 1950, 289 and note 5 with bibliography. For the more ideological aspects of medieval Romgedanke, Schneider 1925 remains useful. Graf 1923 has dated, and its title is deceptive: it mainly concerns the way successive Roman emperors and Latin writers were interpreted in the Middle Ages. For medieval artistic response to the antiquities of Rome, the bibliography is huge, but see, in particular, Adhémar 1939, Hamann McLean 1949-50, Ladendorf 1953, and the bibliographical note in Panofsky 1965, 42, note L. Useful contributions to post-12th century antiquarian thought in Italy have been made by Weiss 1958A and 1969. On the fate of the ancient monuments of Rome during the Middle Ages, Gregorovius contains *passim* a great deal of information; see also Lanciani 1899, and Lanciani 1902-12, vol. I, 3-41.
proliferated subsidiary growths, the embryonic forms of what we now term the auxiliary sciences of history. These were the *antiquititates*. They were collected and systematized by Varro.\(^2\)

This antiquarian strain in Roman culture was deep-seated and influential. Through it the traditions attached to the legendary sites of Rome and the monuments that marked their location were transmitted and elaborated. The process is inseparable from the accepted notion of Rome's sacred mission. Rome was, as a recent writer has described it:

'...a punctiliously protected city of great temples where the religion that had guaranteed the greatness of the Empire could survive and be seen to survive.'\(^3\)

It was on this guarantee that Rome's status as capital and the privileges it traditionally enjoyed were maintained long after events had progressively concurred to rob them of any utility. While emperors rose and fell on the frontiers, the *annona* continued to be distributed. When emperors did come, it was not to govern, but to go through the empty ceremonies of triumph. When, for this purpose, Diocletian visited Rome for the first time in 303 A.D., after having been on the throne for nearly twenty years, he erected both a triumphal arch (demolished in 1491) and, as a token of favour, the baths that carry his name: they cover almost thirty acres of floor-space.\(^4\) Constantine, too, became gripped by this 'pathological' urge

---

2. The Varronian system of *antiquititates* requires further study: see the remarks of Momigliano 1950, 288-289. It should be stressed that in this thesis the term 'antiquities' is not employed in this Varronian sense - though it was by Biondo in his *Roma triumphans* - but is conventionally restricted to tangible remains.


4. Finley 1968, 144.
to rebuild the city,\textsuperscript{5} so much so that the Roman poet, Porphyrius, could, before the Emperor turned to the East, proclaim Rome's restoration to her true position as \textit{mundi caput}.\textsuperscript{6} Even after Constantine's expedient removal to a new capital (Constantinople, dedicated in 330 A.D.), Rome retained its token preeminence: 'The sister Rome, the jewel of the Pontus,' declared Porphyrius, 'only serves to exalt the Tuscan Rome, which we behold with our own eyes.'\textsuperscript{7} Indeed, as Mackail long ago noted, the denomination of Rome as Eternal City becomes even more prevalent after the foundation of Constantinople.\textsuperscript{8} Rome, in the phrases of Ammianus Marcellinus, was \textit{domina et regina, urbs venerabilis, caput mundi, victura cum seculis, urbs sacratissima, templum mundi totius}.\textsuperscript{9} When the Emperor Constantius II came to Rome for the first time in 356, his astonishment at the size and splendour of the public buildings (particularly the Forum of Trajan) is memorably described by the same historian, as is the colossal obelisk raised by the Emperor as a memento of his visit.\textsuperscript{10}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{5} It was Lactantius who diagnosed in Diocletian an 'uncontrollable passion to build' \textit{(De mort. pers., 7. 8-10)} but this may simply be an echo of Plutarch's similar diagnosis of Domitian's 'mere disease of building' \textit{(Poplicola, 15. 5)}.  
\textsuperscript{7} Porphyrius, \textit{Carm.}, 18, 32ff. Cf. Alféldi 1948, 122.  
\textsuperscript{8} Mackail 1920, 109.  
\textsuperscript{9} Ammianus Marcellinus, XIV. 6, 6; XIV. 6, 5; XIV. 6, 23; XXVI. 1, 14; XXVII. 3, 3; XVII. 4, 13.  
\textsuperscript{10} Ammianus Marcellinus, XVI. 10, 13-17; XVII. 4, 1-23. The obelisk, set up on the spina of the Circus Maximus by Constantius in 357 A.D., was re-erected at the Lateran by Domenico Fontana in 1588; cf. Platner-Ashby, 367-368; Nash, II, 142-143.
Ammianus Marcellinus was writing his History at a time of extreme cultural reaction in the city of Rome, a reaction that is both pagan and antiquarian in character. Ammianus himself throws some light on it. It can also be seen reflected, for example, in the aristocratic correspondence of Symmachus, in compilations like the Origo Gentis Romanae of c. 360 A.D., and in the medallions of contorniate type, representing, on one side, the political and literary heroes of antiquity, and, on the reverse, scenes of pagan cult. This revived antiquarian climate of the later 4th century is proof of the extraordinary hold that the traditions of Rome still had, and prophetic, too, of the whole future course of antiquarianism in the city. Pagan though the movement was, one cannot entirely exempt Christian writers from its underlying historiographic assumptions; for all their fulminations against the new Sodom or Babylon, the city came to have, for them too, the nature of a guarantee. And in the spate of apologetic unloosed by the Gothic Sack of 410 both Christians and pagans vied to reconcile their differing interpretations of Roma aeterna to the new situation: 'If Rome can perish, what can be safe?' exclaimed St. Jerome, just as Lactantius had prophesied that its fall would necessarily entail the dissolution of the whole world.

Nor, as it transpired, was this concern for the preservation

11. On the Origo Gentis Romanae, see Momigliano 1958, passim. On the related Chronography of the year A.D. 354, incorporating the Chronica urbis Romae, which traces the chronology of Rome from the mythical king Faunus to the death of Licinius, see Mommsen 1850; CTR, I, 266-281. On contorniate medallions, see Alföldi 1942-43. More recent contributions to the problem of late Roman antiquarian revivalism include Bloch 1945 and 1963; Cameron 1964; and Paschoud 1967.

of Rome generally incompatible with barbarian wishes. First on behalf of their imperial puppets, and then independently, the barbarian rulers of Rome instigated various measures for the maintenance of the city, so that Procopius could, with some justice, claim that:

'Although the Romans have long endured barbarian rule, they have preserved as far as possible the buildings of their city, and the greater part of its adornments.'

Under Theoderic the Ostrogoth in the 6th century, a full-scale restoration was undertaken, celebrated by Cassiodorus, and commemorated by Theoderic's ubiquitous brick-stamps. His restauratio was the first of a whole series stretching through the Middle Ages to the Roma instaurata of the Renaissance.

With the reconquest of Italy, the dissolution of Theoderic's kingdom, and the fall of Rome first to Belisarius (547) and then to Narses (552), the city entered into the world of Byzantium; in his Pragmatic Sanction of 554 Justinian, too, legislated for the restoration of its public buildings. But though the centre of barbarian power in Europe had meanwhile shifted from Ostrogothic Italy to Merovingian Gaul, the rejection of Arianism initiated by Clovis had ensured that Rome was drawn into the Merovingian sphere of interest. Under his successors the rapprochement tightened. In 754 Pipin flew

15. On Biondo's Roma instaurata, see infra, chap. VIII.
to the aid of Stephen II, while his son Charlemagne, lured by Hadrian I, progressively became entangled in Roman politics. He set his seal on this perilous process when he translated his re-born *imperium* to the far North, while maintaining protection over Rome.

Just as Constantine had conceived of his new capital as an *altera Roma*, so Aachen became Charlemagne's substitute. Like Constantinople, it aped its archetype. Charlemagne's palace and chapel were built with marbles ransacked from Rome and Ravenna. His palace was called the Lateran. In front of it stood an equestrian statue brought back from Ravenna in 801, aping the *caballus Constantini* (as the statue of Marcus Aurelius was known in the Middle Ages) then displayed in front of the Lateran in Rome. Similarly the bronze she-bear, which still stands in the entrance-hall to Aachen Cathedral, was evidently inspired by the Roman *Lupa* (also at the Lateran during the Middle Ages). Other curious parallels have been noted.

Among Charlemagne's most prized possessions (since they figure in his testament as recorded by Einhart) were three tables, the surface of each decorated with a map, one of Constantinople, one of Rome, and

18. For correlations between the imperial complexes at Aachen and Rome, see Falkenstein 1966, with bibliography and useful Stand der Forschung, 5-21.
21. The correlations proposed by Lauer and Krautheimer, in particular, are reviewed in Falkenstein 1966, 32ff.
one of the world. 22 The circular *Romanae urbis effigies* is the first post-Roman plan of the city we have knowledge of. There may have been others. Christian Huelsen, indeed, following a suggestion by De Rossi, has persuasively argued that the Carolingian *Itinerarium Einsidlensis* originally must have been associated with one. 23 In this itinerary of Rome for the use of pilgrims the lists of prominent monuments, both Christian and pagan, are divided into two columns, marked *in sinistra* and *in dextra* (the obvious analogy being the directions on a guided tour), and, Huelsen argued, without an accompanying map or plan, these lists would have been meaningless. 24 The interest shown by the *Itinerarium Einsidlensis* in the pagan monuments of the city is extraordinary. It has been suggested they were included simply as conspicuous points of reference. 25 Yet the preponderance of pagan inscriptions in the carefully transcribed *sylloge* of Roman inscriptions preceding the Itinerary indicates a more explicit interest. 26

It is one generally substantiated by the marked antiquarian


26. The *sylloge* is published in CIL, VI, Pars I, IX-XV; De Rossi 1857-88, vol. II, 9-33. For a study of the *sylloge* in relation to the origins of epigraphy, see Silvagni 1921.
(and classicizing) tendencies of Carolingian, and later of Ottonian, culture: the pseudo-antique poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance, the all'antica forms of the palace chapel at Aachen and the Torhalle at Lorsch, and, untransmuted, the Phaedra and Hippolytus sarcophagus in which Charlemagne was buried are all redolent of it. Antiquities, to the Carolingian and Ottonian rulers, were more than pretty objects; they were status-symbols, mementos of empire. The cameos and other classical disjecta membra that decorate their crown- and church-jewels, like the permutations of their imperial devices, are a constant reminder of the theme of renovatio that unites the designs of the Holy Roman Empire. Attention may be drawn, in particular, to the renovatio imperii associated with Otto III. This was accompanied by an antiquarian efflorescence in Rome itself. Under the learned tutelage of Bernward of Hildesheim, the Emperor, alienated from his homeland, and filled with dreams of the millennium, evidently contemplated turning the city back into the imperial seat. The antagonism of the Romans, however, and his own premature death in 1002, soon put an end to this impractical dream.

Undoubtedly, Otto III, in his sentimental identification with Rome (the city in which his father lay buried), both as fount of

27. For the classicizing elements in Carolingian art, see the useful synthesis, with bibliography, in Panofsky 1965, 43-54.
29. Bernward of Hildesheim erected a bronze column at Hildesheim evidently inspired by one of the triumphal columns in Rome: see Schramm 1929, 106; Haftmann 1939, 151 ff; Noehles 1966, 28. Bernward's interest in antiquities is also attested by the tiles which he had stamped with his name in the Roman fashion: Oakeshott 1959, 67; Weiss 1969, 4.
30. For Otto's plans to turn Rome back into an imperial residence, see Schramm 1929, 108. For plans to revive the Palatine palace, see the Chronicon of Martin Polonus, 466: 'Tunc imperator cepit construere grande palacium in Urbe in palacio Iuliani imperatoris.'
antity and imperial seat, is unique in the annals of the Holy Roman Empire. His Salian and Hohenstaufen successors took a more pragmatic, and self-seeking, view of the renovatio imperii. We enter upon the familiar cycle of Italian expeditions, papal nominations, and imperial coronations, in which the antiquities of Rome played little or no part. Repeated invitations (often fulsome in nature) sent out by the Romans to the Hohenstaufen to reinhabit the Capitol (and give de facto recognition to the commune) met with only disdain; 31 Frederick Barbarossa, for his part, dismissed Roman communal pretensions with the claim that the Germans were the effective Romans of the day. 32

This pattern of claims and counter-claims, communal overtures and imperial rebuffs, was to persist, but took on a more critical dimension, when, in the following century, the confrontation turned into a viciously three-cornered one, with the papacy ranged against the Hohenstaufen, the Roman commune becoming increasingly militant in its drive for autonomy, and Frederick II bent on domination yet cutting himself off in Sicily from the heartland of his empire. The peculiarly antique court-culture which he implanted there is too well-known to merit description here: monumental sculpture and glyptography, the golden augustales, the triumphal arch erected at Capua all convey its imperialistic tone. 33 Roma caput mundi still graced Frederick's seal, and, in a correspondingly antique gesture, he ordered the spoils of Cortenuovo to be exhibited on the Capitol: the Milanese

31. On letters sent by the Senate to Conrad III, see Gregorovius, IV, 510-517; Lenkeith 1952, 11-12. On the envoys sent to Frederick Barbarossa in 1155, see Gregorovius, IV, 532-539; Lenkeith 1952, 12-15.
carrocco was mounted on five marble pillars with a dedicatory inscription.

With the dissolution of the Hohenstaufen empire in Italy soon after Frederick's death in 1250 (Manfred killed at Benevento in 1266; Conradin executed in 1268), the precarious stability of Rome, balanced between empire, papacy, and people, collapsed. Anarchy prevailed. It became a city armed against itself (hence Roma turrita): an open wound remorselessly picked over by Guelfs and Ghibellines until there was nothing but corruption left, understandably shunned by emperors, and, ultimately, abandoned by the papacy itself (Pope Clement V formally removing to Avignon in 1308).

Out of this desolation rises Dante's vehement rebuke, in Canto VI of the Purgatorio, both to Italy and, more particularly, to the neglectful Habsburg, Albert I (uncrowned emperor 1298-1308), whom he beseeches to enter Italy, tend the sores of faction, and, in her desolation, give solace to Rome:

'Vien crudel, vieni, e vedi la pressura
de' tuoi gentili, e cura lor magagne,
e vedrai Santafior com' è oscura.

Vieni a veder la tua Roma che piagne,
vedova e sola, e di e notte chiama:
"Cesare mio, perché non m'accompagne?" 36

34. Gregorovius, V, 192-194; Kantorowicz 1957, 444, 448-450. This was not, in fact, the first time that the Capitol was used for the display of booty in the Middle Ages: after the destruction of Tusculum in 1191, two columns were brought back and placed there; cf. Noehles 1966, 23.

35. For the towers of the feuding nobility at this time, which so changed the character of Rome (as they did that of many other cities and towns of Italy), the indispensable study remains Amadei 1943.

36. Dante, Purgatorio, VI, 109-114. Albert's father and predecessor on the throne, Rudolf I, is, for similar reasons, consigned by Dante to the ante-Purgatorio among the Negligent Rulers: Purgatorio, VII, 91-96; cf. VI, 103.
To Albert's successor, Henry VII of Luxemburg (1308-1313), the ideal sovereign of the De Monarchia, Dante's exhortations became even more extravagant and persistent. His expectations went so far that he furnished the Paradiso with a suitable throne for Henry to assume, once he had accomplished the regeneration of Italy. The hopes were to be dashed. Henry's disastrous progress through the peninsula to the humiliation of having to accept a shabby imperial coronation in S. Giovanni Laterano (St. Peter's being in the hands of Robert of Naples) was only halted in August 1313 by his death from fever near Siena. How bathetic is the contrast between these disillusioning events and the simile of the starry-eyed barbarians 'vedendo Roma e l'ardua sua opra / stupefaciens, quando Laterano / alle cose mortali andò di sopra' suggested by Dante's own incredulous progress from Florence to Paradise!

It had been Henry's intention, as he bitterly pointed out to the Romans in the peroration attributed to him, 'to repair to the Capitol amid their acclamations'. Instead, the Capitol had been barricaded against him. Yet only a few years later, in 1328, Ludwig of Bavaria, having entered Rome to a triumphant reception, received the diadem from the senators and people, not, according to Mussatus, in St. Peter's, but on the Capitol itself. In the schematic view of the city which

37. Dante, Epistulae, V and VI indirectly, and VII directly, exhort the Emperor's intervention in Italian affairs: Lenkeith 1952, 82-86; Davis 1957, passim; Ricci 1965, passim.
39. Ibid., XXXI, 31-40.
40. Gregorovius, VI, 50.
41. Ibid., 47-53.
42. Mussatus, Lud. Bavar., 782. Gregorovius, VI, 111, note 2, casts doubt on the authenticity of the account, but the coronation on the Capitol has been accepted by Theseider 1942, 237 ff, and Kantorowicz 1965, 157-158.
embellishes the golden-bull of Ludwig, dating to the year of his imperial coronation, and attributed to Leonardo da Venezia, it is noticeable that the centre is occupied by the Palace of the Senators.\textsuperscript{43} This comparatively sophisticated \textit{veduta} of Rome, deftly compressed onto the size of a large coin, and encircled with the now familiar device \textit{Roma Caput Mundi Regi Orbis Frena Rotundi}, may fairly claim to be the first surviving post-Roman view of the city to depict the ancient monuments with any degree of accuracy;\textsuperscript{44} clearly recognisable are the Vatican obelisk, Hadrian's Mausoleum, the Pantheon, the Column of Trajan or Marcus Aurelius, the Colosseum, the arch of Titus or of Constantine, and the Pyramid of Cestius.

Dante's apostrophes to absentee-emperors later found a sympathetic echo in Petrarch's attempt, in February 1351, following the collapse of Cola di Rienzo's regime, to lure the still uncrowned Charles IV into Italy.\textsuperscript{45} In the latter part of his letter Petrarch lets personified Rome, widowed as in Dante's \textit{Purgatorio}, conduct the appeal, and, at the end, Henry VII is resurrected to urge his grandson on.\textsuperscript{46} Eventually, after further prodding on Petrarch's

\textsuperscript{44} For previous plans and views, cf. \textit{ibid.}, vol. I, 111-119, vol. II, tav. 140-143.
\textsuperscript{45} Bayley 1942, passim; Wilkins 1958, 43-45; Wilkins 1961, 97-98.
\textsuperscript{46} Petrarca, \textit{Ep. fam.}, X 1; Rossi ed., \textit{Le Familiari}, vol. II, 277-284. The allegorical conceit of widowed Rome \textit{recurs} in Fazio degli Uberti's vernacular poem, the \textit{Dittamondo}, an encyclopaedic world-view, in the course of which personified Rome tells her history from the coming of Noah to Italy down to the coronation of Charles IV in 1355 (Fazio died shortly after 1368) (Lib. II. XXX, 106-108). This historical survey is followed by a brief description of the antiquities of Rome taken from the \textit{Mirabilia} and Martinus Polonus (Lib. II. XXXI): CTR, IV, 55-64. And in a miniature of Rome, dating to 1447 but based on a Trecento prototype, which illustrates this chapter in a MS. of the \textit{Dittamondo}, now Paris, Bib. Nat., fond. Ital. ms. 81 (olim 8375), fol. 18r, personified Rome, in widow's weeds, can be seen crouched \textit{disconsolately} beside the Colosseum: Frutaz 1962, LXXXI, vol. I, 129-130, vol. II, tav. 153.
part, and much vacillation on his own, Charles crossed over the Alps in the autumn of 1354. At Mantua he received from Petrarch's own hand a gift of some suitably edifying Roman imperial coins as a further inducement, but could not prevail on the poet to accompany him south. On reaching Rome in April 1355, Charles celebrated his coronation and left the city on the same day. Two months later he began the retreat from Italy. Petrarch watched his flight both with dismay and, as Gibbon thought, with the bitterness bred of the Emperor's laureation of Zanobi da Strada, a mediocrity, in May of that year; in a final angry appeal he summoned up the reproachful spectres of the Emperor's kin to goad his conscience: 'Thou bringest with thee crowns of iron and of gold and the sterile name of empire.'

The humiliations of Henry VII and his grandson in Italy were not lightly forgotten. Rome was abandoned to the turbulence of the Schism. We must look forward to the fresh climate of the renovatio promoted by Eugenius IV for an alteration: it was then that Sigismund made his dignified entry. He was crowned Emperor on 31 May 1433, but remained in the city until 14 August (possibly a record by imperial standards). During these months he spent time touring the ancient monuments with the prominent Italian antiquary and epigraphist,

48. Wilkins 1958, 79-80; Wilkins 1961, 142-144. The meeting is described by Petrarch in his Ep. fam., XIX. 3.
51. Gibbon, VII, 280, note 64; Bayley 1942, 332 and note 2; Wilkins 1958, 96.
Ciriaco d'Ancona, acting as guide. Ciriaco had been sent by the Pope to greet Sigismund at Siena, where he presented him, in a manner reminiscent of Petrarch, with a gold coin of Trajan. But the present was, in the context of the new age, like the ruins of Rome themselves, more sentimental than admonitory. Once crowned, Sigismund had no higher expectations in Rome beyond those of any curious traveller: the persistent imperial theme in the antiquarian culture of Rome was, to all purposes, over.

2. Papal

Notwithstanding the famous homily directed by Gregory the Great against the ancient glories of Rome, the earlier medieval popes often chose to convert rather than destroy what still lay intact. The ancient Roman structures transformed into churches, particularly in the period from the 6th to the 8th centuries, appear to fall into four main groups. To the first belong the actual pagan temples reconsecrated to Christian worship, such as the Pantheon, and the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina, within which the church of S. Lorenzo in Miranda was founded. Secondly, we can group together several

churches erected within miscellaneous earlier imperial secular structures: S. Stephano Rotondo founded by Simplicius (468-483) in the Neronian Macellum Magnum;⁵⁸ S. Maria Antiqua originally erected probably in the 6th century within the ruins of the bibliotheca templi Divi Augusti on the Forum;⁵⁹ S. Adriano (in tribus fatis) founded by Honorius I (625-638) in the aula of the Roman Senate;⁶⁰ S. Maria in Via Lata originally built, probably in the early 7th century, within a Roman horrea;⁶¹ S. Felicità in Termis founded in a small chamber of the Domus Aurea, probably in the 7th century;⁶² S. Agnese (in Agone) in Piazza Navona erected within the substructure of Domitian's Stadium,⁶³ etc. In the third group can be placed those mainly late antique secular basilicas taken over as churches more or less unchanged: S. Pudenziana converted at a very early date out of a thermal basilica of the 2nd century A.D.;⁶⁴ S. Andrea in Catabarbara, now demolished, founded in the 5th century by the Goth Valila in a secular basilica built by Junius Bassus;⁶⁵ S. Balbina on the Aventine erected in a similar basilica at roughly the same date;⁶⁶ S. Lucia in Selcis founded by Honorius I (625-638) probably in the so-called Library of Agapitas, a secular basilica of the late 3rd or 4th century,⁶⁷ etc. The fourth group consists of late Roman mausolea converted into churches and

---

⁵⁹ Huelsen 1927, 309, no. 8; CBCR, II, 249-268.
⁶⁰ L.P., LXXII, 6 (vol. I, 324); Huelsen 1927, 260, no. 1; Platner-Ashby, 143-146; Nash, I, 301-303.
⁶¹ Huelsen 1927, 376, no. 97; CBCR, III, 72-81.
⁶² Huelsen 1927, 252, no. 2; CBCR, I, 219.
⁶⁴ Huelsen 1927, 424, no. 25; CBCR, III, 277-302.
⁶⁵ CBCR, I, 62-63; Nash, I, 190-195.
⁶⁶ Huelsen 1927, 203, no. 1; CBCR, I, 82-92.
chapels: S. Petronilla; S. Urbano on the Via Appia, S. Constanza, etc.

Common as this process of transformation was, it admittedly played a relatively subsidiary rôle to the main impetus of church-building during the same period — an impetus maintained, as any tour of the early Christian basilicas of Rome would make abundantly clear, by the wholesale spoliation of the ancient monuments. This spoliation continued unabated throughout the Middle Ages, accelerating in the periods of reconstruction following the Saracen incursions in the 9th century and the disastrous Norman Sack of Rome in 1084. The huge imperial thermae offered the most accessible, and rewarding, quarries, and it is known that in Innocent II's rebuilding of S. Maria in Trastevere (1139), material excavated from the Baths of Caracalla, including Ionic capitals, was used.

The same Pope (1130-1143) evidently had a taste for the antique. He took the unprecedented step of ordering the removal from Hadrian's Mausoleum of the porphyry sarcophagus, containing the remains of Roman emperors from Hadrian to Geta, which had remained till then in situ in the circular burial chamber. Innocent intended it

68. Huelsen 1927, 422, no. 21; Platner-Ashby, 481.
69. Huelsen 1927, 501, no. 11.
70. Huelsen 1927, 238, no. 20.
71. Lanciani 1899, and CBCR, passim. Lanciani 1902-12 only begins its documentary survey of this spoliation with the year 1000 A.D.
72. Cf. Lanciani 1899, 126-173; Lanciani 1902-12, I, 5-6. For the considerable restorations, particularly on the ruined Lateran, undertaken by Sergius III in the early 10th century, see Gregorovius, III, 245-247; his restoratio was lauded by the poet Vulgarius: 'Nunc gaudeat aurea Roma' etc. (MGH, Poetae latini aevi carolini, IV, 415).
73. Ibid. Cf. Delbrueck 1932, 216; Deér 1959, 150.
for his own burial; and we learn from later texts of the *Mirabilia*, from the life of the Pope in the *Liber Pontificalis*, and from the descriptions of the Lateran by Johannes Diaconus and Petrus Mallius, that this sarcophagus, initially set up 'Lateranis ante folloniam', later found its way inside the basilica, where it stood near the Altar of Forty Martyrs:

Inde est altare sanctorum XL Martyrum. Prope hoc altare in navi ecclesiae iacet Innocentius papa II in conch(a) porfiscetica, quae fuit (H)adriani imperatoris sepultura.'

In the disastrous fire of the Lateran in 1308 this sarcophagus was destroyed. Shortly afterwards Innocent's example was followed by Anastasius IV (1153-54), who ordered the removal of the famous porphyry sarcophagus of St. Helena, mother of Constantine, from her mausoleum on the Via Labicana (Tor Pignattara), on the pretext that it had been plundered by robbers and no longer contained the remains of the holy empress. It, too, was placed in S. Giovanni Laterano, and, on his death, Anastasius was buried in it. It stood on the left side of the basilica, near the altar of S. Antonino:

'A sinistro vero latere basilicae est altare sancti Antonini martiris. Ibi iuxta iacet Anastasius papa IIII, qui fuit Sabinensis episcopus, in mausoleo porfiscetico preclaro opere sculpto, in quo olim iacuit Helena, mater Constantini imperatoris; quod videlicet mausoleum de ecclesia, quam idem imperator ad honorem ipsius matris extra Urbem fabricaverat, idem papa deportari fecerat.'

75. CTR, III, 47.
76. Ibid., 348. Cf. ibid., 86 and 431; IV, 135; L.P., CLXV (vol. II, 385); Deèr 1959, 150.
77. On the possible surviving fragments, see Delbrueck 1932, 216; cf. Deèr 1959, 151.
78. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 7; Deèr 1959, 151-152.
79. CTR, III, 351. Cf. ibid., 86; L.P., CLXIX (vol. II, 388); Ptolomaeus Lucensis, Hist. eccl., XX, 18; Deèr 1959, 151, note 135.
This sarcophagus, having survived the fire of 1308, was restored in 1509, and eventually placed by Pius VI in the Sala della Croce Greca of the Vatican. 80

Innocent II and Anastasius IV were the first popes to be interred in porphyry sarcophagi. It has been suggested that both the pink granite late imperial sarcophagus used by Anastasius' successor, Adrian IV, in the Vatican Grotte, and the rosso veronese tombstone of Lucius III in the Cathedral of Verona attempted to follow the same fashion. 81 Subsequently, it is reported that Honorius III (1216-17) was buried in a concha porphyretica in S. Maria Maggiore. 82

Both for its rarity and its purple colour, porphyry was highly prized in the Middle Ages; antique specimens were quite often re-used, as in the famous 12th century eagle vase of Abbot Suger. 83 Moreover, it is known from Anna Comnena's Alexias how much the stone was coveted by the Byzantine emperors: she mentions that there was a chamber in the imperial palace at Constantinople called Porphyra after the marble with which it was paved; this is not, she explains,

'... an ordinary kind of marble, not as one of the many sorts that are expensive without being rare, but as a kind that already the basileis of old were wont to look for in Rome.' 84

The Roman source of porphyry is confirmed by other Byzantine writers, 85 and is corroborated by modern research. 86 It is thus quite certain

80. Helbig, I, no. 25, with further bibliography.
81. Deér 1959, 152.
83. On the medieval re-use of porphyry, see Delbrueck 1932, passim.
85. Ibid., 117 and note 2.
86. Ibid., 123; Delbrueck 1932, XII.
that the porphyry used in the 12th to early 13th century dynastic tombs of the Hautevilles and Hohenstaufen at Palermo and Monreale in Sicily was quarried in Rome. 87 Indeed, the most likely model for the tombs of Henry VI, William I, and Constance is the Hadrianic porphyry trough displayed outside the Pantheon in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, until it was removed to form the tomb of Pope Clement XII in S. Giovanni Laterano. 88

The Sicilian series of porphyry dynastic tombs, subjected to a masterly study by Josef Deér, 89 begins with Roger II's donation in 1145 of two porphyry sarcophagi to Cefalu; 90 these were subsequently transferred to Palermo, where they became the tombs of Frederick II and Henry VI. 91 Roger probably acquired them in Rome very shortly after Innocent II's acquisition of his own sarcophagus from Hadrian's mausoleum, but they are not genuinely antique: like all the Sicilian porphyry sarcophagi, they seem to have been hewn at the time from huge antique porphyry shafts. 92

The presumably competitive activities of Roger's stonemasons in Rome and of Innocent's recovery of his sarcophagus, as Deér has suggested, reflect the ideological conflict between the papacy and the Norman dynasty at this time (we may recall that after the schism of 1130 Roger II had given his support to the anti-Pope Anastasius II); 93

88. Delbrueck 1932, 157-161; Deér 1959, 70-76. That the Lateran Trough was visible in the Middle Ages, pace Flaminius Vacca, is indicated by Magister Gregorius: Rushforth 1919, 53; CTR, III, 159 and note 2; Deér 1959, 73-74 and note 10. See further, note 226 infra.
89. Deér 1959.
90. Ibid. 1.
91. Ibid. 23, 46-90.
92. Ibid. 124.
while Innocent wanted to erect, in the face of Norman intransigence and communal revolt, a monument worthy of the papal-imperial idea he represented, Roger, for his part, wanted to counter such usurpation, and this he did not only symbolically through porphyry, but diplomatically, and through various ceremonial displays calculated to restore his sovereignty. 94

But Innocent's use of porphyry — and by implication his usurpation of an imperial prerogative — had already been anticipated in the revival of opus sectile pavements by Roman marmorarii during the pontificate of Paschal II (1099-1118). 95 In view of what is already known of the ceremonial function fulfilled by the porphyry rotae in Constantine's palace, in Hagia Sophia, in the chrysotriclinus of Justinus II, in Galla Placidia's Ravenna, and in Constantine's basilica of St. Peter, 96 it may be assumed that the porphyry component in the Cosmatesque pavements of S. Croce in Gerusalemme, S. Maria in Cosmedin, SS. Quattro Coronati, and S. Clemente played, at once, an aesthetic, liturgical, and an implicit political rôle. 97 The assumption is reinforced by the prominent rôle played by the large rota porphyretica at St. Peter's in the ceremonies accompanying the Coronation of the Emperor Henry V in 1111. 98 Paschal II, it has been suggested, by authorizing

94. Ibid., 153-165.
95. See now Glass 1969, 386ff. On Paschal II's extensive restorations of Roman churches, see Lanciani 1902-12, I, 5-6. Paschal's taste for porphyry, moreover, was whetted by the discovery in 1112 of a porphyry tub below the main altar of SS. Quattro Coronati, a church destroyed by the Normans; cf. ibid., I, 6: '(Paschal) iussit cavare sub alte, quod prius combustum et confractum fuerat, et inventit duas concas, unam porphireticam, et aliam ex proconnesso, in quibus erant recondita sacra corpora.'
the use of porphyry in Cosmatesque pavements, and by thus exploiting it as a weapon in the Investiture Contest, was attempting to 'pre-empt' its imperial significance. 

His policy in this matter can be substantiated by the recognition that the twin curules, which played an important part in the ceremonies through which, as newly elected Pope, he was given possession of the Lateran, are identical with the mock-imperial, antique sedes porphyreticae described in the 12th century ceremonial books of Albinus and Censius.

Similar ceremonies, emphasising the papal-imperial idea, were indulged in by Innocent II; indeed, the whole trend towards the spectacular between Paschal and Innocent was such as to induce St. Bernard of Clairvaux, who came to Rome in 1138, when the city was split between Innocent and Anaclete, to deplore the sorry contrast between St. Peter and his flamboyant successors. Towards the end of his pontificate, Innocent II commissioned a cycle of frescoes (now lost) in the Chapel of St. Nicholas in the Lateran, in which his

100. Deér 1959, 142-146, rejects this identification, but the ceremonial function of the curules as described in the Vita Paschalis II, L P., CLXI (vol. II, 296, 306, note 4), is much the same as that of the sedes porphyreticae described by Albinus and Censius: Deér 1959, 144. Both, in my opinion, can be identified with the twin chairs of rosso antico in, respectively, the Vatican Museum and the Louvre: Helbig, I, no. 212; Lauer 1911, 58, fig. 61. Mabillon 1724, 57, saw them when they were still displayed in the Lateran Cloister; cf. Montfaucon 1725, 96, for a similar account.

101. The main source is the ceremonial book, the Liber Politicus, compiled by Benedict, a Canon of St. Peter's, during the pontificate of Innocent II and dedicated to his eventual successor: see Fabre and Duchesne 1910, vol. II, 141-177 for text. For the section incorporated in it describing processional routes in Rome, the so-called Ordo Romanus, a valuable source for the medieval topography of the city, see Nichols 1889, 157-175 (English translation); Lanciani 1899, 174-179; CTR, III, 197-222 (introduction and critical edition).

102. Mâle 1960, 132-133; Deér 1959, 147.
imperiousness reached new heights: the traditional protocol reversed, the kneeling Lothar III was depicted as receiving the imperial crown from the enthroned Pope. 103

We can follow the same ideological commitment, and its expression in stone, in the activities of later popes during the second half of the 12th century. 104 In the following century the papal cult of antiquity was extended to assimilate a whole range of antique borrowings in the ecclesiastical sculpture of the romani marmorarii: Karl Noehles has recently emphasised how directly the familiar Cosmatesque repertoire of Easter candelabra, 105 episcopal thrones, 106 triumphal-arch crossings, 107 and pseudo-antique lions and sphinxes 108 was formed and conditioned by the papal-imperial idea. 109 The renewed efflorescence of Cosmatesque art in the early 13th century 110 corresponds in time with the triumph of the patrimonium Petri and papal sovereignty following the collapse of imperial authority in Italy after the death of Henry VI in 1197: 111 the period that sees the erection of the splendid porticoes of S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura and the Duomo of Civitā Castellana, the latter with its triumphal-arch inspired by that of the Emperor Gallienus in Roma. 112 The Roman marmorarii associated with these works continued to make generous use of porphyry; the discs of porphyry which decorate the imposing episcopal thrones in S. Lorenzo

103. Deér 1959, 148 and note 112 with literature.
104. Ibid., 151-152.
105. On Cosmatesque candelabra and possible antique influences, see Torp 1962, 79ff; Noehles 1966, 28.
107. Ibid., 30.
108. Ibid., 24-28; Roullet 1968, I, 110-115, 190-192.
fuori le Mura and S. Sabina were undoubtedly intended to lend an imperial touch. 113

The reception of antique art in 12th and 13th century Rome, in short, cannot be divorced from political considerations. The recovery of antiques, the decoration of churches, and the re-employment of porphyry are to be understood in the context of the Investiture Contest and its repercussions; they reflect the temporal claims of the papacy, and thus the bid to usurp the prerogatives of empire. 114

The cult of antiquity elaborated by successive popes from Paschal II onwards was matched, on equally sectarian grounds, by that of the Roman commune, and it is to this we must now turn.

3. **Communal**

a) The 1143 Commune

The popular movement in Rome had, even before the 12th century, a long and turbulent history: Schramm has traced the roots of the Roman commune back to the state of affairs precipitated by the collapse of Otto III’s renovatio at the beginning of the 11th century. 115 During the earlier 12th century, influenced by the flourishing communes of Lombardy, Tuscany, Romagna and the Marches,
the movement gained impetus. While Innocent II was anticipating his papal-imperial funeral, events came to a head: the Romans, according to Otto of Freising, converged on the Capitol, 'antiquam Urbis dignitatem renovare cupientes,' installed a restored Senate, and renewed the war against Tivoli. Coins were minted to commemorate the event, bearing the device Senatus Populusque Romanus and, on the obverse, the effigy of an apostle with the inscription Princeps Romanorum. The revolt was not survived by the Pope, who died in September 1143.

b) The Mirabilia

That these events in Rome are to be associated with the inception of the Mirabilia is the thesis advanced by Duchesne and now generally accepted. Duchesne contended that Benedict, the author of the Liber Politicus, was responsible for it, and that he wrote it on the eve of the establishment of the 1143 Commune; in what seems to be the earliest extant MS., the text of the Mirabilia is actually incorporated into the Liber Politicus.

118. Ibid., 451. For the beginnings of the medieval Palace of the Senators on the Capitol, see ibid., 477, and, in general, Pietrangeli 1960.
120. Gregorovius, IV, 452.
The latter compilation was dedicated by Benedict to Guido de Castello, Cardinal of St. Mark. Like Arnaldo da Brescia, perhaps the prime mover behind the 1143 Commune, Guido was a pupil of Abelard; the two, indeed, were well known to each other: after Arnaldo's condemnation at the Lateran Council in 1139, and his banishment from Italy, Guido, then legate in Bohemia, extended his protection to him. On the declaration of the Commune, and only two days after the death of Innocent II, he ascended the papal throne as Celestine II. Such, in brief, is the political background against which Benedict's composition of the *Mirabilia* is to be understood; the work expresses before all else the revival of the civic spirit of Rome in the twelfth century.

The *Mirabilia* consists, in essence, of three distinct parts: firstly, an enumeration of the monuments of Rome by categories — the walls and gates, the triumphal arches, the hills, *thermae*, palaces, theatres, sacred places, bridges, and cemeteries; secondly, a collection of legends associated with the pagan and Christian monuments of the city; and thirdly, a *Periegesis* or description of the principal monuments, notably temples, to be encountered on a tour of the city. The preponderance of temples in this last section, indeed, induced Duchesne to remark that it might well be entitled *De templis*, and had earlier led Jordan to even suggest that the purpose of the *Periegesis* was to convince the reader that the ruins of the city were originally the

---

temples of the pagan gods.

In its topographical aspect, the Mirabilia has a dual, but undemonstrated, ancestry: on the one hand, the late antique Regionaries (Notitia and Curiosum) and related opuscula, and, on the other, the catalogues of the stages, cemeteries and basilicas compiled for the use of pilgrims, dating from the 4th century Depositio Episcoporum et Martyrum to the 12th Itinerarium of William of Malmesbury (itself derived from a late 7th or early 8th century source), and including the already mentioned Itinerarium Einsidlensis. The dearth of post-Carolingian itineraries may only reflect a poor survival rate (since much of this literature is, by its nature, ephemeral); those private itineraries of visiting ecclesiastics and pilgrims to Rome which have been preserved, such as that of Sigeric, Archbishop of Canterbury in the later 10th century, and the mid-12th century itinerarium of Nikolas, abbot of a Benedictine monastery in Northern Iceland, need to be collected together and studied as a genre.

The relationship of the Mirabilia to this antecedent literature, one pagan, the other Christian, is imperfectly understood, but by Benedict's day both had long become synthesized: the Mirabilia, like the Ordo Romanus, describe a topography of Rome in which Christian and pagan monuments exist in harmony.

130. CTR, II, 1-153; Itineraria et Alia Geographica, 284-328.
132. Magoun 1940A and B.
133. It is commonly conceded that the Mirabilia contains some undigested earlier material: Gregorovius, IV, 654; Jordan, vol. II, 386-387; Hyde 1965-66, 320.
The huge popularity of the Mirabilia in the Middle Ages, revealed in the proliferation of later redactions and in the profusion of MSS., indicates that it long outlived the initial tendentious purpose attributed to it by Duchesne and the other proponents of his thesis. There are several later versions. Ulrichs, the first to attempt a corpus, defined six classes, dating from the Ur-text down to the early Quattrocento Anonymus Magliabecchianus. Of these perhaps the most influential was the Graphia aureae Urbis Romae, a version expanded to include the early 11th century Libellus de caerimoniis aulae imperatoris, an anonymous treatise on court ceremonial. The date of the Graphia is contested: Ulrichs dated it to the 13th century, and the earliest extant MS., Cod. Laurenziano Plut. LXXIX, inf. 41 (previously Gaddiano 267) (from which the Quattrocento Cod. Vaticanus Lat. 1983 appears to derive) also falls into this century, but Schramm took the view that the Graphia was compiled in Rome c. 1155; apart from the Florentine MS., the terminus ante quem is given by the quotations from it in the Chronicon of Martinus Polonus, which goes down to 1277 (Martinus died in the following year).

In addition to independent texts of one class or another, the Mirabilia literature reached a wide audience at second-hand;

134. Ulrichs 1871. The Ulrichs corpus has now been generally superseded by that of Valentini and Zucchetti in CTR, III, 3-136, 175-196; CTR, IV, 101-150.
135. Text of the Graphia: CTR, III, 67-110. See also Schramm 1929, 193ff, II Teil, 73-104 (text). On the Graphia-Libellus, see ibid., 193-222; its date is contested: Giesebrecht associated it with Otto III's residence in Rome, and Gregorovius thought it specifically compiled for his usage, whereas Schramm, on the force of the imperial device recorded in it, connected it rather with Conrad II and dated it to c. 1030: ibid., 203-204, 214-215.
136. CTR, III, 73-74.
137. But Schramm's date seems more in the nature of a terminus post quem: Schramm 1929, 195; CTR, III, 68; Anastasius IV, whose porphyry tomb is mentioned in the Graphia, died in December 1154.
138. CTR, III, 74-75.
particularly influential were the excerpts from the *Graphia* disseminated by the chronicle of Martinus Polonus.\(^{139}\) Above all, it was a popular literature, making fact palatable with legend, and there is little doubt that, among pilgrims, it fulfilled something of the function of a modern *Baedeker*. In fact, the *Mirabilia* literature long outlived the Middle Ages.\(^{140}\) Early printed versions are common;\(^{141}\) the one published by Marcello Silber in Rome in 1513, for instance, retains such well-tried legends as that of Trajan and the Widow, and the caballus Constantini.\(^{142}\) In the course of the Renaissance Italian, English, German, and Spanish translations proliferated; and even during the 17th century over forty editions have been accounted for.\(^{143}\)

---


140. The survival of the *Mirabilia* may be illustrated by one instance with topical interest. It has been brought to my attention that MS. Adv. 18. 2. 9 of the National Library of Scotland, a miscellaneous codex mainly devoted to various works of Ovid, written by Nicolas Crabel at Padua in 1448-1449, contains on f. 223r a brief *opusculum* describing the antiquities of Rome, written in a degenerate *bastarda* script, which differs somewhat from Crabel's own *Gothica textualis* but belongs to the same period; the work, on analysis, consists of disordered excerpts from the *Periegesis* of the *Mirabilia*, listing sundry temples of ancient Rome. I have not attempted to trace the exact redaction from which these excerpts derive, but considering the difference of some three centuries in date, they are remarkably close to the *Ur-text*: cf. CTR, III, 45, 53-61 *passim*. It is conceivable that the work may be connected with a pilgrimage Crabel, a native of Mittelberg in Austria, may have made to Rome in the Jubilee Year of 1450.

141. Printed editions of the *Mirabilia* are catalogued in Schudt 1930, nos. 1-172, *passim*, 563-566; the incorporation of the majority of these in *Indulgentiae* is proof that the appeal of the *Mirabilia* became primarily directed at pilgrims to Rome.


c) From Arnaldo da Brescia to Cola di Rienzo

The movement of the communal *renovatio* of 1143-1144, far from wearing itself out, was still gathering momentum. Its antiquarian flavour determined the taste of the Casa dei Crescenzi, a surviving house of the period, with antique friezes incongruously stuck onto the façade and sides; the proud inscription reads:

'Nicolaus, owner of this house, was not incited by vain love of glory, when he built it, but that he did it "Romae veterem renovare decorem".'

Meanwhile, the political rift between commune and papacy was growing. In February 1145 the unfortunate Pope Lucius II died of injuries sustained while making an assault on the Capitol, with the object of dislodging the insurgents. Soon after, the demagogue Arnaldo da Brescia, lured by their success, returned triumphantly from exile and instituted his own regime on the Capitol. According to Otto of Freising, he urged the Romans, amongst other things, to undertake its restoration. In June 1148, on his return to Italy from France, Eugenius III excommunicated him. But it was only after the English Pope Hadrian IV had taken the unprecedented step of laying Rome under an interdict in 1154 that, as a concession for lifting it, Arnaldo was expelled from the city for good.

The subsequent development of the communal movement in Rome is complex; progressively intransigent, republican agitation

---

144. Amadei 1932, 113-118; Heckscher 1937-38; Fedele 1940.
145. Gregorovius, IV, 491.
147. Gregorovius, IV, 477, note 2; Ross 1938, 311-312; Weiss 1969, 10.
periodically erupted into revolt, as it did at the close of the 12th century (Pandulf de Suburra, Senator in 1199), as it did in 1234 (Lucas Savelli, Senator), and in the 1250's under Senator Brancalone, and as it did, most spectacularly, in 1347, when Cola di Rienzo, a publican's son with imperial pretensions, had himself crowned Tribune of the people after leading a successful coup.

The antiquarian motive detectable in 1143 and in the time of Arnaldo da Brescia persists in these later revolts. It was directed, for the most part, at the Capitol, seat of the Senate. Thus, at an unspecified date after 1144 an obelisk was re-erected there, where it remained until, as part of Paul III's remodelling of the Piazza del Campidoglio, it was dismantled in 1542, subsequently finding its way to its present location in the Villa Mattei; there, in its vicinity, are to be seen two white marble recumbent lions, supporting an antique sarcophagus; they date, on stylistic grounds, to the mid 13th century, and Karl Noehles has convincingly argued that they belong to the medieval supports of the Capitoline obelisk, which, as several Heemskerck drawings show, was raised over a plinth resting on four recumbent lions of precisely the same type. According to Noehles, the object of re-erecting this obelisk was to celebrate the victory over Tivoli in 1254, but it is perhaps even more plausible that it was intended rather to commemorate Brancalone's death four years later.

149. Ibid., V, 35.
150. Ibid., V, 170-172.
151. Ibid., V, 285ff; Theseider 1952, 3ff.
152. Gregorovius, VI, 246ff; Theseider 1952, 543ff.
The supposition rests on one source, describing a curious pseudo-antique funerary monument accorded to the Senator; his head, says Matthew Paris, was placed in a costly urn, which was deposited on top of a column:

'Caput vero ipsius B(rancaleonis), in vase pretioso super marmoream columnam collocatum, in signum sui valoris et probitatis, quasi reliquias, superstitiose nimis et pompose sustulerunt.'\(^{156}\)

The obvious analogy is to the Vatican obelisk, the gilt bronze sphere on the top of which was supposed, in the Middle Ages, to contain the ashes of Julius Caesar.\(^{157}\) Thus the 13th century De Mirabilibus Urbis Romae of Magister Gregorius states: 'Habetque in summitate spareae aeneam, in qua cineres et ossa Iulii Caesaris condita sunt.'\(^{158}\) And of the supports of the Vatican obelisk the same source notes: 'Sub quo magno labore reptant ubi super .III. aeneos leones saxum fundatur.'\(^{159}\) These bronze lion-supports, which are mentioned by other medieval sources, provide the most obvious model for the marble lion-supports associated with the Capitoline obelisk.\(^{160}\)

It may be pointed out that these were not the only sculptures of lions visible on the Capitol at this time. The well-known, and genuinely antique, animal group of a lion attacking a horse, which stood in the later Middle Ages under the loggia of the Senators' Palace, and before which death sentences were passed, may well also be associated with Brancaleone's draconian regime.\(^{161}\)

\(^{157}\) Rushforth 1919, 42-43; Platner-Ashby, 370-371; Graf 1923, 226-234.
\(^{158}\) Rushforth 1919, 56; CTR, III, 164.
\(^{159}\) Rushforth 1919, 57; CTR, III, 165.
\(^{161}\) Ibid., 21-23. The group, heavily restored, is now displayed in the Giardino del Palazzo dei Conservatori: Jones 1926, 249, no. 100, pl. 96, with earlier literature; Helbig, II, 1793; cf. Michaelis 1891, 6-10; Huelser 1899A, 16-17; Bober 1957, 76.
traditionally an emblem of the Roman Senate, moreover, seems to have played a special rôle under Brancaleone, whose very name incorporates it. On the *grosso romanino* of the reformed coinage of 1257, one side bears the device *Roma caput mundi*, while the obverse shows a lion with the inscription *Senatus Populusque Romanorum*; a few specimens of the same coin carry, on the obverse, the alternative inscription *Brancaleo S. P. Q. R.* and it is clear from them that the lion emblem alluded to the Senator's name.

Yet the lion-emblem, and lion-iconography in general in medieval Rome, cannot be confined to Brancaleone. It played an important part in the antiquarian image of the city's history. Hence the survival of other antique lion sculptures: the two lion-masks which decorated the two older measures for wine and oil on the Capitol and now in the Conservatori,* 164* the two lions that supported the base of the *caballus Constantini* at the Lateran,* 165* and, notably, the pair of Egyptian basalt lions, taken from a monument of the Pharaoh Nektanebos I (4th century B.C.), which were exhibited outside the Pantheon in the Middle Ages. 166 The latter provided the chief model for the whole

162. Theseider 1952, 52; Noehles 1966, 23.
163. Ibid.
164. Rodocanachi 1904, 139-140; Noehles 1966, 23.
165. *When, under* Sixtus IV, the statue of Marcus Aurelius was given a new pedestal in 1473, these lions were placed on pilaster bases: cf. Heemskerck, I, fol. 71; Heckscher 1955A, 11-13. After the Marcus Aurelius was moved to the Capitol in 1538, the two lions were placed in front of the North door of the basilica, where they remained up to the time of Sixtus V. Cf. Michaelis 1898, 248-249; Huelsen 1907B, 29; Lanciani 1902-12, vol. I, 15.
166. They are now in the Museo Egiziano of the Vatican: Botti and Romanelli 1951, nos. 26-27, 14-18, pls. 16-18; cf. Lanciani 1902-12, vol. I, 15; Deer 1959, 106-110, an exemplary account of the Nektanebos Lions in the Middle Ages; CTR, III, 159 and note 2.
series of pseudo-antique lions sculpted in the course of the 13th century by Roman *marmorarii*; particularly close in style are the twin marble lions flanking the episcopal throne in the Cathedral of Anagni, dating to 1263-1276, and inscribed 'Vasalet de Roma me fecit'.

Rome, indeed, was actually conceived in the symbolic shape of a lion, and is so depicted in a 13th century miniature of the city. It was the same symbolism that, in the later Middle Ages at least, dictated the maintenance of a caged lion on the Capitol, much as a wolf is kept today beside the steps leading up to Aracoeli.

The political and judicial significance which this lion-symbolism had on the Capitol is quite consistent with the popular medieval interpretation of antique statuary in general. The two other known groups of such statuary visible in Rome in the Middle Ages, the one at the Lateran, the other on the Quirinal, both had well-defined legal associations: under their aegis, the law was dispensed.

169. In a late 13th century MS. containing the volgare version of the Liber vistoriarum Romanorum, now Hamburg Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. ms. 151, f. 107v: Frutaz 1962, III, vol. I, 44-46, vol. II, tav. 13. Cf. ibid., LXI, vol. I, 117: Paolino da Venezia's plan of Rome, Marciana ms. lat. Zan. 399 (1610), f. 98r, with the annotation 'In Ymagine mundi (Rom)a habet formam leonis...'. The notion of Rome as being in the form of a lion can be traced back, in literary contexts, to the 12th century, and is corroborated, for example, in the mid-Trecento Polistoria of Giovanni Cavallini: 'Sed hodie Roma habet formam leonis... etc. See CTR, IV, 53. For further instances, see Frutaz 1962, III, vol. I, 45-46.
170. Huelsen 1899A, 18; Lanciani 1906, 32. The custom came to an end, it seems, in 1414, when the lion was taken out of its cage and, in a fit of delinquency, killed by a boy: see the Diarium of Antonio di Pietro, 95.
171. Thus the 10th century Chronicle of the Monk Benedict records that the bronze *Lupa* at the Lateran marked the site of executions: Jones 1926, 57-48; CTR, III, 167, note 1. Also at the Lateran was preserved the Vespasianic *Lex regia* (C.I.L., VI, 930), on which see infra, note 229. And, on the Quirinal, a loggia, built at an
very preservation of antique sculpture in Rome seems to have depended, not on any intrinsic properties, but on the spurious judicial, and even constitutional, connotations attached to them in the course of the Middle Ages. 172

The juristic foundations of communal antiquarianism in Rome, already displayed in Arnaldo da Brescia's planned renovatio of the Capitol, were in the mid-Trecento even more strikingly to provide the basis for Cola di Rienzo's passion for antiquity. 173 Like other functionaries of the Roman commune, he was trained as a notary — a training which his fractured and exotic Latin could never repudiate. 174 And it was rather as a notary than as a humanist that Cola reclaimed the Vespasianic Lex regia at the Lateran and explicated it to the assembled crowd; 175 like his inflammatory pictorial tableaux, it was

unspecified date beside the Dioscuri, its roof supported by four statues of Constantine and his sons, three of which were later transferred to the Capitol (where they still decorate the balustrade), served as a law-court in the mid-15th century and probably earlier. The loggia is mentioned by Nicolò Signorili, and Flavio Biondo, R.I., II. 19: CTR, IV, 197, 293. But the first to record its judicial function was apparently the German traveller, Nikolaus Maffel, who visited Rome in 1452: 'Item auf dem rossperg sten swey hubsche grosse steyrne ross und zwen junggesellen darauf als die ryser, auch von stein, und darumb sten vier seulen die sind von merbelstein gehawen als menschen, und send abtgotter gebest und auf iren haubten stet das gurks zymmer und dach, daryn man zu gericht gesessen ist.' (CTR, IV, 368).


172. Cf. Michaelis 1898, passim; Borchardt 1936, passim; Rodocanachi 1904, 139-141; but a full-scale survey of the extant statuary in Rome in the Middle Ages, and its political and judicial associations, remains a desideratum.

173. Earlier literature on Cola di Rienzo listed in Theseider 1952, 734-738; on Cola as an antiquarian, see now Weiss 1969, 38-42.


publicised, not to revive learning, but to provoke sedition. Cola, indeed, was never the dedicated antiquary he has been represented as being; the claims made for him as an epigraphist — that he alone knew how to read ancient inscriptions — by his anonymous Roman biographer have never been substantiated, and should be treated with scepticism, the more so since, by a trail of faulty corroboration, Cola, on the force of them, has been inflated into a kind of founding-father of modern classical epigraphy. Cola demonstrably stands not at the beginning of the succession of learned humanists from Petrarch to Poggio, who were to revolutionise the study of Roman antiquity, but, with Arnaldo da Brescia and Brancaleone, among the demagogues of medieval Rome, for whom antiquity was little more than the repository of precedent and the source of legitimacy.

176. Gregorovius, VI, 236-237; the pictorial tableaux, with their antiquarian as well as Joachimite messages, are described in the anonymous Vita, I. 2 and 4, 5-8, 11-14.
177. Vita, I, 1, 3-4: 'Tutta die se speculava nelli intagli de marmo, che iaccio intorno a Roma. Non c'era aitri che esso che sapessi leijere li antichi pitaffi. Tutte scritture antiche vulgarizzava; queste fegure de marmo iustamente interpretava.'
178. After first attributing the so-called Sylloge Signoriliana to Signorili in 1852, De Rossi 1871, jff, subsequently came to the conclusion that the two ostensibly earliest MSS., the codex of S. Nicolo dell' Arena at Catania (now Vat. Lat. 10687), and the codex Chigiano I. VI. 204, dated respectively to 1388 and 1344-47; on this basis he re-attributed the sylloge to Cola di Rienzo. This conclusion was followed by Henzen in C.I.L., VI, Pars I, XV-XVI, and elaborated by De Rossi 1857-88, II, 316-328. But the attribution, historically implausible, has been effectively disproved by Silvagni 1924. See further infra, chap. VI. 1.
179. As an instance of Cola's manipulation of antiquity to further legitimise his position, one may mention the six crowns involved in the pseudo-antique coronation ceremony of 15 August 1347; they were made, in the order in which they were presented to him, of oak leaves, ivy, myrtle, laurel, olive, and silver; and in a letter of 11 Oct. 1347 to the Pope, Cola claimed that the first five had been made from vegetation plucked from the Arch of Constantine: 'Omnes coronae frondae, quas suscepi, in arcu triumphali ejusd. Constantini repertae fuere contingendo, quod cui concha militiam, arcus ejusdem coronam tribunitiam praebisset.' (Papencordt 1841, XXV); cf. Gregorovius, VI, 284-287; Theseider 1952, 589-591.
4. Moral and Aesthetic

The picture so far adumbrated of emperors, popes, and communes using the antiquities of Rome to propagate, or legitimise, their respective renovationes would be incomplete without touching on more disinterested appraisals.

Philosophic speculation inspired by the ruins of Rome from St. Augustine to Petrarch is in itself a long and complex story. In brief, it may be said that such speculation tended to veer between elegy for an admitted grandeur passed away, wonder at what providentially remained, and, in the last analysis, a pious acknowledgement of the vanity it signified. The ambiguities bred of these conflicting views, fortified by a touch of pagan sentiment, are discernible in the early 12th century De Roma of Hildebert of Lavardin, Bishop of Le Mans, and later Archbishop of Tours. 180 This unique poem reflects, in its sorrow, the city recently sacked by the Normans, and, in its wonder, the antiquarian tone of Paschal II's renovatio (in the course of which Hildebert had been in Rome). 181 Yet it is basically pessimistic: what, at the beginning of the poem are admitted to be splendours, become, at the end, fearful exempla of decline and fall; in the words of W. S. Heckscher, they

'... had ceased to be things, the aspect of which would provoke a desire for renovatio. The ancient sites, monuments, and statutes, fallen to pieces and deprived of their former decorations, could only be regarded as specimens of Vanity ...' 182

180. Hildebert de Lavardin, Mélanges poétiques, ed. Hauréau, no. XXXI, 60ff; text reprinted, with German translation, by Schramm 1929, 300-305; Carmina Minora, ed. Scott, nos. 36 and 38. Cf. Heckscher 1937-38, 207-208; Ross 1938, 304-306; Panofsky 1965, 73 and note 2 with further literature; and on Hildebert's antique culture in general, Moos 1965.
181. Ross 1938, 305.
182. Heckscher 1937-38, 208.
This tendency to allegorize ruin is typical of the Middle Ages. It necessarily subverted the appreciation of antiquities for their own sake. Since they had, as in Hildebert's poem, to be reconciled with an over-arching providence, they tended to be perceived in an ontological context in which objects reached beyond the shell of appearance to a divine essence. Hence the medieval predilection for both lucidity and integrity in objects - a taste which is authorized in the Thomistic canon of beauty, \textsuperscript{183} and manifested in the popularity of antique gems and cameos. The semantic status of \textit{cameo} - a high medieval neologism - in itself reflects this view. \textsuperscript{184} Yet it has to be pointed out that the pagan-antique character of cameos by no means won general recognition in the Middle Ages. Albertus Magnus, like others, treated them - incredible as it may seem - as natural phenomena; thus, the paradox of how pagan objects could quite congruously be incorporated into liturgical objects does not arise. \textsuperscript{185} Even if recognised, the incongruity could be

\textsuperscript{183} St. Thomas Aquinas, \textit{Summa Theol.}, I, q. 39, a. 8. The three cardinal properties which Thomas Aquinas postulated in his definition of beauty were, in order, integrity, symmetry, and clarity (or translucence). Cf. Heckscher 1937-38, 210-212.

\textsuperscript{184} The word \textit{camaeus} or \textit{cameaeu} seems to have first appeared in the 13th century; it provided a special term for a relief consisting of three differently coloured layers of stone: Meiss 1967, 52 and note 195 (after Du Cange). The phenomenon of transparency in stones is analysed by Albertus Magnus in his \textit{Book of Minerals}, I. l. 3, as in other medieval lapidaries.

\textsuperscript{185} Cf. Heckscher 1937-38, 216-219. In his \textit{Book of Minerals}, II. 11. 2 ('Figures in Stones Made by Nature'), Albertus Magnus describes a cameo which he had seen at Cologne, and which Dorothy Wyckoff has convincingly identified with the sardonyx Ptolemy cameo in Vienna. Wyckoff tr., 130-131: 'For there is at Cologne, in the shrine of the Three Kings, an onyx of large size, having the breadth of a man's hand or more; and on it, upon the material of the onyx stone, which is like a fingernail (in colour), are pictured in pure white the heads of two young men; one (profile) is behind the other, but the nose and mouth project enough to be seen... I have proved that this is not glass but stone; and therefore I have assumed that this picture was made naturally and not artificially. Many others like this are found.'
removed simply by reinterpreting pagan iconography in terms of Christian symbolism (a kind of proto-euhemerism): just as a winged Victory could be supplied with a tag from Malachi, so a Poseidon and Athena could be rechristened Adam and Eve, and so a relief of Trajan could be transmuted into an exemplum of humility and good government.

Whatever the motive, and whatever the interpretation put upon it, there is no doubt that classical statuary was admired, and collected, throughout the Middle Ages. It was widely, if inaccurately, copied - filtered through what Panofsky has engagingly called the 'principle of disjunction'; derivations of il spinario, a Roman bronze visible at the Lateran during the Middle Ages, were disseminated as far afield as France and Germany. The influence of antique sculpture on the court-art of Frederick II was evidently deep.

The Emperor himself collected antiquities.

186. For the interpretatio Christiana, see Heckscher 1937-38, 217-218; Panofsky 1965, 83-113, passim; and the numerous studies on medieval cameos of H. Wentzel, the most important of which are listed in Panofsky's bibliography, to which can be added Wentzel 1972.


189. I.e. the relief of Trajan, representing the popular legend of Trajan being importuned by a widow, included by Dante among the exempla of humility in Canto X (73-96) of the Purgatorio; it has been suggested that Dante is here referring to an actual antique relief visible in Rome at the time, either in the Forum of Trajan or on the Arcus Pietatis opposite the Pantheon: cf. CTR, III, 49 and note 4; IV, 122; Babelon 1952, 195ff; Hammond 1953, 130, note 10. For the medieval legend, see Toynbee 1898, 535-536; Graf 1923, 370-404. Dante's version apparently derives from the Fiore di Filosofi, and its primary dependence on any existing relief must be considered tenuous.

190. Panofsky 1965, 84.

191. Among the many contributions to the spinario problem can be listed: Adhémar 1939, 189ff; Ladendorf 1953, 20ff; Heckscher 1955B; Panofsky 1965, 89 and note 1.

192. Panofsky 1965, 66 and note 3. On the colossal head from Lanuvium apparently a Dugento remodelling of a late-antique original, thought to represent Frederick II, see Kaschnitz-Weinberg 1953-54, 1ff.

193. Weiss 1969, 12. On the antique bronzes of a man and a cow which

Continued
There is some evidence to indicate that the commercial exploitation of the ancient monuments of Rome for building materials and lime during the Middle Ages developed, as a sideline, the recovery of antique works of art, either as models for Roman sculptors, or for export. To the former category must belong the statue of Aesculapius with the inscription ASSALECTUS (probably one of the Vassalletti) carved on the plinth, observed by Winckelmann in the Palazzo Verospi; other antique statues in Rome have been found in well-authenticated medieval contexts.

In the Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury we learn that Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester and brother of King Stephen, purchased some antique statues in Rome during the pontificate of Eugenius III (1145-1153), and sent them back to England:

'Cum vero episcopus praeter absolutionem se nihil obtinere posse videret, accepta licentia rediens, veteres statuas emit Romae, qua Wintoniam deferri fecit.'

In view of what is known of Suger's plans to procure building materials in Rome for St. Denis, and the demonstrable shipment of marbles, including porphyry, to Westminster Abbey, where the tomb of Henry III of England (inter alia) was built by Cosmati craftsmen in the last quarter of the 13th century, John of Salisbury's account is not

---

Frederick removed from a monastery at Grottaferrata in 1242 in order to embellish Lucera with Roman trophies, see, in addition, Lanciani 1902-12, I, 33.


195. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 11-12.


so preposterous as it might seem at first sight.  

In Rome itself the taste for classical sarcophagi, beginning with Innocent II, continued into the following century: for instance, the splendid Nuptial sarcophagus used in the mid-Dugento tomb of Cardinal Guglielmo Fieschi in S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura, and the Bacchic sarcophagus containing the remains of Senator Luca Savelli, father of Honorius IV, in S. Maria in Aracoeli. Besides, the use of tubs (recovered from the imperial thermae) as reliquaries, cippi cinerarii as stoups, and other assorted antique vases and bowls for miscellaneous liturgical purposes is well-attested in the medieval churches of Rome. Many are still in situ, but it is impossible, in most cases, to know when they were excavated; a case can be made out for supposing that many were uncovered in the wave of spoliation that accompanied the heyday of Cosmatesque art during the Dugento.

---

199. Deér 1959, 118, makes the apposite point that if Henry of Blois did purchase antique statuary in Rome, he did so 'at almost exactly the time when the artists of Roger II must have done their copying in Rome.'

200. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 33; Hutton 1950, 21 and plate 48. It has been further alleged that the kline sarcophagus of Attic type, decorated with reliefs of amoretti harvesting grapes, now in the atrium of S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura, was used as the tomb of Pope Damasus II in 1048: Montini 1957, no. 152. The sarcophagus was formerly inside the church, but according to Rodenwaldt 1930, 120, the earliest mention of it occurs in Marangoni 1744, who affirms that it stood behind the choir, and was empty.

201. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 34; Hutton 1950, 21 and plate 49.

202. E.g., for a dated example (1197), the porphyry tub placed under the high altar of the church of S. Eustachio, rebuilt by Celestine III, with dedicatory inscription: Lanciani 1902-12, I, 8; De Rossi 1857-68, II, 449, no. 216. For cippi cinerarii, vases, bowls, etc. re-used for liturgical purposes in Roman churches, see Lanciani 1902-12, I, 14-16.

203. Many sarcophagi associated with Roman churches in the 15th and 16th centuries (e.g. the influential Bacchic sarcophagus at S. Maria Maggiore by 1430 and now in the British Museum, no. 2298; cf. Degenhart and Schmitt 1968, 1, 1, no. 136, 245-246) could conceivably have been discovered at this time. Other sarcophagi (e.g. the Amor and Psyche specimen, with added bust of S. Agnese in the clipeus, forming the antependium for the main altar of S. Agnese fuori le Mura: Matz-Duhn no. 2506) had clearly been turned to Christian usage at a very early date.
The revived interest in classical statuary, which these disparate activities suggest, finds, in the literary record, its locus classicus in the De Mirabilibus Urbis Romae of Magister Gregorius. The single known MS. of this work was discovered in the library of St. Catherine's College, Cambridge, in 1917, and published by the discoverer, M. R. James, in the same year. 204 James concluded that the author of the work - otherwise unattested - was an Englishman, and belongs to the 12th century. 205 In 1919 Rushforth brought out an amended text, and also brought forward Gregory's visit to Rome to the beginning of the following century, 206 on the basis of internal evidence, which, he thought, reflected events in Rome during the pontificate of Innocent III (1198-1218). 207 As far as the dating is concerned, the upper and lower termini are clearly laid down by Gregory's quotation from the De Roma of Hildebert of Lavardin (possibly derived in turn from the excerpt quoted by William of Malmesbury), 208 and by being subsequently used in Ranulf Higden's Polychronicon (Book I. XXV), the first version of which was probably

204. James 1917.
205. Ibid.
206. Rushforth 1919, 16-17. A generally more reliable text included by Valentini and Zucchetti in CTR, III, 137-167, is based on a collation of James and Rushforth, and not on a new examination of the Cambridge MS., but since it rectifies some of the obviously corrupt readings that had crept into both earlier editions (mainly unexpanded abbreviations), it is the one used in the present discussion. While this thesis was in an advanced state of preparation, a new edition of Magister Gregorius has been published (Leiden, 1970). But it is hard to see what advantages it has to offer: it has no commentary, and only a perfunctory textual note; moreover, it reverts to just the solecisms of transcription perpetrated by James.
208. Ibid., 16.
written in the 1320's. Pending a proper palaeographical examination of the Cambridge MS., it may not be advisable to be much more chronologically specific than this, but it may be hazarded that the generally pessimistic tone of the work conforms best with the political climate in Rome in the mid-Dugento. 210

In spite of its title, Gregory's account appears to owe nothing to the Mirabilia literature. 211 It is secular in tone. More than once, Gregory refers to pilgrims and the stories they brought back in a tone of contempt, 212 and it is possible that, as his Magister title would indicate, he had university affiliations. 213 He mentions only three churches: the Lateran, St. Peter's, merely incidentally, and the Pantheon more fully, precisely because it was a converted temple. 214

Gregory's interest in the extant antique statuary in Rome is


210. On the pessimism of the work, cf. Rushforth 1919, 17. It may reflect the political climate in Rome either in the early 1240's when Rome was being threatened by Frederick II (cf. the description of the insufferable conditions in the city at this time contained in a priest's letter, quoted by Gregorovius, V, 211), or following the death of Brancacone in 1258. Both datings receive some corroboration from the consonance between Gregory's description of a bronze tablet at the Lateran (CTR, III, 167) and the mid-Dugento interpretation of the Lex regia at the Lateran by the glossator Odofredus (d. 1265): cf. Weiss 1969, 12, 40. On Cola di Rienzo's alleged rediscovery of the Lex regia, see infra, note 229.


213. Ibid., 18.

remarkable. After pausing, on Monte Mario, to admire the panorama of
the city, and after describing the gates leading into it, he
immediately launches into their enumeration and description, first the
bronzes and then the marbles. He describes the bronze bull to be
seen on the ramparts of the Castel S. Angelo, and the important
nucleus of bronzes preserved at the Lateran: the equestrian statue of
Marcus Aurelius (apropos of which he says that the rider was called
Theodoric by the pilgrims, Constantine by the Romans, but Marcus or
Quintus Quirinus by the better informed cardinals and officials of the
curia); the colossus represented by the bronze head and right hand
holding an orb; and il spinario. There follows an account of
the fabulous collection of statues known as the Salvatio Civium,
derived from another source, the De Septem Miraculis Mundi (attributed
at one time to Bede). Gregory's account of the ancient statues of
Rome is now interrupted by two digressions, one devoted to a sulphur
bath in Rome, which he claims to have visited, the other to the

216. CTR, III, 145; cf. Rushforth 1919, 21. The bronze bull is also
mentioned in the Mirabilia (CTR, III, 46), and may be represented
by the hindquarters of a colossal bull now in the Conservatori:
Jones 1926, 170, no. 1; Helbig, II, 1580.
218. CTR, III, 149-150; cf. Rushforth 1919, 23. Both fragments are
now in the Conservatori: Jones 1926, 173, no. 7, 174, no. 9;
Helbig, II, 1578; the head used to be thought to represent
Constantius II or Constans I, but more recent opinion, as in
Helbig with further bibliography, has inclined to attribute it to
Constantine the Great.
represents the earliest literary record of the famous spinario,
which was removed to the Campidoglio in 1471, where it remains in
the Palazzo dei Conservatori: Jones 1926, 43-47, no. 2; Helbig,
II, 1448. See also supra, note 191.
Theatre of Heraclea. The ensuing description of the most notable surviving marble statues of the city begins with a nude image of Venus in Parian marble, the vivid beauty of which, he confesses, so moved him that he went to see it three times, though it was located, as he tells us, a couple of miles away from his hostelry:

'Haec autem ymago ex Pario marmore tam miro et inexplicabili perfecta est artificio, ut magis viva creatura videatur quam statua... Hanc autem propter mirandam speciem et nescio quam magicam persuasionem ter coactus sum revisere, cum ab hospicio meo duobus stadiis distaret.'

Gregory continues with an account of the Dioscuri, the twin River-Gods nearby, and a clearly apocryphal collection of sculpture which allegedly existed in the palacium Cornutorum situated in the same region. He then turns to the palaces and temples of Rome, In his chapter on the Pantheon he is the first to make any mention of the antiquities displayed in front, including the two Nektanebos lions already referred to:

'Haec quidem habet porticum spaciosam multis et mirae altitudinis columnis marmoreis sustentatam. Ante quam conchae et vasa alia miranda de marmore porfiroco et leones et cetera signa de eodem marmore usque in...'

221. CTR, III, 153; cf. Rushforth 1919, 33-35, 44.
222. CTR, III, 153-154. Rushforth 1919, 24-26, argues, quite convincingly, that this statue, mentioned in no other medieval source, could have been the Capitoline Venus, allegedly discovered purposely walled-up in the late 17th century near S. Vitale on the Quirinal; cf. Helbig, II, 1277. Rushforth's hypothesis receives some corroboration from the statue of a female nude placed on a column to be seen in the anonymous early Quattrocento circular miniature of Rome contained in a codex of Sallust, belonging to a private collection: Frutaz 1962, LXXVIII, I, 126-127, II, tav. 150. The miniature is ultimately based on an early Trecento prototype.
224. Ibid.
Gregory closes his treatise with an addendum of three further sculptures and an ancient inscription: a marble sow with her litter of thirty; the bronze *lupa* in the portico of the Lateran Palace, the nearby bronze ram, *'qui ante palatium praefatum aquam abluendis manibus ore emittit'*; and, finally, also at the Lateran, a bronze tablet *'prohibens peccatum'* , which can safely be identified with the Vespasianic *Lex regia*.

226. CTR, III, 159; cf. Rushforth 1919, 37; Deér 1959, 109. Gregory's account refutes Flaminio Vacca's statement (*Memorie*, 35) that 'Una dei due Leoni di Basalte, e la Conca di porfido, che sin'al tempo di Sisto IV sono stati avanti il Portico della Rotonda, furono trovati al tempo di Eugenio IV quando fece la Basilicata per tutto Campo Marzio.' Cf. Montfaucon 1725, 176; Lanciani 1902-12, I, 51-52. The antiquities in question may have been lost to sight during the course of the Trecento, though Biondo, *R.I.*, III. 64-66, makes no mention of them coming to light again in his account of Eugenius IV's restorations at the Pantheon. The antiquities mentioned by Gregory are shown *in situ* in front of the Pantheon portico in the anonymous later Quattrocento drawing, Louvre, Cabinet des dessins, n. 11029; Egger 1931-32, vol. II, taf. 92; cf. Heemskerck's drawing of the Pantheon in 1534 for a similar view: Heemskerck, I, fol. 10; Nash, II, 174, fig. 900.


229. CTR, III, 167; cf. Rushforth 1919, 29. In view of Gregory's acknowledgement that he could make little sense of the contents of the inscription ('plura legi, set pauca intellexi'), Rushforth's denial that it is the *Lex regia* carries little conviction. Moreover, the identification is corroborated by the reports of Odofredus in the mid-Dugento (see *supra*, note 210) and by Cola di Rienzo a century later. The latter, admittedly, claimed to have himself rediscovered the *Lex regia*, which (so he tells us) had been used by Boniface VIII (1294-1303) in the construction of an altar in S. Giovanni Laterano; while held prisoner in Prague in 1350, Cola went so far as to allege in a letter to Archbishop Ernst von Pardubitz that the tablet had been purposely hidden by Boniface from hatred of the Empire: Papencordt 1841, LVI; cf. Cola's *Vita*, L, 3, 8-9. But Cola's account makes it clear that the *Lex regia* had been openly displayed at the Lateran up to the time of Boniface VIII's pontificate, and thus if we are right in supposing that Gregory is referring to it, we arrive at a slightly earlier *terminus ante quem* for the work as a whole than that suggested by Higden's derivations.
In his account of the Forum of Nerva, Gregory notes the existence there of a great heap of broken statues: 'Ibi magna congeries est fractarum effigierum.' The passage, reminiscent of the heaps of fragmented statuary found in modern times in the imperial fora and elsewhere, surely alludes to the activities of Roman marble-cutters (marmorarii) and lime-burners (calcararii). The activities of both are otherwise known in the Middle Ages from documentary evidence, from the tracing of Roman (and Ostian) marbles to Pisa, Orvieto, Lucca, Florence, Amalfi etc., not to mention Westminster Abbey, and from the discovery in modern times of medieval lime-kilns and the floor-levels of officini marmorarii in Rome. The demolition-work accelerated during the course of the 13th century to accommodate the demands of the essentially parasitical Cosmatesque style. Gregory's general hostility to such practices is clear. On three occasions he attributes the destruction of antique statues to Gregory the Great. Of the Templum Palladis (i.e. the Temple of Minerva) in the Forum of Nerva, marked by the pile of broken statues, he ruefully declares that it was once beautiful but was now torn down by the great efforts of the Christians:

231. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 18-27.
232. Lanciani 1899, 184-188; Lanciani 1902-12, I, 18-22; Meiggs 1960, 102-103.
234. Ibid., 29-36, passim. For the antique marbles used by the Cosmati, see Hutton 1950, passim.
235. CTR, III, 145, 150, 153. Of the marble statues in Rome, he affirms that nearly all were destroyed by Gregory I: 'Nunc vero pauc a subiciam de signis marmoreis, quae paene omnes a beato Gregorio aut deletae aut deturpatae sunt.'
And he further tells us that the *pallacium Augusti* (presumably the *Domus Augustana* on the Palatine) had been stripped of its precious marbles for the benefit of the Roman churches:

'Haec autem domus tota marmorea pretiosam materiam et copiosam aedificandis ecclesiis, quae Romae sunt, praebuit.' 237

While recalling the spoliations of earlier periods, the observation seems to have been prompted, above all, by the Cosmatesque decoration of Roman churches during the later 12th and 13th centuries.

Gregory's *De Mirabilibus Urbis Romae* occupies an ambivalent position among the antiquarian treatises of the central Middle Ages. It is both indebted to earlier sources and independent in spirit. It combines, in a curious manner, truthful observation with pure fantasy. And if, in its intellectual foundations, it belongs to its age, it also anticipates, in its aestheticism, the sheer delectation in antiquities as something ineffable, and therefore transcending the claims of mere allegory, typical, it may be said, of the Renaissance. 238

---

237. *CTR*, III, 156; cf. Rushforth 1919, 31-32. On the imperial inscription recorded by Gregory in his account of the *pallacium Augusti*, see *ibid.*, 31; if at all genuine, the inscription most likely belongs to a late imperial restoration.
238. Cf. the pertinent remarks of Krautheimer 1956, 296-298; Panofsky 1965, 113. It is striking, in particular, how Gregory's observation that his statue of Venus 'bore its nudity like one blushing' anticipates by two centuries a familiar trope of Renaissance aesthetics.
CHAPTER II

TRECENTO CONTRIBUTIONS TO
THE STUDY OF THE RUINS OF ROME

1. Petrarch

In the preceding chapter an attempt was made to separately distinguish the imperial, papal, and communal interests shown in the antiquities of Rome during the Middle Ages. Petrarch, in the Trecento, effectively mediated between them all. While emperors malingered north of the Alps, and popes sported on the banks of the Rhone, he saw Rome, the queen of cities, sink further and further into desolation. And just as Petrarch's shifting political allegiances hinged on his hopes for a renovatio Romae, so his whole attitude to the ancient monuments of the city was conditioned by the concept of the antique hero, the classical vir illustris, whose reincarnation, as deliverer of Rome, he was to recognise, successively, in Cola di Rienzo and Charles IV. This is notably true of Petrarch's famous letter in which he describes the ancient monuments of Rome, addressed to his colleague, the Dominican friar Giovanni Colonna (Epistulae familiares, VI. 2), and datable to 1337.

It was in December 1336, a few months after the ascent of Mont Ventoux, that Petrarch decided to visit Rome for the first time. The immediate occasion was presented by Giacomo Colonna, Bishop of Lombez,

2. See, for example, Bayley 1942, 325ff; Wilkins 1961, 63-73.
4. On the date of Ep.fam., VI. 2, see below, Appendix A.
who had been resident in Rome for some three years, and whom Petrarch was anxious to meet again. In his letter to Giacomo (Ep. fam., II. 9), Petrarch expressed this wish, and also his longing to see the city itself, desolate though it was and a mere shadow of ancient Rome:

'Credi non posset quantum urbem illam, desertam quamvis et veteris effigiem Romae spectare cupiam, quam nunquam vidi.'

And in the same letter he makes it clear that what excited him most about the city was the memory of its ancient heroes:

'... Roma, ubi Scipio natus est, ubi educatus, ubi victor idem et reus pari gloria triumphavit; ubi non unus ille, sed innumerabiles vixerunt viri, quos nunquam fama taciturna est.'

The same preoccupation pervades Ep. fam. VI. 2.

On his arrival in Rome in February 1337, Petrarch was received as a guest of the Colonna, then Rome's dominant family. His first letter from the city (to Cardinal Giovanni Colonna) bears the proud superscription 'Romae, Idibus Martis, in Capitolio' (Ep. fam., II. 14). In it he exclaims how overwhelmed he is by the marvels of the city. His ardour, far from cooling, face to face with the reality of the situation, as Giovanni Colonna had predicted it might, had actually increased. Rome and its remains were greater than even Petrarch had imagined:

'Ab urbe Roma quid expectet, qui tam multa de montibus acceperit? Putabas me grande aliquid scripturum, cum Romam pervenissem. Ingens michi forsan in posterum scribendi

7. Ibid.
8. Ibid., 103.
materia oblata est; in presens nichil est quod inchoare
ausim, miraculo rerum tantarum et stuporis mole obrutus.
Unum hoc tacitum noluerim: contra ac tu suspicabaris
accidit. Solebas enim, memini, me a veniendo dehortari,
hoc maxime pretextu ne, ruinosae urbis aspectu famae non
respondente atque opinioni meae ex libris conceptae ardu
meus ille lentesceret. Ego quoque, quamvis desiderio
flagrarem, non invitus differebam, metuens ne quod ipse
michi animo finxeram, extenuarent oculi et magnis semper
nominibus inimica presentia. Illa vero, mirum dictu,
nichil imminuit, sed auxit omnia. Vere maior fuit Roma,
maioresque sunt reliquiae quam rebar. Iam non orbem ab
hac urbe domitum, sed tam sero dominum miror. Vale." 9

The Giovanni Colonna to whom Petrarch addressed Ep. fam., VI.
2, and in whose company he perambulated the ruins of Rome, was a
different member of the same family. 10 A friar with humanist
interests, he had spent many years travelling in the Orient. On his
return to Europe, his health sapped and his eyesight fading, he had met
Petrarch for the first time at Avignon, probably in 1331. In the same
year he returned to Rome, and in 1339 entered a convent at Tivoli. In
1343 he was at Palestrina, where Petrarch met him for the last time. 11

Though it is tempting to identify in Ep. fam., VI. 2 the
incipient genre of promenades dans Rome classically associated with
Montaigne, Goethe and Stendhal, and a staple ingredient of practically
every journal of the Grand Tour, the wanderings of Petrarch and Giovanni
Colonna, as described in this letter, are perhaps more imaginary than
real. 12 They evince little or no interest in topography. Indeed,
Petrarch's attention was directed not so much at the visible monuments

9. Ibid.
10. On Giovanni Colonna's life and humanism, see Sabbadini 1905-14,
11. The facts of Giovanni Colonna's later life generally support a 1337
date for Ep.fam., VI. 2. By 1341, when he was seventy-six years
old, he would hardly have been well enough to perambulate Rome, let
alone scramble to the roof of the Terme.
12. The analogy is drawn by Weiss 1969, 32.
themselves as the legendary or historical events associated with them. In this respect, the letter is far more a literary and historical evocation, recalling the great men of Roman antiquity, than an antiquarian periegesis. As Krautheimer has presciently remarked, 'to Petrarch it mattered little whether or not a site was commemorated by a monument, or merely haunted by memories.'\(^\text{13}\)

The method used by Petrarch to describe the antiquities may be judged from a short extract:

'Haec autem Sacra Via est, hae sunt Esquiliae, hic Viminalis, his Quirinalis collis, hic Caelius, his Martius Campus et Superbi manibus decussa papavera. Hic miserabilis Lucretia ferro incumbens, et in mortem fugiens adulter, et lesae pudicitiae vindex Brutus. His minax Porsenna, et etruscus exercitus, et infestus erranti dextrae Mutius, et tyranni filius cum libertate concurrens, et hostem urbe depulsum ad inferos sequens consul, et fractus a tergo viri fortis Pons Sublicius, et Horatius natans, et Tyberis revehens Cloeliam.'\(^\text{14}\)

These are the laconic reminiscences rather of Vergil and Varro than of any actual walks through Rome.\(^\text{15}\) Moreover, it is clear that Petrarch intended to arrange his account of the antiquities of the city not topographically, but chronologically, in the order of the incidents and events alluded to: the first, and most substantial, section of the letter covers the period of the monarchy and the republic; the second, the period of the empire; the third, and shortest, section, mentioning only ten events, deals with Roma sacra from St. Peter to Pope Calixtus.\(^\text{16}\)

The second section, in contrast to the first, does mention a number of

\(^{13}\) Krautheimer 1956, 294.
\(^{14}\) Petrarca, Le Familiari, vol. II, 56; CTR, IV, 6-7.
\(^{15}\) The classical sources drawn upon by Petrarch in the course of the letter are identified in the footnotes of CTR, IV, 6-8.
\(^{16}\) CTR, IV, 9-10; Mommsen 1942, 231.
well-known monuments; here Petrarch relied on a text of the Mirabilia or Graphia, reproducing some of their errors (e.g. that the sphere on top of the Vatican obelisk contained the ashes of Caesar). But he is critically-minded enough to dismiss the Mirabilia's, and Giovanni Colonna's, opinion about the Septizonium, and to correctly attribute it to Septimius Severus: 'hoc Severi Afri Septizonium, quam tu sedem Solis vocas, sed meum nomen in historiis scriptum lego.'

Even in his treatment of these imperial monuments of Rome, Petrarch follows no topographical route or scheme. He passes, in turn, from the Column of Trajan, to the Ponte S. Pietro and the Castel S. Angelo, to the Vatican obelisk, to the temples of Tellus (on the Esquiline), Fortuna (probably the one on the Forum Boarium), and Peace (on the Forum Romanum), to the legends associated with the dedications of S. Maria Maggiore and S. Maria in Trastevere, to the Domus Aurea, the Mausoleum of Augustus, the

17. CTR, IV, 8: 'Hoc est saxum mirae magnitudinis aeneisque leonibus innixum, divis imperatoribus sacrum, cuius in vertice Iulii Caesaris ossa quiescere fama est.'
18. CTR, IV, 9. Petrarch's source for controverting the traditional attribution of the Septizonium was evidently the chronicle of Eusebius in St. Jerome's translation; cf. Billanovich 1954, 19, 68; Weiss 1969, 33. As Weiss points out, ibid., 33f, Giovanni Colonna accepted Petrarch's correction in his historical compendium, the Mare historiarum, on which he was still busy in 1340, and in which the Septizonium is attributed to Septimius Severus, and the Temple of the Sun to Aurelian. See also Forte 1950, 409-410.
20. CTR, IV, 8. Petrarch mistakenly attributes the ancient Pons Aelius, the modern Ponte S. Angelo (Platner-Ashby, 396-397), to Trajan.
21. CTR, IV, 8. See supra, note 17.
24. CTR, IV, 8 and note 16.
25. CTR, IV, 9 and note 2.
27. Ibid.
Column of Marcus Aurelius, the Baths of Caracalla, the Septizonium, and the Dioscuri on the Quirinal.

This cursory enumeration of the heroes and monuments of ancient Rome is brought to an end with the explanation that there was no need to continue, since Rome could not be fixed on a little sheet of paper, and, even if it could, Giovanni Colonna knew it all already:

'Sed quo pego? possum ne tibi in hac parva papiro Romam designare? profecto, si possim, non oportet; nostri omnia, non quia romanus civis, sed quia talium in primis rerum curiosissimus ab adolescentia fuisti.'

Petrarch continues by deploring the ignorance of the Romans themselves about their heritage: nowhere, he claims, is Rome less well-known than in Rome itself:

'Qui enim hodie magis ignari rerum romanorum sunt, quam romani cives? invitus dico: nusquam minus Roma cognoscitur quam Romae.'

There follows the celebrated Baths of Diocletian passage, which Theodore Mommsen has so rightly compared with Gibbon 'musing on the Capitol'.

After the exertion of their walks through the city,
Petrarch and Giovanni Colonna would climb to the roof of the Terme. No other place, Petrarch declares, afforded such a wide view, such refreshing air, such silence and solitude:

'Solebamus ergo, post fatigationem quam nobis immensa urbs ambita peperat, sepius ad Termas Dioclitianas subsistere, nonnunquam vero supra testudinem illius magnificentissime olim domus ascendere, quod et aer salutaris et prospectus liber et silentium ac votiva solitudo nusquam magis.'

It also provided a suitable eminence from which to review the history of Rome. On this they were, as Petrarch admits, divided: he himself looked back to the ancient world, whereas Giovanni Colonna concerned himself with the modern:

'... multus de historiis sermo erat, quas ita partiti videbamus, ut in novis tu, in antiquis ego viderer experior, et dicantur antique quecunque ante celebratum Romeae et veneratum romanis principibus Christi nomen, nove autem ex ille usque ad hanc etatem.'

The Baths of Diocletian thus provide not only a vantage-point over the ruins of Rome, but, in a figurative sense, one over two opposing world-views, and latent in them are the emerging antinomies of medieval and Renaissance.

By July 1337 Petrarch was back in Avignon. Soon after he acquired a country-house far from the madding crowd at Vaucluse. It was there, wandering in the surrounding hills, as he recalls in his Epistle to Posterity, that he was inspired 'to write an epic poem about that first Scipio Africanus, whose glorious name has been dear to me since boyhood.' Into Book VIII of the Africa, as his epic came to be

36. The classic discussion of this aspect of Ep.fam., VI. 2, is Mommsen 1942, 232ff.
38. On Petrarch's periodization of history, see Mommsen 1942, 238-242.
called, Petrarch inserted an imaginary itinerary of Rome followed by the Carthaginian envoys to the Senate. This, in contrast to the haphazard topography of Ep. fam., VI. 2, does follow a discernible route, beginning at the Porta Appia, traversing the Aventine to the Tiber and the ancient Pons Sublicius, and flanking the Palatine to the Capitol; from there the envoys descend into the Suburra, cross over the Quirinal, passing the Dioscuri, to the Porta Flaminia (now the Porta del Popolo), returning to the Capitol by way of the Campus Martius. As an account of an itinerary, this may be an improvement on Ep. fam., VI. 2, but is, in other respects, even more tellingly naive, in that Petrarch has no scruples about making Hasdrubal and his compatriots inspect monuments of patently imperial date.

While Petrarch worked on his Africa, he was simultaneously compiling what was to be his main historical work, the De viris illustribus, begun before the end of 1337 and unfinished on his death. By 1343 the work consisted of 23 biographies of ancient heroes, chiefly Roman, from Romulus to Cato the Censor, including those he had already commemorated in the course of Ep. fam., VI. 2. Petrarch then recast the work, enlarging its scope, and adding a further 12 biographies of early non-Roman heroes. It was probably in 1368, at the request of Francesco da Carrara, that he planned to complete the work with a further 13 biographies of Roman viri illustres, ending with Trajan.

42. Among them, the Palace of Caesar (ibid., 904), the Dioscuri (ibid., 910), and the Pantheon (ibid., 923-924). Cf. Weiss 1969, 35; Burke 1969, 24.
43. Mommsen 1952, 95-98.
44. Wilkins 1961, 19, 108.
45. Ibid., 218.
Apparently inspired by Petrarch's *De viris illustribus*, Francesco da Carrara commissioned, after 1367, a cycle of frescoes devoted to classical *viri illustres* at Padua. Damaged by fire at the beginning of the 16th century, some of its features were retained and incorporated in a new fresco cycle, painted c. 1540. Though Theodore Mommsen has made an attempt to correlate the existing frescoes in the Sala dei Giganti (as it is now called) with those destroyed in the Sala Virorum Illustrium, he is obliged to admit that the differences are great. There exists, however, a valuable ancillary source of evidence for the lost frescoes, and, by implication, of Petrarch's antiquarian concept of the *viri illustres*, in the Darmstadt codex of Donato degli Albanzani's translation of Petrarch's *De viris illustribus* (c. 1400), discovered and described by Julius von Schlosser. Schlosser concluded that, apart from the portrait of Petrarch on the fly-leaf, the other illuminations derived from the frescoes of historical scenes in the original Sala Virorum Illustrium at Padua. The illuminations of the Darmstadt codex, accordingly, afford a useful iconographic parallel to the evocations in *Ep. fam.*, VI. 2, as well as the itinerary of Rome in the *Africa*.

Furthermore, the historical scenes from the lives of the heroes of antiquity depicted in these illuminations contain a number of topographical references to the antiquities of Rome. In the illustration of Romulus building the walls of Rome can be identified, in the background, incongruously enough, the Castel S. Angelo, the Colosseum,

---

47. Ibid.
the Vatican obelisk, the Pantheon, and what Mommsen takes to be the arch of Janus Quadrifons (also depicted in the scene of Romulus attacking Alba). 50 In the illustration of Lucretia and Tarquin can be seen the Vatican obelisk, the Pantheon, and one of the triumphal columns. 51 And the scene of a city being besieged by Alexander's army includes, even more anachronistically, a view of S. Nicola in Carcere in Rome. 52 The Vatican obelisk is depicted in no less than three of the illuminations. 53

It is plausible to assume that the topographical component in the illuminations of the Darmstadt codex, and, it is to be inferred, the Sala Virorum Illustrium itself, was influenced by Petrarch. 'In view of Petrarch's interest and knowledge,' writes Mommsen, 'one is led to believe that the choice of an actually Roman background, and perhaps even the selection of the particular monuments shown in the Sala Virorum Illustrium, were due to the advice of Petrarch... ' 54 Common to both was the anachronism of associating the legendary heroes of Rome with imperial monuments.

The Paduan fresco cycle of viri illustres belongs to a recognisable genre of secular painting in the Trecento. Thus, in c. 1332 Giotto allegedly executed for King Robert of Naples the decoration of 'la sala dei uomini famosi' in Castelnuovo. 55 Further lost fresco cycles of viri illustres are known to have existed at Milan, 56 Verona, 57 and in the Orsini palace at Rome. 58 The genre continued to be

50. Mommsen 1952, 110, figs. 10 and 11.
51. Ibid., fig. 15.
52. Ibid., 111, fig. 22; Panofsky 1965, 154 and note 3, figs. 116 and 117.
53. Mommsen 1952, 111, figs. 11, 15, 18.
54. Ibid., 111-112.
55. Ibid., 113.
56. Ibid.
57. Ibid., 113-114.
popular during the earlier Quattrocento. In 1413-14 Taddeo di Bartolo depicted a series of 'uomini famosi' in the Palazzo Pubblico at Siena; 59 associated with it, in the apex of the arch leading to the Sala dei Mappamondo, is the circular stadtplan of Rome, also the work of Taddeo di Bartolo, which, according to Nicolai Rubinstein, forms an integral part of an elaborate exemplum civile presided over by Aristotle. 60 Shortly afterwards, between 1413 and 1424, the Trinci family of Foligno in Umbria constructed in their palace la sala de l'imperatori, a room decorated with frescoes of twenty great Roman statesmen and generals, from Romulus to Trajan, each accompanied with a pseudo-antique titulus in Latin hexameters, composed by the Roman humanist, antiquarian, and Chancellor of Rome, Francesco da Fiano. 61

The collaboration of Francesco da Fiano in the Foligno cycle of viri illustres is illustrative of the way in which we may assume Petrarch became implicated in the earlier cycle at Padua. It was the humanists who drew up the programmes in which the heroes of antiquity were held up as moral and political exempla. Both at Padua and at Siena such exempla were explicitly related to the topography of Rome,

---

Giottino's decoration of a 'Hall of Famous Men' in the Orsini palace, if Vasari's account can be credited, would date to c. 1370. But Masolino, as Vasari tells us, also executed paintings in the Palazzo Orsini, and it is more likely that he is responsible: Vasari, Le Vie, III, 108. Cf. Toesca 1952, 19; and infra, chapter III. 3 and note 207.

59. Mommsen 1952, 114; Rubinstein 1958A.
61. Salmi 1919; Mommsen 1952, 114. For Francesco da Fiano's tituli see Bertalot 1911, 71-72; Messina 1942, 84-98; Rubinstein 1958A, 198, note 121.
the stage on which had been enacted, *par excellence*, the exemplary and heroic deeds of antiquity.

This iconographic evidence merely reinforces what we may already deduce from *Ep. fam.*, VI. 2: namely, that what captured the imagination of Petrarch and his circle was not so much the ruins of Rome themselves as the dramas to which they formed the backdrop. In the phrase of Petrarch's close colleague, Giovanni Dondi, the ancient monuments of Rome were the *argumenta* of great men, testimonials all the more overwhelming in the context of the derelict and abandoned city of the Trecento. Rising above the desolation that surrounded them, they took on the emblematic force of immutability, mementos, in Krautheimer's phrase, 'of an exemplary and timeless way of life'.

Other aspects of Petrarch's antiquarianism, his interest in classical art, epigraphy and numismatics, all of them admirably treated by Weiss, cannot be dealt with here. When all these separate aspects have been explored, one is bound to ask whether his contribution to antiquarian thought was revolutionary at all. Many of his attitudes, like his respect for the *Mirabilia* and his tendency to interpret antique objects as metaphors of good conduct, were formed by the conventions of his day and age. His *gestalt* of Rome must have been as incongruous as the settings in the Darmstadt codex. There is, indeed, an even apter pictorial simulacrum in a marginal drawing in the MS. of Pliny from Petrarch's own library (now Paris, Bibliothèque Nat., Ms. lat. 6802). The drawing (f. 266v) accompanies Pliny's account

---

of the buildings of Rome in Book XXXVI. 24 of the Historia Naturalis, and represents a fantastic; two-storied, battlemented building with steeple and cupola; underneath this thoroughly medieval architectural caprice is the inscription 'Roma sola mirabilis toto orbe terrarum'.

Degenhart and Schmitt contrast it with the naturalism of the well-known drawing representing the source of the Sorgue in the same MS. (f. 143v), inscribed in Petrarch's own hand 'Transalpina solitudo mea iocundissima'.

That Petrarch's attitude to the ancient monuments was essentially literary, not visual, moralistic, not aesthetic, is corroborated by the marginal annotations, deriving, as Lucia Ciapponi has argued, from Petrarch's own, in a Trecento MS. of Vitruvius, now in the Bodleian Library. These annotations do reveal some interest in Roman architecture, but it is striking, in a work devoted to that subject, that most of them gloss anecdotes about life and morality in antiquity. They tend to treat the text of Vitruvius, not as a treatise on architecture, but as a source for classical history and geography. This is consistent enough with what is known of Petrarch's marginalia to other classical texts, for instance, his personal copy of Livy (now Paris, Bibliothèque Nat., Ms. lat. 5690). The exception to this rule is, surprisingly, the chronicle of Eusebius in St. Jerome's translation, Petrarch's annotations to which do show an interest in the ancient monuments of Rome.

---

67. Ibid.
69. Ciapponi 1960, 70.
One may hazard the conclusion, that Petrarch's main contribution to the study of the antiquities of Rome lies not so much in his letters and published writings, as, more covertly, in his humanism and cumulative influence as a praeceptor Italiae. His influence was vast. Even in the field of antiquarian interest in Rome he generated a cultural continuum which can be traced right through the Trecento into the following century.72 From Petrarch the line stretches unbroken through Dondi, Salutati, Vergerio, Francesco da Fiano, Cencio de' Rustici to Nicolò Signorili, who quotes the description of Rome from Petrarch's Ep. fam., VI. 2 in his own treatise on Rome, written in the late 1420's.73 Already by this time, only some fifty years after his death in 1374, Petrarch, as an antiquarian as well as a poet, had been canonised.

72. One specific example of this influence is the impetus covertly given by Petrarch to Vitruvian studies, as Lucia Ciapponi 1960, 83-93, has brilliantly shown. The MSS. of Vitruvius known to have been owned by Boccaccio and Giovanni Dondi dall'Orologio (on both of whom, as antiquaries, see infra, chapter II. 2) 'furono certo copiati direttamente dal vecchio manoscritto in carolino posseduto ed annotato dal Petrarca' (Ciapponi 1960, 93). A third MS. of Vitruvius associated with Petrarch's circle is listed in the inventory (1359) of the library of Nicola Acciaiuoli: Ciapponi 1960, 91. In view of this dissemination of Vitruvius MSS. among Petrarch's friends and followers, not to mention the many Vitruvius MSS. of the earlier Middle Ages (usefully catalogued by Krinsky 1967), Poggio Bracciolini's 'discovery' of a Vitruvius codex at S. Gall in 1416 loses some of its novelty; cf. Ciapponi 1960, 98, with earlier literature; Panofsky 1965, 178 and note 3.

73. Archivio Colonna, II. A. 50, ff. 22v-23v: 'Unde poeta Petrarcha in quadam sua res familiarum epistola, quam ad domanum Hanibaldum, Tusculanum episcopum cardinalem descripsert, inter caetera sic scribit. Vagabamus pariter in illa urbe tam magna... etc.' On this form of the address of Ep. fam., VI. 2, see Wilkins 1963, 621, and Appendix A infra.
2. The Followers of Petrarch

a) The Humanist Complaint from Petrarch to Cencio de' Rustici

Apart from the idealistic presentiment of the *vir illustries*, there is, in Petrarch's attitude to Roman antiquities, a more pessimistic tone: a *cri de coeur* against the traducers of Rome, and a burden of lament over what had been destroyed. Both elements can be traced in the *Epistolae metricae*. In the *De remediis utriusque fortunae*, Book I (Dialogue 118: 'De gloria ex aedificiis sperata') there is a long jeremiad in the form of a catalogue of Roman imperial monuments that had disappeared:

'... ubi est, queso, illa Neronis domus aurea, quae quantum fatigaverit Architectos cogita, lectores etiam nunc fatigat, quae quidem domus unà cum aliis aedificandi furoribus, quibus omnes excessit, ad inopiam illum compulit et rapinas; ubi sunt thermae Diocletianae, et balneum Antonianum, et cymbrum Marii, et septizonium Severi, et eiusdem thermae Severianae. Demum ut summam rerum attingam, ubi est Augusti forum, et aedes Martis ultoris, ubi aedes Tonantis, Iovis in capitolio, et Apollinis templum in palatio, ubi eiusdem porticus ac bibliotheca Graeca pariter et Latina, ubi porticus altera et basilica Gaii Luciique nepotum sub nomine dedicata et extracta, et porticus tertia Liviae coniugis et sororis Octaviae, theatrumque Marcelli. Ubi tot opera per illustrea viros iussu eiusdem principis et hortatu, multis urbis in locis, tanto labore, tantis impensis aedificata:

Martii Philippi aedes Herculis et musarum, Lucii Cornificii aedes Dianae, Asinii Pollionis atrium libertatis, Munaci Plancii aedes Saturnia, Theatrum Balbi Cornelli, Amphitheatrum Statilii Tauri; innumerabilia praeter haec opera Marci Agrippae, neve eam per singulos, ubi sunt tot luxuriosa principum palatia...

The jeremiad continues with the bitter suggestion that if the great Augustus had left nothing behind but buildings, his fame would have perished long ago:

'Certè Augustus omnium supremus, nisi aliud quam aedificia reliquisset, iam pridem omnis eius gloria corruisset.'

The Petrarchan lament over the antiquities of Rome was briefly echoed by Boccaccio in his letter of 1372 to Iacopo Pizzinga, logothete to the King of Sicily, in the Filocolo, and in the De casibus virorum illustrium.

Towards the end of the Trecento, Petrarch's biographer, Pier Paolo Vergerio, a Paduan humanist, and a colleague of Coluccio Salutati (both helped to edit Petrarch's Africa for publication), visited Rome for the first time (in 1398); and, in a long letter to an anonymous correspondent, registered both his appreciation of the greatness of the city as revealed in its ancient ruins, and his regret at the continuing...

---

75. Petrarca, Opera, vol. I, 119; cf. Gregorovius, VI, 715f; Carettoni 1969, 77. The passage is rhetorical in tone, and should not be taken as a statement of fact. Indeed, Tatham 1925-26, vol. I, 339, note 8, already pointed out that Petrarch had actually seen the ruins of seven out of the twenty-five buildings that had allegedly disappeared without trace.


77. Boccaccio, Opere latini minori, 197.

78. Boccaccio, Tutte le opere, ed. V. Branca, I, 70-71.

79. Boccaccio, De casibus virorum illustrium, VIII. 17.

80. Petrarca, L'Africa, ed. N. Festa, LII-LIX; Vergerio, Epistolario, XVI and 204; Holmes 1969, 15. Vergerio's Vita of Petrarch, basically a reworking of the Epistola ad posteros, is included in Solerti 1904, 294-302, but in it Vergerio also discusses the text of the Africa on Petrarch's death and his own contribution towards preparing it for publication: ibid., 300-302.
destruction of their marbles for lime:

\[ 'item eorum qui fornaces exercent, qui, ne lapides e 
longinquo vehant, aedificia destruunt, uti marmor et vivum 
lapidem convertant in calcem. Qua ratione plurima iam 
egregia aedificia diruta sunt et diruuntur in dies.' \]

In Rome itself, another disciple of Petrarch and colleague of Salutati, Francesco da Fiano, Chancellor of the City under Boniface IX and curial official intermittently till 1412 at least, also deplored this wave of destruction. Vergerio had found few people in Rome who were well-informed about the ancient monuments, but Francesco was one of them. A lone voice crying in the wilderness, his reputation as a poet all' antica and as a practising antiquarian grew, and disciples gravitated towards him, as they had previously done towards Petrarch, forming a humanistic coterie in the Rome of the Schism, the embryo of the curial antiquarianism which was to flourish in the Rome of Martin V.

81. Vergerio, Epistolario, 216. The letter is also published in CTR, IV, 89-100. See also Weiss 1969, 56-57; Greco 1969, 36.
83. CTR, IV, 96.
84. Cf. Baron 1955, vol. II, 403f. On the return of the Curia from Viterbo to Rome in 1406, Bruni, Poggio, Vergerio, and Loschi, all employees in the papal chancery, came into contact with Francesco da Fiano. The extent of his prestige and influence is revealed in the still inedited Itinerarium of the Brescian humanist, Bartolomeo Bayguera, who was in Rome from c. 1405 to 1410. In this poem, which is basically an account of Bayguera's journey from Brescia to Rome, Francesco da Fiano appears as a respected cicerone, who showed the younger and more inexperienced humanists around the ruins of Rome, and inspired them with enthusiasm for classical poetry and art. There are two known MSS. of the Itinerarium: Brescia, Biblioteca Queriniana, Cod. A.V.6 (Kristeller 1963-, vol. I, 31); and Milan, Cod. Ambros. A 6 inf., fol. 1ff (Kristeller 1963-, vol. I, 317). The section dealing with Rome and Francesco da Fiano occurs on f. 33r ff of the latter; cf. Baron 1955, vol. II, 404, note 13.
In 1416 one of Francesco da Fiano's pupils, Cincio de' Rustici (Cincius Romanus), who had entered the papal chancery as scripтор in 1411, and, like Poggio Bracciolini, had been posted to the Council of Constance (1414-1417), wrote to his mentor (‘suo preceptori doctissimo’) on the discovery of MSS. of classical texts at the monastery of S. Gall. The letter culminates in a bitterly outspoken attack, reminiscent of Vergerio's, on the destroyers of the ancient libraries and monuments of Rome. As for the work of demolition, it was a daily occurrence:

'Vides quotidian cives, si civis, si denique homo appellandus est is, qui tam detestabili scelere polluitur, aut amphitheatrum aut hippodromum aut colossum aut signa aut parietes mira arte lapide confectos veterem illum peneque divinam populi romani dignitatem ostendentes demoliri.'

Classical statuary, too, was being destroyed, 'aut in pulverem aut in minutissimos lapillos', and Cincio attacks the narrow-minded boorishness of those who condoned the practice with the pious apology that it was done to eradicate the idols of false gods:

'At si quis ex eis querat, quibus rationibus adducti marmorea signa destruant, respondent: ut falsorum deorum idola execrantur. O vocem agrestium hominum errorem non sine alio errore fugientium. Neque enim nostrae religioni adversum est, si inspicimus aut Veneris aut Herculis signum summa arte elaboratum, veterum sculptorum ingenia pene divina admirantes.'

87. Cincio's complaint that the libraries of Rome had been destroyed 'partim ignoratione, partim negligentia, partim ut divina Veronica facies pingeretur' (Bertalot 1929-30, 224) corroborates Vergerio's charge that manuscripts were being destroyed 'ut sudaria peregrinis effingant' (CTR, IV, 97).
89. Ibid.
90. Ibid.
Nor does Cencio flinch from the conclusion that the main culprits in this wave of vandalism were the popes themselves. He goes so far as to compare them to the wastrel, Herostratus, who, having failed to make a name for himself through virtue, sought to do so by setting the Temple of Ephesus on fire; so the popes, unable to admire the excellence and beauty of ancient Rome, sought to destroy them instead:

'Sed credo eos secutos nebulonis cuiusdam sententiam, qui cum diffideret virtute sibi nomen comparare posse, Ephesi Diane templum cremavit. Ita hi nostre religionis antistites, cum urbis excellentiam pulchritudinemque parum admirari, consequi nullo modo possent, huiusmodi ruinam atque perniciem moliti sunt.'

In conclusion, Cencio urges Francesco da Fiano to compose an invective 'adversus preclarissimorum monimentorum perversores' (in other words, the popes). Whether Francesco actually responded to this appeal is not known, but is unlikely, in view of the rather poignant note of self-betrayal subsequently revealed in his epistolary exchange with Leonardo Bruni: the exultant humanism of his youth had been reclaimed, in old age, by ecclesiastical conformism, and, in order to make ends meet, Francesco was reduced to reading homilies at matins. His pupil had the resilience of youth. He survived to see the restoration of Rome under Martin V, and to play a part in its intellectual rejuvenation. In an undated letter probably written under that Pope, Cencio asks Altus de

---

93. Ibid. Cencio clearly had in mind a sequel to Francesco's previous invective Contra oblocutores et detractores Poetarum, dating to c. 1400, and his one surviving major work, now edited by Taü 1965.
Comite, later (in 1432) to become Ambassador of Eugenius IV to the Emperor Sigismund, to send fruit-trees to Rome. 96 It is a humanist's contribution to the physical renovatio Romae, and, after the bitter invectives of the Schism, a token of the florescent spirit of the new age.

b) Descriptions of Rome

Throughout the Trecento topographical descriptions of Rome continued to be pervaded by the bizarre spirit of the Mirabilia, texts of which, in one form or another, were still being produced. Among them may be mentioned the De Mirabilibus Civitatis Romae, included in the miscellaneous collection compiled (c. 1360) during his stay in Avignon by Nicolas Rosell, Cardinal of Aragon (d. 1362), and first published by Montfaucon. 97 There are several extant 14th century MSS. of this version. 98 Less well-known is the enumeration of the ancient monuments of Rome which Boccaccio derived from Martinus Polonus, and inserted into one of his Zibaldoni; this is preserved in a codex now in the Bibliotheca Nazionale Centrale at Florence. 99 Boccaccio, in

96. Bertalot 1929-30, no. 11, 235-236.
97. Montfaucon 1702, 283-298; for an English translation, see Montfaucon 1725, 202-216. Montfaucon, as he explains, did not copy the MS. himself, but located a transcript among the papers of Claudio Stefanozi; the MS. in question, a rather corrupt text of the De Mirabilibus Civitatis Romae, was in the library of S. Isidoro in Rome, arm. IV, no. 69, but has not survived; cf. CTR, IV, 180. Other independent texts of this version of the Mirabilia have been published by Urlichs 1871, 126-133; and in CTR, IV, 175-196.
98. For the various MSS., either incorporated in the Cardinal of Aragon's collection, as in the British Museum, Cod. Cottoniano, Nero, C. II, ff. 82-94, or as a separate opusculus, see CTR, IV, 178-180.
99. For information on this list, entitled 'De hedifitiis memorandis Urbis Rome secundum fratrem Martinum', I rely on Weiss 1969, 46 and

Continued
addition, gives an etymological account of the seven hills of Rome in the course of his alphabetically-arranged *De montibus, silvis, fontibus, lacubus*, etc. 100

Side by side with this continued diffusion of the *Mirabilia* literature, however, can be detected a new element, introduced by the Italian proto-humanists of the Trecento, namely, a return to the classical sources. This can be seen, even before Petrarch's day, in the chapter on Rome incorporated by the Lombard humanist, Benzo d'Alessandria, in his geographical and historical encyclopaedia, the *Chronicon* (completed at the earliest in 1321) (Book XIV, cap. CXXXII). 101

Note 1; it is contained in Biblioteca Naz. Centrale, Ms. II, II. 327, f. 88r. On Boccaccio's antiquarian pursuits in general, see ibid., 43-46.

100. Boccaccio, *Liber de montibus, silvis, fontibus, lacubus, stagnis seu paludibus, et de diversis nominibus maris*, Venice 1473. The etymological definitions of the hills of Rome given by Boccaccio do echo those of Varro, *De lingua latina*, V. 41-54, and a case has, indeed, been made out by Sabbadini 1905-14, vol. I, 30-31, for supposing that the 11th century parent codex of the *De lingua latina*, now Florence, Laurent. 50. 10, was recovered by Boccaccio himself from Monte Cassino, at the same time that he recovered the famous Tacitus MS., now Laurent. 68. 2. Cf. Nolhac 1965, vol. II, 114-115. At Monte Cassino Boccaccio could also have seen the 11th century fragment of the *De lingua latina* in Codex Cassinensis 361, containing Book V. 41-56, precisely the section dealing with the topography of Rome. Sabbadini does not overlook this, but has traced citations from other books of the *De lingua latina* in Boccaccio's works. Cf. Sabbadini 1905-14, vol. I, 31, where he also notes that Varro 'e sette volte adoperato senza designazione di nome nel *De montibus* etc.' Cf. Hortis 1879, 435. Unfortunately, the recent study of humanistic elements in the *De Montibus* etc. by Stocchi 1963 does not include a consideration of the Varronian sources.

101. Benzo's *Chronicon* is extant in a single MS., Milan, Ambros. Ms., B 241 inf., of which there is no modern edition. The account of the chapter on Rome given above derives from the recent brief survey of the *Chronicon* by Berrigan 1969, 258-259; in his note 42 he justly regrets that this chapter is ignored by Valentini and Zucchetti in CTR. On Benzo's familiarity with classical sources, see Sabbadini 1905-14, vol. II, 128-150.
In this account Benzo relies on both classical and medieval sources in a way which already anticipates the method of Flavio Biondo in the following century. The chapter opens with a description of Rome as 'provinciarum regina et urbium domina ac gencium princeps orbisque caput', followed by an account of its foundation, with reference to Servius, Justinus, Orosius, Eutropius, Isidore, Livy, Solinus, and Vergil, the testimony of the latter being dismissed as poetic licence ('non fuit historiographus sed poeta'). Benzo proceeds by giving a version, rendered into prose, of Claudian's encomium of Rome. But the main section that follows, 'de ornatu urbis huius quoad templa, turres, portas, palacia, archus, theatra, et alia mira quaedam...' (covering three folio pages), is conventionally drawn from the Mirabilia, the Graphia, and from Martinus Polonus. It is concluded with the observation that many of Rome's architectural marvels had been destroyed, either by age or by the barbarians, or, in more recent times, by the citizens, popes and emperors:

'... quamquam et vetustate et incursibus hostium et ab ipsis eciam civibus ac a summi pontificibus et imperatoribus multa sunt consumpta et pariter deformata.'

Turning from the tangible remains of antiquity to the sphere of morality, Benzo touches on the virtues and victories of the Romans, the avarice and luxury into which Rome declined, and the subsequent vices of papal Rome.

103. Ibid., 259.
104. Ibid.
105. Ibid.
106. Ibid.
107. Ibid.
It may be said that the chapter on Rome in Benzo's *Chronicon* represents a transitional stage whereby the conventional form of the *Mirabilia* was assimilated by the proto-humanism of the earlier Trecento and embedded in a context substantially derived from the classical sources. A more advanced stage in the eventual humanistic supersession of the *Mirabilia* may be recognised in the description of Rome contained in Giovanni Cavallini's *Polistoria*, a treatise 'ad laudem et gloriam perpetuam Romanae Urbis',108 addressed to Clement VI (1343-52), and written, presumably, in the course of his pontificate.109 Cavallini, a citizen of Rome (the son, perhaps, of the more famous Pietro) and a canon of S. Maria della Rotonda (the Pantheon), tends to confound, as also does his close contemporary, Cola di Rienzo, Petrarch's allegation that the Romans were more ignorant of their heritage than anyone else.110

Cavallini's description of Rome is actually interspersed through the *Polistoria*, but the relevant passages on the topography and antiquities of Rome have been excerpted by Valentini and Zucchetti.111 In the Prologue there is an encomiastic statement of the author's intentions,112 which reveals that Cavallini was concerned with institutional as well as properly archaeological aspects of Rome in antiquity (one must look forward to the *Roma instaurata* and *Roma triumphans* of Flavio Biondo in the following century for a conscious dichotomy between the two), and, indeed, much of the *Polistoria* is devoted to the political and administrative offices of the ancient city,

---

108. CTR, IV, 11.
110. See note 33 supra. See also Theseider 1952, 702-704; Weiss 1969, 42-43.
111. CTR, IV, 11-54.
112. Ibid., 22.
and also to tracing the growth of Christianity within it.\footnote{113} Into Book VI, however, Cavallini inserted a detailed and basically etymological account of the ancient gates, distinguished by its reliance on classical authorities, notably Livy's\textit{ab urbe condita}.\footnote{114} His main purpose here was to collate the various nomenclature of the gates as testified in the classical sources or as current in his own day. In doing so, he implicitly accepted the notion that the circuit of the walls had not materially altered since the time of Livy; thus, for example, he equates the Porta Capena in the Servian wall with the Porta Ostiensis of the Aurelian wall.\footnote{115} The same assumption, however, would seem to be common to all medieval lists of the city gates, including the \textit{Mirabilia} (and we may recall that Petrarch made the Carthaginian envoys anachronistically enter Rome through the Aurelian Porta Appia).\footnote{116}

\footnote{113. Lib. I-VI, passim; cf. CTR, IV, 23-25.} \footnote{114. CTR, IV, 27-41. The etymological approach is explicit in Cavallini's heading: 'Restat ex praedictis nunc videre de vocabulis propriis portarum urbis antiquis et varietate nominum earundem.' (CTR, IV, 27). Cavallini's study of classical sources is treated by Sabbadini 1905-14, vol. II, 47-50; cf. CTR, IV, 13f.} \footnote{115. CTR, IV, 28. Though Cavallini made these false correlations of pre-Aurelian and Aurelian gates, he still manages to give an empirically sound account of the gates into the city as they existed in his own day, beginning with the Porta Ostiensis and systematically following the circuit of the Aurelian walls anti-clockwise, concluding with the Transtiberine gates. He includes 19 gates in all: Porta Capena / Trigemina / Ostiensis, Libera, Appia, Latina / Latumia, Metaura, Asinaria / Laterana, Lavicana / Maior / Exquilia / Aequilia, Taurina / Sancti Laurentii, Numentana, Salaria, Pinciana, Flammae / Sancti Valentinii / de Populo, Collina, Viridaria / Merdara, Tyronum / Tyrena, Pertusa, Septinea, Carmentali, Portuensi / Aurelia / Laususcologana. But the general order of Cavallini's listing of the gates, from Ostiensis to Portuensis, is fundamentally that of the \textit{Mirabilia}: cf. CTR, III, 17-18.} \footnote{116. Petrarch, \textit{L'Africa}, VIII, 362-363: 'Appia marmoreo suscipit limene porta / prima viros.'}
In later books of the *Polistoria* Cavallini inserted sections on the seven hills of Rome, a more comprehensive, but actually less learned, etymological treatment than that given by Boccaccio in the course of his *De montibus*, etc.; as well as on the thirteen medieval regions of Rome, the nomenclature similar to, though in a different order from, the earlier 13th century *De Nominibus Regionum Urbis Romae* preserved in the Vienna Ms. Lat. 1180 (Rec. 3167a), which, in turn, reflects a transitional stage in the transference of the urban administration from the ecclesiastical authorities to the commune after 1144. Finally, in Book IX, Cavallini treats, in a figurative sense, the *forma urbis Romanae*, attributing to the city the shape of a lion, a fitting symbol of the political and juridical rights of the commune.

As a topographer and archaeologist, Cavallini's contribution was small. Like Petrarch, he was much more interested in literary sources than in material remains, and his main preoccupation, in dealing with the ruins of Rome, was to supply etymological explanations, an intrinsically medieval concern. Yet the *Polistoria* is important, not only in the sense that it drew on classical sources ignored by the *Mirabilia* and its derivatives, but also in the sense that it is, far more

117. Lib. VII; CTR, IV, 41-45.
118. Unlike Boccaccio, Cavallini shows no signs of being familiar with the definitions of the hills in Varro's *De lingua latina*; his etymologies are derived rather from Livy, Ovid's *Fasti*, Justinus, and, above all, from the 12th century lexicographer, Uguccone da Pisa, author of the *Magnae Derivationes*, a popular dictionary in the Middle Ages, largely based on Isidore's *Origines*; cf. Toynbee 1902, 97-114. Cavallini explicitly gives definitions 'secundum Hugutionem' for the Capitol (CTR, IV, 42), the Aventine (*ibid.*), the Viminal (*ibid.*, 43), and the Esquiline (*ibid.*, 44).
119. Lib. VIII; CTR, IV, 45-53.
120. CTR, III, 169-171; cf. Duchesne 1890, 134ff.
121. CTR, III, 170-171.
122. Lib. IX; CTR, IV, 53-54. See also *supra*, chap. I, note 206.
than either Mirabilia or Graphia, a fully-fledged laudatio of the city. The genre of the civic encomium is often thought of as a Quattrocento speciality, revived by Leonardo Bruni, and stemming, ultimately, from the Panathenaicus of the 2nd century Greek rhetorician, Aelius Aristides. In fact, the genre has a recognisable medieval pedigree. Cavallini's work forms a clear precedent to the Quattrocento encomium of Rome contained in the treatise written by Nicolò Signorili c. 1430, which is discussed below.

Both Cavallini and Signorili were Roman citizens, and the roots of the encomiastic element in their respective treatises can no doubt be traced back to the rise of the Roman commune, an event, as has been suggested, associated with the origins of the Mirabilia. Both Cavallini and Signorili explicitly draw on the Mirabilia-literature, the former on a codex of the Graphia kept at S. Maria Nova, which Cavallini admits to having much consulted, and the latter on the Graphia as transmitted by Martinus Polonus. Both, accordingly, helped to perpetuate the central, and locally inspired, tradition of medieval descriptions of Rome.

123. E.g. Baron 1955, vol. I, 163ff. Baron, of course, does not overlook the medieval laudes (though he makes no mention of Cavallini), but contends (ibid., 167) that 'no one before the author of the Laudatio Florentinae Urbis (i.e. Bruni) had tried to reproduce the total view of a city from both a geographical and historical perspective.' See also Baron 1968, 113ff, and 217-263 (critical edition of Bruni's Laudatio).

126. See supra, chap. I. 3 (b).
128. CTR, IV, 166, 169.
For a more original contribution to the study of Roman topography during the later Trecento one must look outside Rome to that made by Petrarch's colleague, the Paduan physician, Giovanni Dondi dall'Orologio (c. 1330-89), to whom we owe, among other things, the only reliable account of Petrarch's death at Arquà in July 1374.129 Petrarch, it is well-known, had a poor opinion of the medical profession (which doubtless explains his long life), but what redeemed Dondi in his eyes was his interest in both science and humanism. 130 Unlike some others of Petrarch's humanistic colleagues (who tended to revert to scholasticism), Dondi was undeniably in the avant-garde, and nowhere, perhaps, is this better shown than in the account he compiled subsequent to his visit to Rome in the spring of 1375. 131

What distinguishes this account of the antiquities of the city is its empiricism. Dondi's mind, trained in the natural sciences, was disposed to ignore the moralistic and legendary concerns that had constrained the perceptions of previous antiquaries. Instead of dilating on the nebulous heroes of early Rome, or rehearsing the pious legends associated with its monuments, Dondi went out into the field and trusted to his eyes.

The *Iter Romanum*, as Dondi's text is called, is the straight-forward report of a field-survey. It was conducted by Dondi using two principal methods: epigraphy and mensuration. As an epigraphist, he was reasonably accurate, and took some care to imitate the lapidary

130. So high was Petrarch's regard for Dondi that he made him one of the main beneficiaries of his will, bequeathing him fifty gold ducats: Mommsen 1957, 33-34.
character of ancient inscriptions in his transcripts. Even while on his journey to Rome, Dondi had stopped to copy inscriptions at Rimini, and in the course of the Iter Romanum gives transcripts of fifteen inscriptions from Rome itself, published as a separate sylloge in C.I.L.; among them are those on the Vatican obelisk, on the architrave of the Pantheon, the Column of Trajan, the Arch of Titus and that of Septimius Severus, the Temple of Saturn and that of Antoninus and Faustina, the Ponte S. Petri, the Mausoleum of Caecilia Metella on the Appian Way, and, lastly, the two spurious, presumably late antique, inscriptions on the bases of the Dioscuri.

As for mensuration, Dondi gives in the course of the Iter Romanum measurements and other numerical data for the Vatican obelisk, the basilica of St. Peter, the Pantheon, interior and exterior.

---
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144. CTR, IV, 73; cf. Michaelis 1898, 266. Michaelis argues that these inscriptions of the bases of the Dioscuri are post-Constantinian in date, probably belonging to the 443 A.D. restoration of Quadratianus, as commemorated in C.I.L., VI, 1750 (Michaelis 1898, 274).
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Trajan's column, S. Paolo fuori le Mura, and the Colosseum. Though these figures are not always accurate by modern standards, they are more than mere folklore or inspired guesses, and his data for the Pantheon pronaos cannot seriously be faulted. How Dondi arrived at them, particularly as regards heights, is not exactly known, but possibly he had some kind of astrolabe at his disposal. We may recall that Dondi, in his treatise on mechanical clocks, the Planetarium, had already described instruments for purposes of astronomical mensuration. And in the Iter Romanum itself he mentions that he had been given a measurement of the height of the Vatican obelisk by a priest living in the vicinity, who claimed it was obtained by a previous visitor using an instrument 'ad umbram', in other words, computing the height of the obelisk from the length of the shadow it cast:

'Dixit autem presbiter qui habitat prope eam, quod mensuraverat eam quidam cum instrumento ad umbram, et invenerat brachia 45.'

Dondi, as an antiquarian, however, was more than a technologist. He shared with another colleague of Petrarch's old age, Lombardo della Seta, the continuator of the De viris illustribus, a taste for antique art. Here again, in conformity with the Petrarchan tradition, the
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aesthetic response to classical statuary was conditioned by the concept of the vir illustri. In a letter written sometime after his visit to Rome to Fra Guglielmo da Cremona, Dondi speaks of the statues, in bronze and marble, still extant in Rome. These, he declares, are indeed the testimonies of great men: "Haec projecto sunt magnorum argumenta virorum." In the same letter he notes that the few classical works of art to survive were eagerly sought after by people of sensibility and were expensive to buy, such works being superior to anything being made in his own day:

'De artificiis ingeniorum veterum quamquam pauca supersint, si quae tamen manent alicubi, ab his qui ea in re sentiunt cupidae queruntur et videntur magnique penduntur. Et si illis hodiernae contuleris, non latebit auctores eorum fuisses ex natura ingenio potiores et Artis magisterio doctiores.'

Dondi goes on to recollect an Italian sculptor he had known, 'famosum illius facultatis artificem inter eos quos tum haberet Italia', whom he had often heard hold forth upon the statues and reliefs which he had seen in Rome with such admiration and reverence that he got quite carried away in his enthusiasm:

'... hunc pluries audivi statuas atque sculpturas quas Rome prospexerat tanta cum admiratione atque veneratione narratam, ut id referens poni quodamodo extra se ex rei miraculo videretur.'

155. The text of Dondi's letter, in cod. Marciano Lat. XIV, n. 223, now 4340, f. 48v, is published by Morelli 1820, 302; and the relevant passage here discussed is quoted by Panofsky 1965, 209, note 1. See also Krautheimer 1956, 295f; CTR, IV, 66.


157. Ibid., 208 and 209, note 1 (amended).

158. Ibid.; Krautheimer 1956, 296.

Even if Dendi himself did not entirely share his rapture, he was evidently sympathetic. His letter is an important document illustrating the gradual rapprochement of artists and humanists during the later Trecento. This rapprochement, as Krautheimer has argued, was to consolidate in the next few decades, 'reaching a peak of coincidence in the twenties and thirties'. There can be no doubt that one of the most substantial factors contributing to it was a shared regard for the antiquities of Rome.
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160. It also provides a significant piece of literary evidence to show that already during the second half of the Trecento Italian artists were seriously engaged on in situ study of the antiquities of Rome. In this respect, it anticipates the floruit of artistic Antikenstudium in the city, which we associate with the third decade of the Quattrocento; see infra, chap. IV. 2.
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CHAPTER III

THE RETURN OF THE PAPACY, AND THE
RECOVERY OF ROME UNDER MARTIN V

1. The Return to Rome: from Urban V to Martin V

Petrarch's attitude to the abandonment of Rome during the new 'Babylonish Captivity' was hardly confined to private anger and sorrow. It extended, in verse and prose, to the most bitter invectives. Consumed with abhorrence for Avignon, there poured forth from his pen a stream of exhortation urging the expatriate popes to return to Rome.

The appeal he directed to Urban V, the sixth of the Avignon popes, on 29 June 1366, in its length and urgency, went to extremes. In it he castigates the abuses of the Curia, vindicates the superiority of Italy over France, and dwells on the misery of Rome. Must the Queen of Cities, Petrarch asks, be forever widowed? How can you (Urban) sleep sumptuously on the banks of the Rhone, while the ruined and roofless Lateran lies open to the elements, while the basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul are tottering, and SS. Apostoli is reduced to a heap of rubble?:

'Regina urbium semper vidua erit? ... quo, inquam, animo tu ad ripam Rhodani sub auratis tectorum laquearibus somnum capis, et Lateranum humi iacet, et Ecclesiarum mater omnium tecto carens, et ventis patet ac pluviis, et Petri ac Pauli sanctissimae domus tremunt, et Apostolorum quae nunc aedes fuerat, iam ruina est informisque lapidum acervus.'

Soon after receiving this missive, Urban V announced that it was his irrevocable intention to return to Rome (convinced of its

2. Petrarch, Opera, II, 901; Wilkins 1959, 96.
necessity more, no doubt, by the precariousness of his position in France than by Petrarch's rhetoric).  The Florentine envoy at Avignon, Lapo da Castiglionchio, gave him encouragement, describing the marvels hidden in Christian Rome, and reminding him that any further delay would seriously jeopardise the integrity of the Papal State. Urban lost no time. He left Avignon at the end of April 1367, sailing from Marseilles, and reaching Viterbo on 9 June. Here he spent the summer. Barely surviving a popular revolt in Viterbo in September, Urban journeyed south, entering Rome on 16 October 1367 'avec grand honneur des Romains et de deux mil hommes en armes'. His return elicited from Petrarch a congratulatory letter (Ep. sen., IX. 1), in which he likens the event to the flight of Israel out of Egypt, and urges the Pope to undertake the city's restoration. Urban did, indeed, begin work on urgently-needed church repairs, but hardly to such an extent as to merit Salutati's claim, in a letter to Petrarch dated 3 April 1369, that the city was rising from its ruins. Only a few months later, at the beginning of October 1369, harassed and homesick, his determination undermined by the francophile sympathies of his Cardinals, Urban V left

5. Gregorovius, VI, 427-429; Mollat 1963, 158.
6. Biblioteca Vaticana, Cod. Barberin., XXXIII, f. 121; Glasschrodé 1889, 300; Gregorovius, VI, 432-433; Mollat 1963, 158-159.
7. Petrarch, Opera, II, 942; Gregorovius, VI, 436.
8. Salutati, Epistolario, I, 81; Pastor, I, 96; Mollat 1963, 159.
9. Even while Urban V was still in Rome, a protege of Cardinal Gui de Boulogne, Jean de Headin, produced an invective against Petrarch's Ep. sen., IX. I, in which he pours derision on the poet's rosie picture of a revivified Rome, and champions, amongst other things, the superiority of French wine. Rome, he contends, had fallen lower than he could have believed, had he not seen her degradation with his own eyes, appositely quoting from Juvenal's Third Satire on the miseries of living there: Petrarch, Opera, II, 1169-1177. Cf. Wilkins 1959, 234-237. Petrarch replied in a further polemic: Opera, II, 1178-1198. Cf. Wilkins 1959, 237-240.
Rome for good. On his death in Avignon in December of the following year,\textsuperscript{10} his successor, Gregory XI, nevertheless made it clear that he too intended to return to Rome. After much diplomatic activity, and a crescendo of exhortation issuing from St. Catherine and others, Gregory finally left Avignon in September 1376, entering Rome on 17 January of the following year.\textsuperscript{11} Thereafter, even less resilient than his predecessor, Gregory's health rapidly deteriorated. His death in Rome on 27 March 1378 precipitated the Great Schism.\textsuperscript{12}

Petrarch was no longer alive to see Rome sink to her worst indignities. The most that can be said is that Urban VI and Boniface IX (two of the so-called 'Roman' popes) attempted to govern in the city. The latter, by force of character, diplomatic flair, military strength, malversation, and other unscrupulous means, even managed temporarily to restore papal authority.\textsuperscript{13} The treaties of 1391, 1393, and 1398 effectively robbed the Roman commune of power: the rule of the banderesi was abolished and other machinery of the popular government suppressed.\textsuperscript{14} Boniface buttressed his unstable ascendancy

\textsuperscript{10} Gregorovius, VI, 444-450; Mollat 1963, 159-160.
\textsuperscript{11} Gregorovius, VI, 476-481; Mollat 1963, 162-171.
\textsuperscript{12} Gregorovius, VI, 493; Mollat 1963, 63.
\textsuperscript{13} Gregorovius, VI, 541-566.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 544-552; L.P., II, 507; Theiner 1861-62, III, 78-81 (XXX); Partner 1958, 161. Cf. the claim of the unpublished Diario di Cose Seguite in Roma da P. Bonifacio IX fino a P. Martino V, Biblioteca Vaticana, Cod. Chigiano, N III, 77, f. 2r: 'Ora per la dimoranza de' papi francesi in Avignone divenuta la Città di Roma assai popolare, et i suoi cittadini troppo haveansi pighato licentia, quando al Pontifice Bonifacio Nono, piu saggio di Urbano suo predecessore, succede di ritornare alla sua grandezza l'autorità papale...' On the executive rôle of the banderesi, see Gregorovius, VI, 403; Natale 1939, passim.
by fortifying both the Castel S. Angelo and the Vatican, and, even more boldly, by rebuilding the Palace of the Senators on the Campidoglio, gutted by fire under Cola di Rienzo, undeterred by the popular grievance that the seat of their government was being turned into a papal citadel. In his haste, the new palace was jerry-built, so shoddily that, as Flavio Biondo was to declare, even an ordinary citizen of antiquity would have spurned it.

Boniface IX held out in the Vatican, 'surrounded by lances like a secular prince', until his death in October 1404. His successor, Innocent VII, another Neapolitan, made a gallant attempt to revive intellectual life in Rome by laying plans to resuscitate the University; but they were premature, and his death in 1406 put an end to them.

Conditions in Rome during his pontificate receive some acid comment in the account of the visit to the city which Adam de Usk, an English lawyer of questionable integrity, inserted into his chronicle of English history. The city, once thronged with the palaces of princes, was now a place of hovels and wasteland, infested with thieves, wolves and worms:

'O Deus!, in quantum Roma est dolenda, quia olim principibus et eorum palaciis plena, jam tigurriis, furibus, lupis,'

15. Ibid., VI, 553.
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18. Gregorovius, VI, 556.
19. Ibid., VI, 566.
20. Pastor, I, 165-166; Valentini 1944.
The wolves, in particular, aroused Adam's curiosity; he would get up in the middle of the night to watch their incursion into the Borgo S. Pietro.24 Worse was in store: in the turmoil which engulfed Rome in the wake of Innocent VII's flight to Viterbo in August 1405, Adam had the misfortune to lose everything - 'stripped,' as he claims, 'even to my shoe latches'.25

The anarchic conditions in Rome during this period, as the Romans struggled to recover the rights they had surrendered to Boniface IX, thus playing into the hands of Ladislaus of Naples, can be corroborated from the accounts of Dietrich of Niem and Leonardo Bruni, both papal secretaries at the time.26 In a further eye-witness account, the diary of Antonio di Pietro dello Schiavo (covering the period from 19 October 1404 to 23 September 1417), can be found unembroidered reports of disturbances in the city following the rapid departure of Gregory XII for Viterbo in August 1407,27 the widespread destruction in the Borgo S. Pietro in December 1409,28 the bombardment of the Porta S. Paolo and other gates into the city in January 1410,29 and, worst of all,

23. Adam de Usk, Chronicon, 91, 264.
24. Ibid., 94, 269.
25. Ibid., 99, 276.
28. Ibid., 51-52.
29. Ibid., 55. Cf. Gregorovius, VI, 610. With these events Gregorovius 1883, 11, connects Leonardo da Besozzo's view of Rome contained in a MS. of a universal chronicle from Adam to Tamburlane (who died in 1406), now Milan, Collection Vittorio Crespi, f. 6r. Gregorovius thought the S.P.Q.R. banner shown flying from the Pyramid of Cestius in this miniature must reflect events of 8 Jan. 1410, when the Porta S. Paolo, including the fortified Pyramid of Cestius, capitulated to Paolo Orsini and his Roman partisans, thus
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the havoc unleashed when, in June 1413, Ladislaus turned his troops loose on Rome. In June 1414 Antonio complains of the indigence of St. Peter's, where he served as a beneficed priest, and, following the death of Ladislaus in August, the desolation of the Borgo and the dereliction of the basilica itself. Towards the end of his diary he describes the occupation of Rome by the condottiere, Braccio da Montone, in July 1417.

In November of the same year Oddo Colonna was elected Pope as Martin V at Constance. The Schism was at an end. Though Martin, as a Colonna, had a native inducement to return to Rome, he was not unaware of the problems. Financial difficulties and the territories held by Braccio stood in his way. These and other factors impeded his progress from Constance through Italy, and it was not until 28 September 1420 that the Pope finally entered Rome through the Porta del Popolo. 'The shabby festival of Martin's entry,' writes Gregorovius, in a splendid metaphor of papal ascendancy and communal signalling the liberation of Rome from the troops of Ladislaus of Naples. Cf. Frutaz 1962, LXXXII, I, 131-132, with further bibliography, II, tav. 154. The same detail re-occurs in the very similar miniature of Rome (omitted by Frutaz) in a now dispersed Universal Chronicle formerly in the Cockerell Collection, f. 6. Cf. Toesca 1952, pl. 12.

30. Antonio di Pietro dello Schiavo, Il Diario Romano, 79. Amongst other things, the sacristry of St. Peter's was sacked: 'Item siatis quod eodem die tota poticha Sancti Petri fuit posita assachomanno per dictam gentem armorum dicti domini Regis, etcetera, et specialiter sacristia maior dicte basilice Sancti Petri, videlicet de multis reliquis et ornamentis predicte basilice Sancti Petri.' Cf. Gregorovius, VI, 628-629; Finke 1890, 357-358.
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decline, 'closed the long and memorable period of the medieval city and opened a new age, in which Rome issued from her ruins in a new form, imparted to her by her popes, now become her masters. The Vatican, the fortress of the popes, arose, and its rival, the republican Capitol, degenerated into the monument of the liberty of the people and of a second past.'

2. The Study of the Ruins of Rome during the Schism

Turbulent though the history of Rome was during the period of the Schism, it was not entirely a dark age. Humanists employed in the Curia under Innocent VII (1404-06) and John XXIII (1410-15) helped to keep intellectual life alive, and contributed to the study of the antiquities of Rome. The importance of Francesco da Fiano as a praeceptor in the Petrarchan mode, and as a cicerone, has already been mentioned. Already by 1379 he was a papal scrip tor, but, as Hans Baron has indicated, the period when his rôle in the history of Humanism was relatively most conspicuous was during the short pontificate of Innocent VII. During this time Francesco gained the respect of the younger humanists who had gravitated to Rome; among them, both Leonardo
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Bruni and Pier Paolo Vergerio became papal secretaries in 1405. In the autumn of the following year Antonio Loschi (later Poggio Bracciolini's interlocutor in the *De varietate Fortunae*), visiting Rome as Venetian envoy to the Pope, had occasion to complement this gathering of humanists in verse. And Vergerio has described an al fresco poetry competition held by the Tiber, in which the contestants were Francesco da Fiano, Bruni, and Loschi. These activities are flatteringly corroborated in the verse *Itinerarium* of the Brescian humanist, Bartolomeo Bayguera, who sought refuge in the Curia during Innocent's pontificate, remaining in Rome for some five years (c. 1405-10) in the service of Pietro Stefaneschi, Cardinal of Sant'Angelo.

Also in Rome at this time was the gifted Florentine humanist, Poggio Bracciolini. He arrived in the autumn of 1403, and by February of the following year had become *scriptor* to Boniface IX. Shortly after his arrival in Rome Poggio, at Salutati's request, began collecting inscriptions, and soon forwarded to him the resultant *sylloge*. Though nothing is known of its contents, it presumably provided the nucleus of Poggio's surviving collection of inscriptions, which, in its fully amplified form, dates to the later 1420's.

On the death of Boniface IX, Poggio remained in Rome, subsequently becoming, with Bruni, Vergerio, and Loschi, apostolic secretary under John XXIII. Francesco da Fiano is still documented as

---

42. See infra, chap. VII. 1 (a) and 2 (a).
43. Antonio de Luschis Carmina, 57-58; Holmes 1969, 60.
45. See supra, chap. II, note 84; on Bayguera's life, see Carone 1965.
48. On the *Sylloge Poggiana*, see infra, chap. VI. 2.
At the end of 1411 Cencio de' Rustici also became scriptor. The Curia, indeed, housed at this time what has, with some justice, been called 'the most impressive gathering of humanist talent that had yet to be assembled outside Florence'.

Attached to it, somewhere on the periphery, was perhaps the author of the anonymous version of the Mirabilia first published by Mercklin and now, after Valentini and Zucchetti, generally known as the Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis et Situ Urbis Romae. This work was, in all probability, compiled in Rome under John XXIII, since it records as a recent occurrence the restoration of the corridor between the Vatican and the Castel S. Angelo undertaken by that Pope in 1411.

More pronouncedly than previous versions of the Mirabilia, the Tractatus presents a catalogue of Rome's antiquities, with the monuments analytically arranged according to type: walls and gates, streets, triumphal arches, hills, baths, palaces, bridges, obelisks and...
triumphal columns, and temples. At once progressive and conservative, the *Tractatus*, as Preller recognised, acts as an intermediary between the *Mirabilia* proper and the Quattrocento treatises of Poggio and Biondo: while in context, range of classical sources, and in its residual fidelity to legend, it belongs to the *Mirabilia* tradition, it also, in its marked disinterest in churches and relics, anticipates the secularised antiquarianism of the following three decades. The author of the *Tractatus* was, indeed, well aware that his predilection for temples incurred the disapprobation of some Roman clergy.

Moreover, his humanist proclivities are revealed in two further directions: in his appreciation of Roman inscriptions as evidence for the date and attribution of specific monuments, and in his incorporation of a text of one of the late imperial *Regionaries*. The latter were to become a common component of Quattrocento topographical works on Rome;

63. Ibid., 129-132.
64. Ibid., 133-150. This, the longest section of the *Tractatus*, corresponds closely to the Periegesis of the *Mirabilia*; cf. CTR, III, 43-65; Jordan, II, 399.
66. In the medieval tradition, exemplified by Martinus Polonus, the *Tractatus* is found, in the earliest MSS., incorporated in an anonymous world-chronicle from its origins to the fall of the Roman monarchy: CTR, IV, 102, 106-107.
67. Ibid., 103.
68. Notably that of the Colosseum, which it credulously reproduces: CTR, IV, 132; cf. ibid., III, 195-196.
69. CTR, IV, 146: 'Ad Sanctam Crucem in Iherusalem fuit templum Veneris et Cupidinis, de quibus templis non licet me aliter dicere nec largius extendere, quia non esset dominis presbyteris grata ostensio; sed legentes Ovidium de Fastis possent me habere excusatum, in suo volumine tractantem ad plenum.' Cf. Weiss 1969, 61.
70. See in particular the section on triumphal arches: CTR, IV, 117-123; Jordan, II, 418-419.
71. Mercklin 1852, 10-15; Jordan, II, 300, identified the text as the *Curiosum*, Valentini and Zucchetti as the Notitia, but they omit the text from their edition of the *Tractatus*: CTR, IV, 124. Texts of both versions of the *Regionaries* in CTR, I, 89-188.
the *Tractatus* appears to be the first to reproduce a text of one of them. According to Jordan, it derives, in this case, from the 10th century MS. of the *Curiosum*, Florence, Laurenziana, pluteo 89 sup. 67. But the *Tractatus* attributes the authorship of the work, as Nicolò Signorili was to do a few years later, to Paul the Deacon, and this suggests a priori that the parent codex combined a text of one of the *Regionaries* with one of Paul the Deacon's works; just such a collocation is found in the 11th-12th century MS., Bibl. Vaticana, lat. 1984. Whatever the codex, it is hardly likely that the author of the *Tractatus* made the initial transcript (as, indeed, is suggested by the corruption of the text it reproduces). This is more likely to have been one of his more humanist-minded contemporaries in Rome, one of those, like Poggio and Cencio de' Rustici, actively engaged in the search for unknown classical texts. Yet the whole problem of the relatively sudden reappearance of the *Curiosum* and the *Notitia*, and the dissemination of MSS. containing texts of one or the other, in the first four decades of the 15th century, remains problematical. That the process was not entirely self-generated is indicated by the fact that both Pietro Donato and Flavio Biondo independently 'discovered' texts of the *Regionaries*, the former at Speyer in 1436, and the latter at Monte Cassino by 1444, both of

73. See infra, chap. V. 4.
74. CTR, IV, 103; Jordan, II, 300-301. Cf. CTR, IV, 169.
75. Nogara 1902, 387-390; CTR, I, 74-75.
76. For a pioneer discussion of the problem, see Jordan, II, 299-302, but it is vitiated by its acceptance of De Rossi's dating of Signorili's *Descriptio Urbis Romae* to the Trecento (on which see infra, chap. V. 3).
77. Sabbadini 1905-14, I, 119-120; Schnabel 1926, 243-244; CTR, I, 79-80; Scaglia 1964, 142 and note 22. Donato's transcript is now Oxford, Bodleiana 1985A.
which can, in turn, be differentiated from the texts transmitted through the Tractatus and Signorili's Descriptio Urbis Romae. The lost Speyer codex transcribed by Donato was probably of the 9th century, but later medieval MSS. of the Regionaries are not unknown, and, in a sense, the 'discovery' of the Regionaries (like the Quattrocento 'discovery' of Vitruvius) simply reflects a new demand, created by the new antiquarian spirit of the times; it was the demand that created the supply, not vice versa.

Another figure to become, by implication, connected with the humanist cénacle in Rome during the pontificate of John XXIII was the Byzantine scholar-diplomat and professor of Greek, Manuel Chrysoloras. In April 1411 he followed the Pope to Rome, in the hope of obtaining help for beleaguered Constantinople, and also, it seems, for himself. Neither was immediately forthcoming. Chrysoloras was kept waiting for two years, his frustration periodically assuaged by promises of better things to come. Whether during this time he was employed in any official activity in the Curia is unclear. Cammelli has even doubted that he officially taught Greek, though he certainly did so privately: one of his pupils, Cencio de' Rustici, subsequently accompanied him, and Poggio, to Constance, and was present at his death there in April 1419.

While kicking his heels in Rome, Chrysoloras took the opportunity to study the antiquities of the city. He expressed his

---

79. On the lost Speyer codex, see Seeck 1872, 14-18; Schnabel 1926, passim; CTR, I, 78-82.
80. CTR, I, 74-84.
81. See supra, chap. II, note 72.
82. Cammelli 1941, 153-154.
83. Ibid.; Baxandall 1965, 197.
84. Cammelli 1941, 154.
85. Ibid., 155.
86. Ibid., 156. In his will Chrysoloras left Cencio a quarter of his library: ibid., 157.
appreciation of their beauties in three formal letters. The first and most important of them, addressed to John Palaeologus, eldest son of the Emperor Manuel, and dating to 1411, is really a fully-fledged laudatio, and is so entitled in the Latin translation prepared for Francesco Aleardi and dedicated to the young Galeazzo Maria Sforza in 1444. In his encomium Chrysoloras attempts a dual reconciliation: between ancient and modern Rome, and between Rome and Constantinople. The attempt was enthusiastically received by Guarino, to whom Chrysoloras had sent a copy of his letter. To be sure, the comparatio has a polemical edge: Rome might be extolled as the most splendid city in the world, but its antiquities were either indebted to, or actually imported from, Greece. Chrysoloras goes on to applaud the

88. In the sense of Bruni's Laudatio, dated by Baron to 1403 or 1404: Baron 1955, vol. I, 182-189; Baron 1968, 102-137, 217-263 (introduction and text). There can be little doubt that Bruni's Laudatio, though antedating that of Chrysoloras, must, to some extent, have been influenced by the latter's teaching. He was a pupil of Chrysoloras in Florence during the period 1397-1400: Gammelli 1941, 50ff; Baron 1955, vol. I, 73; Baron 1968, 155-159; Holmes 1969, 9.
90. Baxandall 1965, 197; Guarino, Epistolario, I, no. 7, 19-21 (dated 'Ex Florentia pridie nonas octobris MOCCXI'). Guarino had himself spent some time in Constantinople in the period 1403-09, when he stayed in Chrysoloras's house: Sabbadini 1896, 10-14; Baxandall 1965, 190.
monuments of imperial Rome, laying particular emphasis on those aspects, whether iconographic or epigraphic, that celebrated the achievements of the emperors (triumphal arches etc.). There follows a section praising the monuments of Roma sacra, and the letter ends climactically in a laudatio of Constantinople.

Of the other letters written from Rome, the third, addressed to Demetrius Chrysoloras, reinforces the aesthetic bias discernible in the first. He describes the enthusiasm aroused by his wanderings round Rome in the search for beauty. 'Many people,' he claims, 'would willingly have given many living and pure-bred horses to have one stone horse by Phidias or Praxiteles, even if this happened to be broken or mutilated.' In essence, his appreciation of the antique works of art visible in Rome is couched in terms familiarised by Aristotelian

---

93. Ibid., f. 32v-34r.
94. Ibid., f. 35v-42r.
95. Ibid., f. 42r-59r. Cf. Gregorovius, VI, 676-677. The letter ought to be related to the Byzantine, and ultimately classical, polemical genre, contrasting, either in theological, political, or cultural terms, the capitals of the Eastern and Western Empires. Cf. the disputation between Demetrios Kydones and others on the respective virtues of Rome and Constantinople, dating to c. 1376. Although designed by Kydones to explain his preference for the Roman Church, the argument descends from the theological level to a comparison of the actual cities. One of his opponents having urged the superiority of the walls of Constantinople, Kydones replies: 'But if you find a great expense of wall so magnificent, then you ought to be more truthful in this matter, for as far as size goes the older city wins; anyone who has wandered round and measured out both cities will tell you that he judges the old city to have the superiority.' Kydones was in Rome in 1369-70. Text in Mercati 1931, 370-372. I am grateful to Peter Southern for this information, and also for the translation.
96. For an English translation of most of this letter, coupled with the Greek text, see Baxandall 1965, 197-198, 203-204.
98. Ibid., 198. The passage alludes to the Dioscuri on the Quirinal, the spurious inscriptions on the bases of which Chrysoloras was all too eager to accept; cf. supra, chap. II, note 144.
aesthetics, with some deviations deriving, as Baxandall suggests, from Hellenistic theories of representation. Though Aristotelian thought is generally implicit in the art-appreciation of Italian humanists of the later Trecento (or earlier still, of course, in the Thomistic idea of the rôle of art), and quite explicit, for instance, in that of Pier Paolo Vergerio, in a letter of 1404, it may be said that Chrysoloras was one of the main agents in liberating Italian humanist aesthetics from the literary/moralistic constraints of the Middle Ages. In this respect, he plays no less seminal a rôle in the rapprochement of artists and humanists (before Alberti) than Giovanni Dondi. His preoccupation with antique works of art, and their Greek pedigree, may well have had a decisive influence on the contemporary humanists in Rome and Florence (as it clearly did on Guarino), who, as we shall see, turned with increasing interest to classical statuary in the following two decades. Indeed, it is not inconceivable that, at the same time, he may have stimulated the appetite in artists to study the relief sculpture of Rome, the antique Greek iconography of which he was eager to

101. On Dondi, see supra, chap. II. 2 (b); Krautheimer 1956, 295-298; Panofsky 1965, 208-210.
102. Baxandall 1965, 190-201. Yet in his invective of 1413, Guarino poured derision on Niccoli's enthusiasm for Roman ruins: 'Who could help bursting with laughter when this man, in order to appear also to expound the laws of architecture, bares his arm and probes ancient buildings, surveys the walls, diligently explains the ruins and half-collapsed vaults of destroyed cities....? Guarino, Epistolario, I, 39-40. Cf. Gombrich 1967, 78; Holmes 1969, 175. If Guarino could find this amusing, what may he have thought of Chrysoloras 'clambering up palace walls, even up to their windows, on the chance of seeing something of the beauties inside'? So the latter describes his antiquarian zeal in the letter to Demetrius Chrysoloras: Baxandall 1965, 197.
distinguish in the course of his *Laudatio*. 103 It was just this iconography of Greek myth, associated above all with Roman sarcophagi, which was to fascinate Gentile da Fabriano, Pisanello, Ghiberti and others in the 1420's and 1430's.

Shadowy as his activities were, there can be little doubt of Chrysoloras's antiquarian influence. His dealings with the Curia, and his teaching of Greek, must have brought him into contact with the antiquarian pursuits of Francesco da Fiano, Cencio de' Rustici, Bartolomeo Aragazzi, 104 Poggio Bracciolini, Pier Paolo Vergerio, Antonio Loschi, and Leonardo Bruni in Rome in the years immediately preceding the flight of Pope John XXIII, the occupation of the city by Ladislaus, and the opening of the Council of Constance. The activities of them all form the prelude to the main phase of the archaeological study of the antiquities of Rome during the subsequent pontificates of Martin V and Eugenius IV.

3. The Contribution of Martin V to the Restoration of the City

The city Martin V rode into on 28 September 1420, as all


104. Aragazzi also studied Greek under Chrysoloras in Rome: Cammelli 1941, 157.
commentators agree, must have presented a desolate picture: \(^{105}\) decayed housing, ruined churches, unpaved streets thick with mud and rubbish, vineyards and agriculture abandoned, open spaces gone to seed. The population had dwindled to an estimated 25,000. \(^{106}\) Later Platina painted a disconsolate picture of the scene. Martin, he writes, found Rome so dilapidated and deserted that it bore hardly any resemblance to a city. Houses had fallen into ruin, churches had collapsed, whole quarters were abandoned, and the people oppressed by famine and poverty:

'Urbem Romam adeo diruptam at vastam invenit, ut nulla civitatis facies in ea videretur. Collabentes vidisses domos, collapsa templa, desertos vicos, cenosam et oblitam urbem, laborantem rerum omnium caritate et inopia...' \(^{107}\)

As we have seen, a tentative reconstruction programme had been initiated a half century earlier by Urban V, \(^{108}\) but the magnitude of the task demanded more time, more money, and more effort than Urban was willing, or able, to give. Martin V, though hardly one of the great builder-popes of the Renaissance, must be given credit for devoting the remainder of his pontificate, until his death on 29 February 1431, to the renovation of the city, and thus laying the foundations of the Roma instaurata of the Quattrocento, as it gradually arose under Eugenius IV, Nicholas V, Pius II, Paul II, Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII, and Alexander VI.

Martin V, in fact, began making plans for the reconstruction of

106. Beloch 1939, 2ff. Beloch's rather optimistic figure of 25,000 at the beginning of the 15th century (rising to c. 35,000 by the middle of the next century) was computed from figures of civic representatives (proportionate to the population of each rione) given in the treaty concluded in 1393 between Boniface IX and the Romans. Cf. Magnuson 1958, 14, note 39. Romano 1938, 15, has estimated the population of Rome at the end of the Schism as only 17,000. The difficulty of tracing demographic growth in Rome during the Quattrocento is, of course, the lack of tax returns. But for a sensible discussion of the problem, see Magnuson 1958, 11–15.
108. See supra, chap. III. 1.
Rome while he was still in Florence. On 15 April 1420 an arrangement was concluded with the Medici bank for the provision of credit with which to finance the rehabilitation of the Vatican palace and the restoration of churches.

On reaching Rome in September of the same year, after spending the night at S. Maria dell' Popolo, 'la domenica a demane,' Martin, in Infessura's words, 'se ne gio a palazzo di Santo Pietro.' Here he resided. At this time the Vatican consisted of two palaces: the lower palace as left by Urban V, and the upper palace built by Nicholas III. It was the latter which, during the later Middle Ages, served as the papal residence, the lower palace being entirely given over to the various offices of the Curia. At the end of the Trecento the papal apartment consisted of a suite of no more than five or six rooms, reminiscent of the private apartment of the popes at Avignon. Here resided Urban V, Gregory XI, and Boniface IX; the latter also greatly strengthened the Leonine wall and demolished slums on the Via Francisca 'quando fecit plateam ante palatium suum'. Fortifications in this strategically vital area were continued by John XXIII, who, as a means of escape, following Louis of Anjou's abortive bid to grab the Kingdom of Naples, also restored the wall and covered corridor leading from the

111. Infessura, Diario, 23. Cf. Müntz 1878-82, I, 9. There is some variation in contemporary sources about the exact date of Martin's entry into Rome. I am following the commonly accepted one; on the discrepancies, cf. Pastor, I, 214, note.
113. Magnuson 1958, 104.
114. Ibid., 106.
115. CTR, IV, 116.
Vatican palace to the Castel S. Angelo.116

When Martin V entered the Vatican palace, it had, since the flight of John XXIII in June 1413, stood derelict for seven years. Restoration was urgent. Unfortunately, the surviving documentation of the work Martin undertook is far from complete; it consists of only one register of accounts covering the period October 1420 – April 1421.117 But this presumably refers to the most urgent repairs. It documents work carried out on the Capella Magna (later transformed into the Sistine Chapel),118 and the construction of a wooden corridor from the papal apartments over three bridges to the tribune of the benediction (the tribune, presumably, overlooking the square in front of St. Peter's), thus providing a passageway between the upper and lower palaces.119 The register also records repairs to the guard-rooms,120 the aula consistorii,121 the camera paramenti,122 the forreria,123 and the treasury.124 An account dated 12 March 1421 includes payments made for the wooden shelving for the papal registers; in this modest way was the Vatican Archive of modern times born.125 That Martin V's restorations

116. Ehrle and Egger 1935, 88-90. This connecting wall and corridor between the Vatican Palace and the Castel S. Angelo was presumably built by Nicholas III, as attested by the Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis: CTR, IV, 110. See supra, note 55. That it existed before John XXIII's pontificate is confirmed by Dietrich of Niem in his Life of the Pope: Erler 1887, 334-338; Ehrle and Egger 1935, 88-89. The testimony of Antonio di Pietro dello Schiavo is too ambiguous to prove the contrary.


118. Münz 1878-82, I, 12-14, passim.
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123. Ibid.

124. Ibid., 14.

125. Ibid. On the reconstruction of the Papal Archives under Martin V and Eugenius IV, see Corbo 1968, passim.
were provisional in nature and executed with the thrift characteristic of him is suggested by the payments themselves (the surviving accounts, as published by Müntz, involve little more than 500 gold florins),

and, perhaps more forcibly, by the fact that he was prepared to authorize the installation of fenestrae impannatae (i.e. windows of waxed cloth) even in the Capella Magna.

In the event, for undisclosed reasons, Martin chose not to live in the Vatican for long. Between 1421 and 1424 he resided intermittently (during the summer and autumn months) in the long-derelict papal palace of S. Maria Maggiore, originally built in the 13th century by Nicholas IV. What is known of this palace, never finished, and demolished piecemeal from the time of Sixtus V to the end of the 19th century, concerns the considerable enlargements made by Nicholas V. But Martin V did make some restorations to the palace, as is indicated by a Bull issued from S. Maria Maggiore in July 1423, and, presumably, also to the basilica, which had close Colonna associations in the Middle Ages.

127. Ibid., 13. Account dated 9 December 1420: 'Antonio Bucii dicti domini nostri papae scutifero pro faciendo fieri fenestras impannatas tam in capella majori quam in sala consistorii, quam camera paramenti palatii apostolici, flo. auri d. c. 8. - Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum.'
129. Ibid., 224-225 and fig. 26.
130. Ibid.
131. The Bull Quia mundo posito dated 'Romae apud Sanctam Mariam Maiorem XVIII Kalendes Iulii, Pontificatus nostri anno sexto' was designed to protect the palace of S. Maria Maggiore, and various churches and basilicas of the city, from the surripientes who were subverting the Pope's restorations: Theiner 1861-62, III, 284-285 (CCXX). Bulls issued from S. Maria Maggiore between September 1421 and July 1423 are published in ibid., 274 (CCVI) - 285 (CCXX).
To be associated with Martin V's restorations at S. Maria Maggiore, and, by implication, with his residence there, is the now-dispersed altarpiece, of which Vasari gives a garbled, though recognisable, description in his Life of Masaccio. Its original appearance was first reconstructed by Kenneth Clark, who argued persuasively that it represents a collaboration between Masolino and Masaccio. The theory of a collaboration has subsequently been elaborated by various scholars; most are inclined to give at least the London SS. John the Baptist and Jerome to Masaccio. But the dating remains controversial.

That this altarpiece originally stood in S. Maria Maggiore is testified by Vasari; the cappelletta he mentions was in fact a chapel of the Colonna family. Moreover, the central panel of the triptych in front, now in Naples, and generally given wholly to Masolino, depicts the Founding of that basilica by Pope Liberius,

133. Vasari, Le Vite, III, 128: 'Fece ancora a tempera molte tavole, che ne'travagli di Roma si son tutte o perse o smarrite: una nella chiesa di Santa Maria Maggiore, in una cappelletta vicina alla sagrestia, nella quale sono quattro Santi tanto ben condotti che paiono di rilievo, e nel mezzo Santa Maria della Neve; et il ritratto di papa Martino di naturale, il quale con una zappa disegna i fondamenti di quella chiesa, et appresso a lui è Sigismondo Secondo imperatore. Considerando questa opera un giorno Michelagnolo et io, egli la lodò molto, e poi soggiunse coloro essere stati vivi ne'tempi di Masaccio.' Cf. Clark 1951, 339; Meiss 1964, 169.

136. The exception is Davies 1961, 352, 359.
137. On the dating of the S. Maria Maggiore altarpiece, see further infra, Appendix B.
who is seen tracing out its perimeter with a hoe. The commemoration of this miraculous event was signally appropriate to Martin V's restauratio, and, since it was explicitly associated with the Pope's portrait, seems to have been conceived in this spirit. According to Vasari, it is the figure of Liberius that represents Martin V, but more undisguisedly bearing his features, as Meiss has pointed out, is the figure of the Pope's eponymous Saint in the panel, originally on the right of the triptych, now in Philadelphia; the identification is reinforced by the monograms scattered over the ornate cope, and, even more positively, by the embroidered columns, the Colonna coat-of-arms, depicted along the orphrey (Clark already noted, in addition, that in the London panel there is an allusion to the Colonna in the cross supported on a column held by the Baptist). The rich cope in the Philadelphia panel recalls, in general, the ornate pluvials and other vestments the Pope had commissioned while in Florence. Meiss, indeed, has gone so far as to identify the large morse decorated with a Man of Sorrows with a similar morse mentioned by Lorenzo Ghiberti in his autobiography: 'nel bottone (del piviale) feci una figura d'uno Nostro Signore che segna. The same conclusion has been

140. In the background of the Miracle of the Snow at Naples may be distinguished the Pyramid of Cestius close to the Porta S. Paolo. The rather artificial hillock beside it must represent Monte Testaccio. Neither are in the vicinity of the basilica, yet Leonardi 1906 claimed the background of the Naples panel corresponded with a view to be seen from S. Maria Maggiore; cf. Davies 1961, 358, note 18.

141. Meiss 1964, 177. Meiss regards this, in fact, as the best surviving portrait of Martin V. For other portraits, see ibid., 177 and note 20, figs. 21-24. On the identification of Martin V in the Philadelphia panel, see also Johnson 1966, 48, with catalogue entry.

142. Meiss 1964, 176.


146. Meiss 1964, 178.

147. Schlosser 1912, 47; Krautheimer 1956, 13.
independently arrived at by Vayer. In May 1424 Martin V abandoned the papal palace at S. Maria Maggiore and moved into his personal residence on a Colonna hereditary property beside the basilica of SS. Apostoli. There was already a Colonna residence on the site, which Martin enlarged and refurbished. The Vita included in the continuation of the Liber Pontificalis notes:

'Palacium eciam basilicae XII Apostolorum, in loco quo magno tempore habitavit, quasi ex novo construxit.'

What Martin's motive may have been for deserting the Vatican for such an evidently modest abode remains in doubt. But the other brief Vita of the Pope published by Muratori suggests it was sheer stinginess:

'Martinus vero avarissimus fuit; miserabiliter in Palatio apud Sanctos Apostolos vixit.' That Martin was of a frugal disposition is

149. On the palace of SS. Apostoli, see Santilli 1925, 14; Tomai 1942, 34; Magnuson 1958, 222 and note 16.
151. Muratori, RIS, III. 2, col. 859. Yet the same biography states (col. 858) that Martin V 'maxime Ecclesiæ duodecim Apostolorum renovavit, et ampliavit Palatium.' Cf. L.P., II, 544. The plain exterior of Martin's palace is purportedly shown in two drawings of the Cinquecento published by Egger 1931-32, vol. II, pls. 86-87. Cf. Magnuson 1958, 222, note 16. See also Henri Cliven's engraving of c. 1550, no. 12 of the series Ruinarum varii prospectis..., showing the façade of the Palazzo Colonna, the adjoining basilica, and the Quirinal rising behind: Santilli 1925, 14. But the problem of Martin's palace is complicated by the fact that, in the course of the Quattrocento, the site was on more than one occasion redeveloped. Subsequent palaces were erected adjacent to SS. Apostoli by Cardinal Bessarion (titular Cardinal of SS. Apostoli, 1439-49, but according to Magnuson 1958, 312, he retained the SS. Apostoli 'in commendam' and seems to have lived there till his death in 1472); by Pietro Riario during the pontificate of Sixtus IV, incorporating part or all of Bessarion's (cf. Magnuson 1958, 313); and by Giuliano della Rovere (later Julius II) (cf. Magnuson 1958, 313-315; Francesco Albertini in CTR, IV, 513). The palaces of Riario and Giuliano della Rovere can be distinguished, one on either side of the basilica, in Tempesta's bird's-eye plan of 1593: Magnuson 1958, 317, fig. 56; Frutaz 1962, vol. II, tav. 265. Riario's palace to the right of the basilica and presumably any residual fragments of the original Palazzo
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corroborated by the Life of him attributed to Poggio Bracciolini, and later Pontano was to allege that the Pope would economise on cooking oil by eating raw fish and by blowing out unnecessary candles in churches. On the other hand, Martin's penchant for opulent liturgical vessels, embroidered pluvials, and the like is well-documented. And as a nepotist he was indulgent to a fault.

Certainly, when it came to restoring the dilapidated basilicas of Rome, he was open-handed enough. Of his restorations to St. Peter's and S. Giovanni Laterano, the Vita in the Liber Pontificalis records:

'Hic a Deo dilectus pontifex multas ecclesias Urbis reparavit. Nam porticum sancti Petri, quae ruinam minabatur, ex integro magna impensa reedificavit. Pavimentum quoque navis mediae Lateranensis ecclesiae sumptuose valde fecit construir lapidibus porphireticis et serpentinis; eandem eciam navim de novo preciosis figuris et mira arte fabricatis ex parte pindi procuravit, sed morte preventus compleri opus non potuit.'

At St. Peter's work was mainly confined to propping up, and decorating, the portico, and strengthening the roof; again contemporary documentation is lacking. Bonanni's statement that Martin expended the colossal sum of 50,000 florins on the roof alone, though derived from an earlier source, should be treated with more scepticism than it normally...

Colonna) were eventually submerged during the drastic alterations undertaken on the site during the 16th and 17th centuries, when the present baroque Palazzo Colonna was built; cf. Magnuson 1958, 326-327.

152. Poggio, Opera Omnia, II, 788: 'Parcus fuit, et qui a supervacuis impensis abhorreret.'
153. Fontanus, de liberalitate, 1 c. cap. 7; cf. Voigt 1893, vol. II, 24. Partner 1958, 196, suggests that Martin's parsimony was forced on him; it was the only way he could pay his mercenaries.
156. L.P., II, 522.
158. Ibid.; Pastor I, 218.
Of Martin's restorations at the Lateran we have more definite information. The basilica had been twice seriously damaged by fire during the Avignon period. The new pavement, attested by the Liber Pontificalis, Cosmatesque in style, was begun in 1425, with a brief of 1 July authorizing Antonio Picardi and Nicolao Bellini, the stonemasons contracted for the work, to remove marble, stone, and other materials from derelict churches both within and without the city for use in the pavement:

'... ut a quibuscumque ecclesiis, capellis, et locis ecclesiasticis campestribus, tam intra quam extra urbum existentibus desolatis et ruinam patientibus, marmores et lapides ... et caeteras alias res ad fabricam pavimenti ydoneas, evelli, capi, et ad ecclesiam lateranensem deduci facere possitis.'

Also alluded to in the Liber Pontificalis are the frescoes in S. Giovanni Laterano commissioned by Martin V from Gentile da Fabriano. Gentile began work on them in late January 1427, but died later in the same

159. Bonanni 1700, 36-37; cf. Müntz 1878-82, I, 9; Pastor, I, 218; Guiraud 1909, 91.
162. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 47. Cf. Reumont 1868, 515; Lanciani 1899, 206-207. Previously Urban V had authorized the use of antique marbles in his reconstruction of the Lateran following the fire of 1361: Lanciani 1925, 193.
164. Müntz 1878-82, I, 16: 28 February 1427. 'Magistro Gentili de Fabriano egregio pictori pro salario suo unus mensis incepti die 28 mensis Januarii proxime praeteriti et finiti die ultimo praesentis mensis Februarii flor. auri de camera 25.' Further payments to Gentile up to August 1427.
The frescoes were completed by Pisanello. Dampness and the Baroque conspired to destroy them, but in their day they were praised, among others, by Bartolomeo Fazio and Vasari.

According to the former, they included a group portrait of Martin with ten of his Cardinals, which, Fazio says, was particularly admired by the Flemish painter, Roger van der Weyden, when visiting Rome for the Jubilee of 1450. Apropos, Degenhart has recently suggested that the two Seicento portraits, in profile, of Martin V in the Palazzo Colonna derive from a lost original by Gentile.

165. Gentile had died in Rome before 14 October 1427, as the following documents indicate: Archivio Capitoline - Archivio Urbano, Rogiti Originali vol. 785 bis, fascicolo 11 (Atti del Notaio 'Nardus quondam Putii de Venectinis civis Romanus' dell' anno 1427) fol. 139; Archivio Lateranense, liber intr. et ex. ab anno 1423 per totum annum 1442. Cf. Degenhart and Schmitt 1960, 62.

166. Ibid., 71. There is documentary evidence that Pisanello was at work at the Lateran between 1431 and 1432. See Müntz 1878-82, I, 47: 18 April 1431. 'Item die 18 dicti mensis flor. auri d. c. 40 solutos magistro Pisanello pictori pro picturis per cum factis et fiendis in ecclesia sancti Johannis lateranensis pro parte suae provisionis.' 27 November 1431. 'Provido viro magistro Pisano pictori in ecclesia lateranensi florenos auri de camera 50, in deductionem sui salarui et mercedis ratione pict(urae) dictae ecclesiae.' - In the margin: 'pro Pisanello.' End of February 1432. 'Circumspecto viro magistro Pisano pictori ecclesiae sancti Johannis lateranensis pro complemento provisionis et salarui sui ratione dictae picturae flor. auri d. c. 75.' Pisanello certainly stayed in Rome until July 1432, when Eugenius IV issued him with a safe-conduct to leave the city: 'Littera passus pro Pisanello pictore' (Archivio Secreto Vaticano, Registro. Eugenii IV no. 372 f. 53r). Cf. Sindona 1961, 107, note 32, with text; and on Pisanello's Roman period in general, Hill 1905, 48-55.


170. Baxandall 1964, 100. Fazio's remark is the sole literary evidence of a visit to Italy by Roger van der Weyden.

Other churches restored by Martin V include the basilica of SS. Apostoli, adjacent to his palace, to which he gave a new roof; 172 S. Paolo fuori le Mura, 173 S. Pantaleone, 174 and the Pantheon, inundated by the Tiber flood of 30 November 1422, 175 the roof of which Martin began to cover anew with sheet lead, an operation continued under Eugenius IV. 176

Apart from churches, Martin also undertook repairs, no doubt in deference to the Roman people, on the Capitol; documents of 18 July 1427 and 31 December 1429 refer to this work. 177

An important part of Martin's restoration of Rome was directed at the means of communication. Large-scale repairs were undertaken on the Ponte Rotto (the ancient Pons Aemilius) 178 between 8 June 1426 and 3 February 1427, 179 and, in the following year, on the Ponte Molle. 180 A more pressing problem was presented by the streets: they were clogged with refuse, and 'piena di ladri'. 181 As to crime, Martin's efforts were so successful that it became possible — so it was claimed — for a man to travel by night with gold in his open hand. 182

173. Ibid.
174. Ibid.; Lanciani 1902-12, I, 46.
175. L.P., II, 520: 'Templum Pantheon aqua repletum est usque ad altare maius.'
178. Platner-Ashby, 397-398; Nash, II, 182.
179. Münz 1878-82, I, 17.
180. Ibid.
181. Infessura, Diario, 23.
maintenance, Martin took the positive step, with his Bull 'Et si in cunctarum' of 29 March 1425, of re-establishing the long-defunct office of the Magistri viarum (though attempts had been made to revive it during the Schism). Yet it should be borne in mind that the job of the Magistri viarum was not only to maintain the streets and squares of the city, as well as the gates and bridges and the public water-supply, but also to regulate the private buildings that encroached on them.

Though restricted in scope and primitive in application, the controls over private building instituted by 'Et si in cunctarum' laid the administrative foundations for the controlled redevelopment of Rome, later in the Quattrocento to be extended and elaborated in the detailed ordinances of Nicholas V and Sixtus IV.

Another aspect of Martin V's restauratio was the delegation to his cardinals of the responsibility for restoring their titular churches in Rome and the palaces annexed to them. The repeated claim, however, that the Pope actually urged them to undertake restorations seems to derive from a passage in the Liber Pontificalis, which merely attests that the Cardinals followed his example:

'Ad ejus imitationem omnes fere Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae cardinales eorum titulos ruinae paene proximos repararunt,
Yet the claim that they were urged to do so by the Pope has been fortified by the analogy, as drawn by Lanciani, with Augustus, who, in the words of Suetonius, 'often urged other prominent men to adorn the city with new monuments or to restore and embellish old ones, each according to his means.' Whether Martin was conscious of the analogy is not known, but one cannot help noticing that he, like Augustus, 'restored sacred edifices which had gone to ruin through lapse of time or had been destroyed by fire', and, like him, he lived in a dwelling 'neque laxitate neque cultu conspicuis'.

Of the contributions of Martin's cardinals to the renovatio Romae - itself a suitable subject for a monograph - the following restorations may briefly be noted. The aged Cardinal Branda da Castiglione (1341-1433), famous for his buildings in his native town (they were enthusiastically praised by Francisco Pizolpasso in a letter of January 1432), began work on his titular basilica of S. Clemente in c. 1427-1428, summoning Masolino from Florence to paint a chapel in the upper church. The Spanish Cardinal, Alfonso Carillo, initiated a

189. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 48.
191. Ibid., 30.
192. Ibid., 72.
193. A useful introduction is provided by Guiraud 1909, 106-114, 253-261.
195. It is asserted by Kennedy 1964, 34, as by others, that Branda 'accordingly summoned Masolino and Masaccio' to work on the S. Clemente frescoes. This is mere speculation, prompted, it is true, by the known collaboration of the two artists, and also by Vasari, who says that Masaccio 'lavorò al cardinale di San Clemente, nella chiesa di San Clemente, una cappella, dove a fresco fece la Passione di Cristo co' ladroni in croce e le storie di Santa Caterina martire.' (Vasari, Le Vite, III, 128). The passage is as suspect as the immediately ensuing description of the S. Maria
restoration of his titular basilica and palace of SS. Quattro Coronati, leaving as a memento of it a fine epigraph affixed to the campanile. 196

The French Cardinal, and Archbishop of Rouen, Jean de la Rochetaille, restored the church and palace of S. Lorenzo in Lucina in 1427. 197 The lost dedicatory inscription is recorded by Martinelli. 198 In his Roma instaurata Flavio Biondo declared the palace to be the most beautiful in Rome after that of the Vatican, though this was after further improvements had been made by Jean de Jeune de Contaz, Bishop of St. Jean de Moriane, in the early 1440's. 199 Like others of the period, the palace of S. Lorenzo in Lucina has disappeared without trace, the site now being occupied by the Palazzo Fiano. 200 The only surviving early Quattrocento palace, though much altered in later times, is the Palazzo Capranica, built for himself by the young and studious Cardinal Domenico Capranica (1400-1458). 201


198. Martinelli 1638, 138. Cf. CBCR, II, 162: 'RUPE DE SCISSA JOANIVS ... ISTE DOMUM QUASI COLLAPSAE ET PRESTRATA RUINAE FUNDAMENTA VIDENS ... TEMPLEM DONUMQUE CADENTEM CUNCTA NOVARIS REPARAT...'


200. Tomei 1942, 36; Magnuson 1958, 227. On the Palazzo Fiano, see Gregorovius, VII, 663, 776; Reumont 1884.


Apart from its library, it was of modest appearance. Also equipped with a fine library, the contents of which display advanced humanistic proclivities was the palace of Cardinal Giordano Orsini, who, until his death in 1438, numbered Poggio Bracciolini among his colleagues. His palace has totally disappeared, but it was Poggio who later recalled the fresco cycle of sibyls, with inscriptions containing their prophecies of Christ, on the walls of the principal reception hall:

'Bonaememoriae Cardinallis de Ursinis, qui tempore Eugenii defunctus est, in aula palatii sui, quae paramenti camera appellatur, sybillas omnes summa cum diligentia pecti cum inscriptione eorum, quae suis temporibus, quaeque de Christo praedixit."

The traditional Orsini residence (since the 13th century) was the fortress of Monte Giordano, and this remained the residence of Cardinal Giordano Orsini. The fortress occupies a prominent


204. The inventory, containing 254 codices, including several geographical and topographical works, is published in Cancellieri 1786, 906-907. Cf. Pastor, I, 273 and note, with earlier literature; Scaglia 1964, 153; further bibiol. in Cosenza 1962-67, IV, 3528-3529.


207. It remained the residence of Cardinal Latino Orsini, Giordano's nephew, in the mid-15th century, as is testified by Giovanni Rucellai, who also briefly mentions the fresco cycle: 'Monte Giordano, dove habita il cardinale degli Orsini, dove è una bellissima sala storliata con buone figure et con cierte finestre d' alabastro in luogo di vetri.' (CTR, IV, 416; cf. Simpson 1966, 136). Pastor, I, 272
position in Masolino’s panorama of Rome at Castiglione d’Olona.\textsuperscript{208}

Indeed, according to Vasari, it was Masolino who painted the hall of the old house of the Orsini on Monte Giordano with the frescoes alluded to by Poggio: ‘Ed andatosene a Roma per studiare, mentre che vi dimorò fece la sala di casa Orsina vecchia in monte Giordano.’\textsuperscript{209} In fact, these frescoes consisted of more than sibyls. As two recently published 15th century descriptions of them show, they belong to the series of \textit{viri illustres} fresco cycles discussed above.\textsuperscript{210} In addition, Filarete apparently refers to the Monte Giordano frescoes in his \textit{Trattato dell’Architettura},\textsuperscript{211} and on the basis of this Scheller has deduced that Leonardo da Besozzo’s picture-chronicle of \textit{viri illustres} in the Crespi Collection must derive from the Monte Giordano frescoes.\textsuperscript{212} The deduction has now been strongly corroborated by the two descriptions of the frescoes published by Simpson.\textsuperscript{213}

The palace of Prospero Colonna, nephew of the Pope, and

and note, locates the Palazzo of Giordano Orsini in the Via Papalis at the corner of the Via dei Monerone, but this is possibly a confusion with the palace erected by Francesco Orsini, Prefect of Rome under Eugenius IV, shortly after 1450 on what is now the Piazza Navona; the main entrance, as a plan in the Archivio di Stato indicates, was in the Via di S. Pantaleo – then the Via Papalis. For a discussion of this palace, see Magnuson 1958, 241-243.

212. Scheller 1962, 56-57.
213. Simpson 1966, 137. \textit{The series of \textit{viri illustres} in the Crespi chronicle and in the two descriptions of the Monte Giordano frescoes all conclude with Tamburlane. For further correlations, see Mode 1972.}
appointed Cardinal of S. Giorgio in Velabro on 24 May 1426 at the age of 22. Its ornamental garden, laid out on the slopes of the Quirinal, was later praised by Flavio Biondo in his Roma instaurata. Martin V is unlikely to have allowed his nipote such a display of extravagance in the immediate neighbourhood of the SS. Apostoli during his lifetime, and it seems likely that Prospero's palace and garden belong, in the main, to the period between September 1431, when Eugenius made peace with the Colonna, and August 1436, when the Colonna fortunes fell. But Prospero's fortunes did not thereafter suffer any permanent eclipse. He remained a wealthy and influential figure in the Sacred College right up to his death in 1463, and it was in all likelihood during the early 1440's that the apparently Cosmatesque pavements praised by Biondo were laid out. In later years, Prospero, a patron of humanism, as well as a collector of antiques, had occasion to seek Biondo's participation in his own archaeological investigations.

Other palaces of the cardinalate under Martin V must have existed, but have not survived. We may suppose them to have been

214. Prospero Colonna's nomination to the cardinalate was initially secret, and not published till November 1430: Pastor, I, 261-264.
216. Biondo, R.I., I. 100.
217. Gregorovius, VII, 29. Prospero Colonna presumably annexed Martin's palace on his death on 20 February 1431, but during the war which his death precipitated between the Colonna and Eugenius IV, the palace of SS. Apostoli seems to have been sacked: Gregorovius, VII, 27-28. The Palazzo Capranica suffered the same fate at this time.
218. Gregorovius, VII, 57.
219. On Biondo's relations with Prospero Colonna, see infra, chap. VIII. 7 (b).
modest in scale. The palaces of the Pope at SS. Apostoli, of Rochetaile at S. Lorenzo in Lucina, and of Domenico Capranica all apparently incorporated older structures. This is symptomatic of the fact that Martin's pontificate was essentially a period of urban reconstruction, rather than expansion. It is doubtful if any ecclesiastical foundations date to the period. S. Bernardo della Compagnia, founded by a Roman nobleman adjacent to the Column of Trajan and demolished in 1736, seems to be the only possible contender, Armellini stating that it was consecrated in 1418; but even this has been contested in favour of a foundation under Eugenius IV. It is striking that the greater part of Günter Urban's recent survey of Quattrocento ecclesiastical architecture in Rome is devoted to the second half of the century.

What building there was in Rome after 1420 at least had the dubious value of stimulating the quarrying-industry. In the time-honoured fashion, quarries were afforded by earlier buildings, whether antique or medieval. Two years before he himself authorized the quarrying of derelict churches to furnish the Lateran pavement, Martin V was obliged, in 1423, to publish his Bull Quia mundo posito, to deter the pilfering of building materials, tools, and furnishings even from

221. Ibid., 222, 227; Tomei 1942, 36; CTR, IV, 293, note 1.
224. Urban 1961-62. For churches restored or erected under Martin V and Eugenius IV, see in particular ibid., 77-79, 263-264. See also Huelser's valuable Appendix II: Le chiese construite dopo il 1425 ricordate nei cataloghi n. VIII-XIII, in Huelser 1927, 527-543. On the erroneous dating of the foundation of S. Onofrio al Gianicolo to 1419 (instead of 1439), see Flaccavento 1965, 220, note 34.
St. Peter's and the papal palace of S. Maria Maggiore, as well as from other churches of the city:

'... nonnulli iniquitatis filii ... nonnulla tabulas lignosas, plumbum, clavos, lapides, ligna, calcem, ferramenta tam nova quam antiqua, nec non canapos, funes, cordas, scalas, seras, ascetas, accettas, tribellos, marchios, martellinos, clavos, bullatas et alia quecumque bona mobilia tam in sancti Petri, quam in beate Marie Maioris palaciis, necnon in capella sancti Gregorii sita in ambitu Basilice principis apostolorum de Urbe, ac in dicte Basilice et monasterii s. Pauli extra muros Urbis ordinis sancti Benedicti ecclesiis, atque aliis locis ecclesiasticus pro reparacione et reformacione ecclesiarum et locorum dictorum consistencia furtim surripere, subtrahere et usibus suis applicare mimine formidarunt in animarum suarum periculum, ecclesiastice libertatis vilipendium et scandalum plurimorum. 225

If churches could not be quarried, there remained the ancient monuments. On 1 July 1426 letters of patent were issued by the papal authorities to a company of lime-burners in the rione Pigna permitting them to demolish the travertine pillars of the nave and aisles of the Basilica Julia on the Forum Roma. 226 The agreement stipulated that half of the proceeds were to accrue to Giacomo Isolani, Cardinal of S. Eustachio, then in the process of restoring his titular church. 227 In a comparable case, Martin's restoration of the Ponte Rotto was undertaken, according to a document from the time of Gregory XIII, at the expense of an unspecified ancient monument of travertine. 228

Such iconoclasm has to be reconciled to Martin's restauratio.

226. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 47-48. Cf. Lanciani 1899, 191. An earlier concession of John XXIII dating to 8 January 1413, permitting demolition work, may also refer to the Basilica Julia, but Lanciani thought it more probably involved the Temple of Saturn and its travertine substructure facing the Vicus Iugarius.
227. Lanciani 1899, 191.
228. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 47.
Certainly, he deserves credit for laying the foundations, in however humble a fashion, of the Renaissance city of Rome. Poggio, for one, recognised in him one who had rescued both Christianity and Rome from calamity, the institutor of a golden age: 'Anni sui pontificatus pars saeculi aurei appellantur.' 229

CHAPTER IV

THE EXPLORATION OF THE ANTICUITÉS OF ROME

1420-1431

1. Archaeology and Urban Renewal

It is one of the ironies of urban history that the archives in which the mutations of churches and palaces are so diligently recorded often have next to nothing to say about the morphology of cities as a whole. Chroniclers and historians can be equally reticent. Sometimes, after a major civic disaster, a Livy or a Tacitus will make some laconic comment on urban renewal,¹ but, generally, the rise and fall of cities, as a morphological process, goes unobserved in the literary record.

In the history of Rome, a city peculiarly prone to major disasters, the Schism was undoubtedly a calamity. Yet apart from the vague testimonies of the Liber Pontificalis, Infessura, Platina, and others,² the reconstruction of the city in its aftermath, particularly during the period 1420-1431, has largely to be inferred. Martin's Bull 'Et si in cunctarum' does touch on some of the more utilitarian aspects of the process (the clearing of streets, the maintenance of the city walls, the control of private building etc.),³ and there is some documentation to show the commercial rejuvenation of

---

¹. The locus classicus for the random development of Rome after 390 B.C. is Livy, ab urbe condita, V. 55. 2-5. For the planned Neronian Nova Urbs, see Tacitus, Annals, XV. 43. 1. For the morphology of Rome under the Empire, see the translated excerpta in Dudley 1967, 11-33.
². L. P., II, 519-523, 544; Infessura, 23-26; Platina, 310.
³. See supra, chap. III. 3.
Rome after 1420. 4

Though the city's gradual internal development during the Quattrocento can also, to some extent, be ascertained from the pictorial record, the surviving plans and vedute belonging to the first half of the century are generally too schematic to be helpful from this point of view. For a relatively accurate visual indication of the built-up areas within the Aurelian walls it is necessary to look forward to the anonymous panorama painted in the Palazzo ducale at Mantua; 5 though this has a terminus post quem of 1534, since it includes the two statues of SS. Peter and Paul erected in that year at the entrance to the Ponte S. Angelo by Clement VII, 6 it seems, in the main, to derive from an earlier prototype dating to the period 1478-90, incorporating, as it does, a number of anachronisms, such as the Meta Romuli, demolished in 1499. 7 From this plan it is clear that the most densely populated areas were the Campo Marzio, the Campo dei Fiori, and the area between that and the Capitoline Hill. 8 These were precisely the areas inhabited in the Middle Ages. The breakdown of the Roman aqueducts, as a result of the barbarian incursions and their aftermath, had led to the abandonment of the hills, and to the occupation of the Campo Marzio and the lowlying areas close to the Tiber. 9 It was only with Nicholas V's restoration of the Aqua Vergine in 1453 that any great

4. For the taxes imposed by the gabelle on imports and exports from Rome, see Malatesta 1885; Partner 1958, 165-169.
7. Ibid., 151-152.
8. Ibid., II, tav. 168-169.
contribution was made to ameliorating the water supply, and thus making inhabitable, as Pastor put it, 'that part of the city which was most distant from the river.'

Yet even in the Mantuan plan it is striking how much of the city was still undeveloped: between the Colosseum and the Porta Maggiore, the Quirinal and the Porta Salaria, and over the Caelian and Aventine Hills, extended a wilderness, broken only by a few churches and the hulks of ancient ruins.

Earlier, at the close of Martin V's pontificate, Poggio Bracciolini had commented on the desolation of the hills of Rome, covered only by ruins and vineyards. It seems clear, therefore, that the earlier Quattrocento was a period of civic consolidation, rather than expansion, a process involving piecemeal renewal rather than town-planning. It was not at least until the pontificate of Sixtus IV - 'the Haussmann of the fifteenth century' - that any concerted attempt was made to remodel the city as a whole.

The reconstruction of Rome initiated by the return of Martin V to the city in 1420 may have been modest, yet it forms the necessary background to the simultaneous efflorescence of archaeological interest in Rome. The two are concomitant: the restoration of Rome created the practical conditions under which antiquities could be recovered, at the same time as it stimulated the symbiosis of antica and nova so characteristic of the Renaissance civic ideal. The petrified history of the ancient city into which the foundations of the new were inevitably sunk, besides furnishing collectors with a steady stream of
antiquities, set up, as it came to light, a dialectical relationship with the Rome of the day. The very title of Flavio Biondo's *Roma instaurata* (1444-46) is resonant with it, reflecting, ambivalently, both a literary reconstruction of the city of antiquity and a eulogy of Eugenius IV's *restauratio*. A few years later, Leon Battista Alberti was combining the essentially collaborative functions of archaeologist and architect in Rome, and in the following century the dialectical process was given added impetus by Raphael, commissioned by Leo X not only to rebuild St. Peter's, but also to compile a pictorial record of the ancient city, a project which, in method, recalls Alberti's *Descriptio Urbis Romae*, but with a more obvious application to the needs of the present. As Mandowsky and Mitchell remark of it:

'The reconstitution of ancient and modern Rome were two aspects (reflected also in the subsequent history of Roman map-making in the sixteenth century) of the same grand design.'

For present purposes, it is the recovery of antiques which is of immediate interest. As the fifteenth century progressed, and the pace of urban renewal quickened, so the finds of antiquities in Rome became increasingly prolific. They furnished the bulk of the private collections of Roman sculptures amassed during the course of the century by the great families in Rome: Altieri, Bufoli, Capranica, Cesi, Chigi, Colonna, Maffei, Mattei, Piccolomini, Porcari, della Rovere, Valle, and

many more. To have an ornamental garden adorned with choice sculptures, and a palatial cortile with fragmentary inscriptions and reliefs built into the walls, was, by the close of the century, almost a patent of nobility. The fashion was to persist well into modern times.

Such collections of antique sculptures in Rome can be seen as developing pari passu with the reconstruction of the city: the digging of foundations, the quarrying of materials, the planting of vineyards and orchards - these and related activities produced spectacular finds. On 14 January 1506 the colossal Laocoön was brought to light in the vigna of Felix de Fredis, 'in loco dicto le Capoce appresso la chiesa di S. Pietro ad vincula.' But by this time (during the pontificate of Julius II), so eagerly were antiquities being sought after, their discovery was being removed, increasingly, from the sphere of the fortuitous. In his Life of Giovanni da Udine, a pupil of Raphael, Vasari describes the excavations being carried out, in much the same area where the Laocoön came to light, at 'S. Pietro in Vincola fra le ruine e' anticaglie del palazzo di Tito per trovar figure,' Instead of finding sculptures, however, the excavations revealed the subterranean rooms of the Domus Aurea, decorated with grottesche,

---

20. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 100-127. On the earliest 'antique-gardens' in Rome, see also Huelsen 1917. By the middle of the 16th century these private collections of antiques had grown to such proportions that Ulisse Aldrovandi could produce a pioneer pocket-guide to the statuary they contained: Aldrovandi, Delle statue antiche, che per tutta Roma in diversi luoghi, e case si veggon, Venice 1556 (Scholdt 1930, no. 703). Cf. Gregorovius, VIII, 152; Mandowsky and Mitchell 1963, 19.


Giovanni and Raphael went to see and admire them. Excavation for antiquities, in short, had been transformed, by the beginning of the 16th century, into an autonomous pursuit.

To be sure, the deliberate, as opposed to the fortuitous, recovery of antiquities was an activity not unattested in the Middle Ages. The recovery of antique sarcophagi in Rome, as early as the 12th century, was a deliberate venture. But, for the most part, Roman antiquities had been haphazardly brought to light either by stone-masons or lime-burners (the two principal industries engaged in excavation as a commercial enterprise) or during the actual construction of ecclesiastical and secular buildings. Undoubtedly, some Roman figural sculpture must, in this manner, have been recovered during the Middle Ages in Rome. Yet it is only after 1420 that there is any

24. Ibid. But parts of the Domus Aurea had evidently already been explored, since the grottesche are mentioned by the Prospektivo melanese (125-129) of c. 1500: Dacos 1969, 9-10.
25. The documented instances of excavation for antiquities in the course of the Quattrocento are collected in Lanciani 1902-12, I, 45-127, passim, but a study devoted to the development of what may properly be described as archaeological excavation during the Renaissance remains a desideratum.
26. In 1240 Frederick II licensed Osberto Commenali to excavate near Augusta 'in loca in quibus sperat firmiter inventiones maximes invenire': Weiss 1969, 12. One can, indeed, trace back the purposive excavation for antiquities to the classical world; it is interesting to note that such loci classicæ as Strabo, VIII. 38 and Suetonius, Julius, 81, record the exploitation, and excavation, of funerary antiquities initially found during the rebuilding, under Julius Caesar, of Corinth and Capua respectively. But tomb-robbing, though legislated against in Roman law, seems endemic throughout the ages, and the divide between tomb-robbing and archaeological excavation is perhaps, in a classical context, academic.
27. See supra, chap. I 2.
28. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 5-41 (11th to 14th centuries).
incontestable documentary or literary evidence of such finds being made. The first report, since the shadowy days of Henry of Blois, of the discovery of an antique statue in Rome may, in fact, be credited to the Florentine goldsmith and sculptor, Lorenzo Ghiberti. On the second, and most prolonged, visit which he made to Rome, and which he himself says took place 'in the 440th olympiad',\textsuperscript{30} that is, in Krautheimer's view, during the years 1425-1430,\textsuperscript{31} Ghiberti, as he recalls in his Commentarii, saw a recently excavated statue of a hermaphrodite.\textsuperscript{32} The statue, minus its head, had been found by chance in a drain near S. Celso in the vicinity of the Ponte S. Angelo. It was then removed by an anonymous sculptor to S. Cecilia in Trastevere, where he was engaged on the tomb of a cardinal:\textsuperscript{33}

\textit{'Vidi in roma nella olimpia 440 una statua duno ermoerodito di grandezza duna fanciulla danni 13 la quale statua fatta con mirabile ingegno... fu trovata in una chiavica eraci piano di detta scultura... el detto luogo era sopra a sco. Celso. in detto lato sissfermo uno scultore fece trarre fuori detta statue et condussela in s. Cecilia in trastevere ove dito scultore lavorava una sepultura duno cardinale.'}\textsuperscript{34}

Though this statue appears to be lost, the veracity of Ghiberti's report need not be questioned.

Ghiberti's hermaphrodite may be compared to a similar report in Poggio Bracciolini's \textit{De varietate Fortunae}. Here he records the

\textsuperscript{30} Ghiberti, \textit{Denkwuerdigkeiten (I Commentarii)}, ed. Schlosser, I, 47.
\textsuperscript{31} Krautheimer 1956, 6, 357-358.
\textsuperscript{33} Lanciani 1902-12, I, 46, thought this tomb might have been that of the English Cardinal, Adam Easton (d. 1398), lone survivor of the cardinals decimated during Urban VI's flight from Nocera to Genoa, but Krautheimer 1956, 357, note 27, rules out this possibility, on the grounds that Easton's monument in S. Cecilia on stylistic grounds can hardly be later than the first decade of the 15th century; on this tomb, see also Davies 1910, 44-46.
\textsuperscript{34} Lanciani 1902-12, I, 46. On the hermaphrodite, presumed lost by Schlosser, see Krautheimer 1956, 277 and note 3, 313-314.
discovery, presumably also during the pontificate of Martin V, though the date is unspecified, of a huge recumbent statue, its head intact, found near S. Maria sopra Minerva while someone was digging trenches to plant trees. Poggio goes on to claim that it was 'bigger than all the statues of the city' (no mean claim, in view of the Dioscuri).

Unfortunately, so many people, Poggio declares, turned up to see it that the owner of the garden got tired of the noise and the intrusion, and covered it over with earth again.36 Georgia, in his 1723 edition of the De varietate Fortunae, made the plausible suggestion that this recumbent statue was, in fact, the colossal recumbent Nile now in the Vatican Museum, which was apparently found, together with another river-god (the Tiber), near S. Maria sopra Minerva in 1513.37

Both these cases, Ghiberti's hermaphrodite and Poggio's putative river-god, illustrate the close relationship between the processes of urban renewal and archaeology. Both represent chance finds. Both mark the beginnings of the recovery of antique statuary in the period after the return of Martin V to Rome in 1420. During the fourth and fifth decades of the century the process gained momentum.38

---

35. The description of Rome contained in Book I of the De varietate Fortunae, in which Poggio records the discovery of this statue, purports to reflect the city toward the end of Martin V's pontificate; Valenti and Zuccheti date the dialogue between Poggio and Loschi to the autumn of 1430: CTR, IV, 230 and note 1. See further infra, chap. VII.1 (a).

36. CTR, IV, 235. See infra, chap. VII.2 (a) for the quotation.

37. Poggio Bracciolini, De varietate Fortunae, ed. Dominico Georgia, 12, note (a); Amelung, I, 132-133, no. 109; Helbig, I, no. 440; Bober 1957, 61.

38. It is possible that Prospero Colonna began to amass his collection of antique statuary during the later stages of Martin V's pontificate; the Belvedere Torso was evidently visible in the Palazzo Colonna by 1432, when it was seen by Ciriaco d'Ancona: Michaelis 1898, 258-259; Helbig, I, no. 265. Prospero Colonna may also have acquired by this time the group of the Three Graces, now in Siena, 'repertum in aedibus de Columna.' Lanciani 1902-12, I, 107. On the formation of this and other collections during this period, see ibid., 100-127.
Quite another tradition to which the beginnings of archaeological excavation in early Quattrocento Rome have been referred should be treated more cautiously. The tradition is associated with alleged finds of treasure. It can be traced back, at least, to an actually documented case of September 1397, when a 'treasure' was privately discovered near S. Giovanni Laterano, and received with sufficient cupidity to apply for a papal confirmation of the rights of ownership. The nature of this treasure is divulged neither in the original submission nor in Boniface IX's confirmation of 27 September 1397, but, in all probability, it consisted of Roman coinage.39

The case has superficial similarities to the 'treasures' purportedly discovered by Brunelleschi and Donatello in Rome during the joint antiquarian expeditions attributed to them by the former's biographer, usually, and with increasing confidence, identified with Antonio Manetti.40 In Manetti's account, composed in the 1480's, Brunelleschi went to Rome immediately after the competition for the Florentine Baptistery doors, specifically in order to study its antique sculpture and architecture. In Rome he was joined by Donatello. The two of them, according to Manetti, not only made drawings of buildings within and without the walls, but also undertook excavations 'in order to see the junctures of the membering of the buildings and their type'. The activity won them the sobriquet of 'treasure-hunters', since it was believed they were digging for treasure; and on rare occasions they did

39. Ibid., 41.
40. For a recent review of the evidence supporting Manetti's authorship, see Manetti, The Life of Brunelleschi, ed. Howard Saalman, 10-20. Manetti's holograph of the Vita is identifiable in Florence, Magliabecchiana II, II, 325, f. 295r-312v.
actually find coins, cameos, and the like:

'Ebbe in questa stanza di Roma quasi continuamente Donatello schultore, e originalmente u' andarono d' accordo rispetto alle cose di scultura schiattamente e a quelle attendevano continuamente; e Donatello senza maj aprire gli occhj alla architettura, e Filippo non glij comunico maj tale pensiero, o perché e non ui uedesse atto Donatello ofорse si difidaua di non gugniere tali cose, uegiendo a ogni ora piu le sue difficoltà; quantunque insieme e leuassono grossamente in disegno quasi tutti gli efficij di Roma e in molti luoghi circustanti di fuorj colle misure delle largheze e alteze, secondo che poteuano arbitrando cer tificarsj, e longitudinj ect. E in molti luoghj facieuano cauare per uedere e riscontrj de membrj degli edificj e le loro qualita, s' egli erano quadrj o di quanti anguli o tondi perfetti o ouati o di che conditione. E così due e poteuano congetturare l' alteze, così da basa a basa per alteza come da fondamenti e risehe e tetti degli edificj, e poneuano in su striscie di pergamene che si lieuano per riquadrare le carte con numero d' abaco e caratte che Filippo intendeva per se medesimo. E perché l' uno e l' altro erano buoni maestri dell' arte dello orafo, passauano la uita loro con quello mestiero, che era loro tutto dj nelle botteghe deglj orafi date loro delle faciende piu che non ne poteuano fare; e concluoj Filippo assai gole, dategli a conciare. Non daua noia ne all' uno ne all' altro la cura familiare, perché non aveuano ne donne ne figliuoli ne quij ne altroue, e poco stimauano, cascuno di loro, come si mangassono o beessono, o come si stessono o uestissono, pure che di quelle cose e del uedere e del misurare e si sodisfaciessono. E perché feciono cauare in molti luoghi per trovare riscontrj di membrej e per ritrouare cose et edificj, doue aparia qualche segnial e affare bisogniana, che mettessono delle opere e di facchinj e d' altri bastagi, pure con ispese e non picchole, non u' essendo altrj che faciessi e medesimo, non estimando alcuno per quello che sel facie السن. E la cagione del non estimare el perché era, perché in quel tempo non era chiatendessi, ne era stato di centinaia d' anni innanzi chi suessi ateso al modo dello edificare antico; del quale se per alcuno autore nel tempo de gentilj se dato precetto, come ne nostrij de fecie Batista degli Alberti, poco si puo altro che delle cose generalj; ma le inuenzionj, che sono cose propie del maestro, bisognia, che nella magiore parte sieno date dalla natura o dalla industria sua propia. E tornando alle cause di Filippo e di Donato, generalmente erano chiamati quelli del tesoro, credendo ch' egli spendessono e cercassono di quello. E dicieuasi: quelli del tesoro cercauano oggi nel tale luogo et un altraiolta in un altro ect. El e el uero, che qualche volta ui si troua delle medaglie d' argento e qualchuna d' oro, benchj de rado, così delle pietre intagliate e calcidonj e corniuole e camej e altrj simij; donde nasceua la magiore parte di quella oppenione, che cercassono di tesoro. 41

41. Cod. Magl. , f. 299v-300v. For text, with English translation en face, see Manetti, The Life of Brunelleschi, ed. Saalman, 52-55.
In both editions of his *Life* of Brunelleschi, Vasari follows Manetti in describing how the two artists would excavate buried pieces of capitals, columns, cornices and bases of buildings:

'E se per avventura egli avessino trovato sotterrati pezzi di capitelli, colonne, cornici e basamenti di edifizii, egli mettevano opere e gli facevano cavare per toccare il fondo.'

Vasari also recounts the popular rumour of them as 'quelli del tesoro', attributing it to the fact that one day they had found an ancient earthenware vase full of medals (i.e. Roman coins): 'e di ciò fu cagione l'avere egli trovato un giorno una brocca antica di terra, piena di medaglie.' Vasari dates Brunelleschi's visit to Rome to 1407. Manetti implies that he went as early as 1402 and stayed several years.

It is this chronology, above all, which arouses suspicion. It is hard to reconcile with Donatello's age (he was born c. 1386), and with the fact that he is continuously documented in Florence in the years 1404-1407. This chronological difficulty has tended, since the later 19th century, to produce a divergence of views on the question of the accuracy of Manetti's report, Donatello scholars treating it with scepticism, or dismissing it altogether, and Brunelleschi scholars more...
readily accepting it.\textsuperscript{47} That Brunelleschi and Donatello spent some time together in Rome during the first decade of the Quattrocento, however, is now generally discounted. Yet the possibility that such an encounter took place at a later date cannot be entirely ruled out.

There are, indeed, strong stylistic grounds for assuming that both Brunelleschi and Donatello visited Rome, and studied its monuments, a great deal later than Manetti and Vasari assert. The former may have been in Rome on several occasions between 1403 and 1418,\textsuperscript{48} and possibly made a later visit between 1431 and 1433.\textsuperscript{49} As far as any study of the ancient monuments he might have made, a case can be made out for supposing that it was this last visit that most materially affected his style.\textsuperscript{50} The similarities between S. Maria degli Angioli, Brunelleschi's unfinished octagonal church, and the so-called temple of Minerva Medica in Rome, in particular, have often been noted.\textsuperscript{51} Certainly, none of the early antique influences on

\textsuperscript{47} On this divergence of views, see Janson 1963, 99-100, with literature; it persists, as in Sanpaolesi 1962, 27-33; Golzio and Zander 1968, 33-34; Weiss 1969, 62-63. Among Brunelleschi scholars, however, Heydenreich 1931, 22ff, argued that Brunelleschi did not visit Rome until 1433-1434. But Sanpaolesi 1941, in his study of the cupola of Santa Maria del Fiore, reverted to the traditional view of Fabriczy and Geymüller (following Manetti) that he visited Rome early in life. Cf. Panofsky 1965, 40.

\textsuperscript{48} Fabriczy 1892, 43-44; Krautheimer 1956, 320.

\textsuperscript{49} On the Seicento tradition, recorded in Bocchi, Le Bellezze della Città di Firenze (1591), 248, that Brunelleschi went to work in Rome for Eugenius IV on the recommendation of Cosimo de' Medici, see Holmes 1969, 195-196. His association with Alberti, who dedicated to him the Italian version of the Della Pittura (1436), is consonant with such a putative visit to Rome in the early 1430's (Alberti left Rome with Eugenius IV in 1434); cf. Krautheimer 1956, 319; Holmes 1969, 196.

\textsuperscript{50} Heydenreich 1931, 6ff; Holmes 1969, 196-201.

\textsuperscript{51} Heydenreich 1931, 6-7. The derivation of S. Maria degli Angioli from the temple of Minerva Medica, or an analogous centralised Roman building, has been questioned by Burns 1971, 283, who postulates as an alternative source the half-octagon terminations of the transepts in S. Maria del Fiore, but the theory seems unlikely to oust the

Continued
Brunelleschi need derive from personal familiarity with Rome. On the contrary, the dominant 'classicizing' influence is undeniably Tuscan Romanesque. Its preponderance, supplemented by other non-antique influences, notably the architecture of the Trecento and of the Veneto, makes it extremely unlikely that Brunelleschi can have engaged in the close study of Roman antiquities attributed to him by Manetti much earlier than the inception of the Santo Spirito project in 1434.

As for Donatello, he also was in Rome between 1432 and 1433, when he sculpted the Tabernacle of the Sacrament in St. Peter's and

traditional view. On the Minerva Medica, actually a monumental nymphaeum, situated on the Esquiline, between the via Labicana and the Aurelian wall, see Platner-Ashby, 364-365; Nash, II, 127-129. On the humanist confusion between mausolea (and nymphaea) and temples of antiquity, see Krautheimer 1961, 68-71 - a confusion implicit in Alberti's concept of the templum as outlined in Book VII of the De Re Aedificatoria (the literary source being Vitruvius, IV. 7); this concept was accompanied by a critique of the traditional mode of church architecture in the form of the basilica (a critique, as Krautheimer points out, by implication, aimed also at Brunelleschi's S. Lorenzo and S. Spirito); S. Maria degli Angioli, in this light, may reflect the combined influence of both Albertian theory and the centralised buildings of Rome.

52. It seems highly unlikely that the thorn-picker in Brunelleschi's Competition Relief derives directly from the spinario displayed, since the 13th century at least, at the Lateran. As Krautheimer 1956, 282, points out, it calls the original only through an overlay of medieval transformations.

53. Tietze 1926-27, 52-53; Saalman 1958, 115-116; Gombrich 1967, 77. That in the 1420's even Florentine civic humanists were unable to distinguish between genuine Roman remains and Tuscan Romanesque is suggested by the Paradiso degli Alberti (III, 232-233), in which Luigi Marsigili (1342-1394) was reported as saying the Florentine Baptistery was originally a temple of Mars. Salutati evidently thought the same. Cf. Holmes 1969, 175-176.

55. Saalman 1958, 129-130.
the Tomb slab of Giovanni Crivelli (who died on 28 or 29 July 1432. By
May of the following year, the tomb completed, Donatello was back in
Florence). 57 It is also conceivable that Donatello was in Rome in 1430
or a little earlier, since in a letter written from Rome to Niccoli on
23 September 1430 Poggio Bracciolini mentions a piece of antique
sculpture which, he says, he had shown to Donatello, who praised it, the
implication being that he too was in Rome at this time: 'Ego etiam hic
aliquid habeo, quod in patriam portabitur. Donatellus vidit, et summe
laudavit.' 58 Any earlier visit of Donatello to Rome must be regarded
as elusive. 59 According to Krautheimer, 'nothing precludes his having
made one or two earlier visits prior to 1418...'. 60 Yet the antique
influences that have been adduced to substantiate such visits are quite
unconvincing. 61 Indeed, the precise antique sources that have been
adduced for Donatello as a whole can only be considered, as Janson
concludes, 'strangely inconclusive'. 62 It is symptomatic that perhaps
the most convincing of them, namely the correspondence between two putti
on one of the panels of the Prato pulpit to similar putti on a Roman
sarcophagus now in the storeroom of the Vatican Museum, 63 post-dates
1433. 64

It seems likely, therefore, that if Brunelleschi and Donatello,
whether separately or together, did indeed investigate the ancient

57. Ibid. , 101-102.
59. Janson 1963, 99-100, listing proponents of an earlier visit by
Donatello to Rome.
60. Krautheimer 1956, 320.
61. E. g. the implausible derivation of Donatello's Abraham and Isaac
group from the Pasquino: Janson 1963, 37.
62. Ibid., 100.
64. Janson 1968, 81. On the chronology of the Prato Pulpit: Janson
monuments of Rome, they did so in the period 1430-1433, in the period, that is, when both of them, independently, came most under the stylistic influence of Roman antiquity. Furthermore, if either or both of them made the finds of 'treasure' claimed for them by Manetti and Vasari, they were most likely to have done so in the early 1430's, when cameos and intaglios were finding their way, in considerable numbers, into private collections. Leonardo Bruni, it is true, in a letter to Niccolò from Rome, probably as early as 1407, mentions that a Roman had promised him a cameo or intaglio with a scene of Narcissus, which he had found at Ostia. But it was really only in the third and fourth decades of the century that private antique cabinets containing small bronzes, cameos, intaglios, coins etc., such as those of Niccolò himself, Cosimo de' Medici, Stefano Porcari, Ciriaco d'Ancona, and, a little later, Pietro Barbo, began to flourish, particularly in Rome and Florence. The rapidity with which they were built up strongly suggests that they were furnished from newly excavated material, not just on miscellaneous heirlooms. During the same period artists, too, such as Ghiberti and Donatello, managed to amass small private collections of antiques, and, according to Vasari, it was actually the latter who inspired in Cosimo de' Medici 'la volontà dell'introdurre a Fiorenza le antichità che sono et erano in casa Medici, le quali tutte di sua mano accòncìò.'

65. Baron 1928, 105ff, with the date March 1407; cf. Krautheimer 1956, 302 and note 42.
67. Muntz 1888, 5; Krautheimer 1956, 300; Weiss 1969, 188.
68. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 115-118; Weiss 1969, 186.
69. Ibid., 185.
70. Muntz 1878-82, II, 129ff; Weiss 1958B, 24-29, 83ff; Weiss 1969, 186-188.
71. Schlosser 1903; Krautheimer 1956, 305 and note 51.
Even if the stylistic arguments for assuming that Brunelleschi and Donatello cannot have made any prolonged study of the ancient monuments of Rome during the first two decades of the Quattrocento are discounted as inconclusive, there are wider grounds for suspecting the chronology given by Manetti and Vasari. Such a study during this period is difficult to reconcile with the anarchic internal conditions pertaining in Rome from the pontificate of Boniface IX up to the return of Pope Martin V in 1420. Moreover, it is precisely in the period after 1420 that we have any independent corroborating evidence of a conclusive nature of Florentine artists engaged in the study of the antiquities of Rome.

2. Artists in Rome: aspects of incipient Antikenstudium

A number of drawings formerly attributed to Pisanello but now, perhaps more convincingly, given by Degenhart and Schmitt to Gentile da Fabriano\(^\text{73}\) include copies demonstrably made from sarcophagus reliefs visible at the time in Rome.\(^\text{74}\) Gentile, as we have seen, began work on


\(^{74}\) *Ibid.* The number of sarcophagi presumed to have been visible in Rome during the early Quattrocento is steadily growing, as more antique sources are detected. A detailed catalogue of them is a desideratum; a useful, but by no means complete, and unpublished, contribution has been made by Ragusa 1951 (cf. Krautheimer 1956, 337), and I have deposited at the Warburg Institute a card-file, for the most part extracted from the Census of Antique Works of Art known to Renaissance Artists, which attempts to index all antique sculpture, including sarcophagi, visible in Rome by 1447.
the Lateran frescoes in late January 1427. Before 14 October of the same year he had died. It was during this brief Roman period that Gentile evidently toured the city making in situ drawings of Roman reliefs, compiling, presumably, in the International Gothic manner, a pattern-book, with suitable antique motifs for later adaptation in his paintings. The drawings are now dispersed, and, of course, Gentile died before he could make use of them.

The putative Gentile da Fabriano drawings, as Degenhart and Schmitt have shown, contain unambiguous copies from at least the following sarcophagi in Rome: the Mars and Rhea sarcophagus in the Palazzo Mattei since 1613, and probably displayed in S. Giovanni Laterano in the Quattrocento; the Crestes sarcophagus in the Palazzo Giustiniani, mentioned in 1550 as standing in front of the church of S. Stefano del Cacco; a lost Marsyas sarcophagus, up for sale in Rome in 1904, and probably of Roman provenance; the Medea sarcophagus now in Ancona, but visible up till c. 1550 in the forecourt of SS. Cosma e Damiano; the Bacchic sarcophagus removed by Sixtus V from S. Maria

75. See supra, chap. III, note 163.
76. Degenhart and Schmitt 1960, 62.
79. Paris, Louvre Inv. 2397 recto: Degenhart and Schmitt 1968, I, l. 130, 242, Taf. 175b, Abb. 341; cf. ibid. 1960, 99, on the possible derivation of the kneeling Isaac in Brunelleschi's Competition Relief from the same source.
Maggiore, later acquired by Thomas Jenkins, and in 1784 by the British Museum; one two other Bacchic sarcophagi again of unknown but presumably Roman provenance, one walled into the courtyard of the Belvedere under Pius VI, the other formerly in the possession of the Roman art-dealer Tavucci and now in the Italian Gardens at Hever Castle.

Here, then, we have evidence for a group of antiquities in Rome unattested in the medieval, or even the Quattrocento, topographical literature, consisting, in the main, of Roman imperial sarcophagus reliefs, with several other miscellaneous reliefs included. It was a


84. Among the miscellaneous Roman reliefs visible in Rome during the first half of the 15th century may be mentioned: those attached to, or associated with, triumphal arches, including the Apotheosis of Sabina and Adlocutio of Hadrian reliefs from the demolished Arco di Portogallo, now in the Palazzo dei Conservatori (Jones 1926, I, 37, 266, II, pl. 105), and the three reliefs from the lost arch of Marcus Aurelius, also in the Conservatori (Jones 1926, I, 22-29, II, pl. 12), displayed in S. Martina until 1515 (cf. Flavio Biondo, R.I., III. 55; Flaminio Vacca, Cap. 68); the Eagle relief displayed in the vestibule of SS. Apostoli (Reinach, Reliefs, III, 319, 2), of which there exists a drawing attributed to Benozzo Gozzoli: Stockholm, Nationalmuseum Inv. 88 (Degenhart and Schmitt 1968, I, 2. 411, 467, Taf. 319a); the Polyphemus and Odysseus group relief in the Louvre (Reinach, Statuaire, I, 112), of which there exists a mid-Quattrocento drawing also in the Louvre (no. 38) (Degenhart and Schmitt 1950, 209, fig. 7 and 18), and the Minerva frieze from the Forum of Nerva, from which Ghiberti evidently derived a figure in the Noah panel of the Gates of Paradise (see infra, note 100).
group which was to have rather profound repercussions on the
development of painting and sculpture particularly in Florence during
the first half of the Quattrocento. When exactly such sarcophagi
were discovered, and displayed inside or outside the churches of Rome,
can only be surmised. They need not have been excavated only after
1420. Indeed, their association with Roman churches is consonant with
what is known of the re-employment of Roman sarcophagi during the
central Middle Ages. 85

Nor was Gentile da Fabriano the only artist in Rome assumed
to have made a close study of sarcophagus reliefs. His associate and
follower, Pisanello, who was at work on the Lateran frescoes by 18 April
1431, 86 and, as Degenhart suggests, may have come to Rome from Florence
either in Gentile's company or at much the same time, 87 also evidently
made a close study of Roman antiquities. He remained in Rome until
July 1432, when Eugenius IV issued him with a safe-conduct to leave the
city. 88 Since the corpus of Pisanello drawings is in the process of
being redefined and republished by Degenhart and Schmitt, 89 comment may
here be confined to noting that Pisanello's all'antica repertoire
extended from drawings made from sarcophagus reliefs (including those
studied by Gentile) to free-standing statues: drawings of one of the
Dioscuri, and of one of the River-Gods, both then displayed on the

86. See supra, chap. III. 3 and note 166.
87. Degenhart and Schmitt 1960, 71.
88. See supra, chap. III, note 166. On Pisanello's Roman period, see
Hill 1905, 48-56.
89. Corpus der Italienischen Zeichnungen 1300-1450, of which Part I,
dealing with Central Italy, appeared in 1968.
Quirinal, have been attributed to him.\textsuperscript{90} (A now lost drawing by Gentile da Fabriano previously in Rotterdam, incidentally, includes a type of Venus pudica, but the provenance of the source is open to question; this is the only presumed instance of Gentile copying an antique free-standing statue.)\textsuperscript{91}

Pisanello's interest in antiquity was not restricted to statuary. It extended to classical coinage, which he collected, and which, to some extent, inspired his later revival of medals, though, as Weiss has argued, the main inspiration came rather from the late medieval pseudo-antique medallions of Constantine and Heraclius.\textsuperscript{92} On Pisanello's death in 1455, his collection of antique coins was purchased by Carlo de' Medici, but subsequently found its way into the important collection of Cardinal Pietro Barbo, later Paul II.\textsuperscript{93}

To the antiquarian activities of Gentile da Fabriano and Pisanello in Rome we may relate those of Lorenzo Ghiberti (who seems to have shared Pisanello's interest in antique coins; according to Vasari,


\textsuperscript{93} Weiss 1956B, 27-28; Weiss 1969, 171.
he even delighted in counterfeiting them). Ghiberti seems on
stylistic grounds, to have been in Rome once prior to 1416, but, as
suggested above, his main visit was almost certainly during the period
1425-30. It was then that he saw the newly excavated statue of an
hermaphrodite. Ghiberti was drawn to Rome both to study
antiquities, and, it may be presumed, in the hope of obtaining further
commissions from Martin V, who, as Ghiberti recalls in his
autobiography, when in Florence, had commissioned of him a golden
mitre and the already-mentioned morse for a cope. This was during
the period February 1419 - September 1420.

Ghiberti not only witnessed the antiquities of Rome. It is
highly probable that, in the manner of Gentile da Fabriano and Pisanello,
he too made in situ drawings from Roman sarcophagus reliefs, compiling
a corpus of all'antica motifs for later adaptation to his own relief-art.
Such putative drawings have not survived, but how else can be explained
the close reminiscences of the antiquities of Rome which occur, fairly
profusely, throughout the reliefs of the Gates of Paradise (begun
c. 1427; all the reliefs cast by 1437)? As in the case of Gentile,
these reminiscences are overwhelmingly of sarcophagus reliefs. In
many instances the models can, with a fair degree of certainty, be

25. Krautheimer 1956, 6, 321, suggesting that the most likely time for
this visit to have taken place was in the summer or early autumn
of 1429.
commissions from Ghiberti.
28. See supra, chap. III. 3.
The great majority of them are known, or are presumed.

100. In the course of his invaluable Handlist of Antiques, Krautheimer 1956, 337-352, has succeeded in isolating a number of motifs in Ghiberti's Gates of Paradise which derive from sarcophagus and other reliefs displayed in Rome: GENESIS - Creation of Adam, possibly influenced by the Adonis sarcophagus in the Palazzo Rospigliosi (Krautheimer 1956, 343, no. 24, pl. 83a and fig. 122); Creation of Eve, derived in reverse from the floating nereid on a Marine sarcophagus now in the Vatican, Giardino della Pigna, which was at S. Maria in Aracoeli at least by the early 16th century (ibid., 344, no. 25, pl. 83b and fig. 124; cf. Ameling, I, 828, pl. 92, no. 34); Expulsion of Adam, derived in reverse from the satyr on the Bacchic sarcophagus from S. Maria Maggiore now in the British Museum (Krautheimer 1956, 344, no. 26, pl. 84, figs. 125-127); Expulsion of Eve, possibly influenced by a dancing maenad on the same sarcophagus (ibid., 344, no. 27, pl. 84 and fig. 125); CAIN AND ABEL - Abel slain, derived in reverse from the collapsing Dacian in the foreground of one of the Trajanic battle reliefs inside the Arch of Constantine (ibid., 345, no. 28, pl. 86a and fig. 131); NOAH - Noah's sacrifice, Woman seen from the back, derived from a figure in the Minerva frieze, Forum of Nerva (ibid., 346, no. 34, pl. 92 and fig. 129); Noah's son, derived from a sarcophagus illustrating the private life of a Roman official, Los Angeles County Museum, in the early 16th century in the atrium of St. Peter's (ibid., 346, no. 35, pl. 92 and figs. 132-133; cf. Feinblatt 1952, figs. 1, 9, 11); ISAAC - Visitors Group, Woman to the right, freely derived in reverse from the moira on the Los Angeles sarcophagus (Krautheimer 1956, 347, no. 40, pl. 97a and figs. 132-133); JOSEPH - Discovery of the Cup, Mourning brother, freely derived from a lost Meleager sarcophagus evidently known in the early 15th century (ibid., 347, no. 42, pl. 98 and fig. 136; cf. C. Robert, III, 2, no. 286); MOSES - Passage through the Red Sea, dancing maiden, derived from the figure of Venus, Adonis sarcophagus, Palazzo Rospigliosi (Krautheimer 1956, 348, no. 44, pl. 103 and fig. 123); Man hiding face, right foreground, derived from the figure of a mourner walking behind Meleager's body, Meleager sarcophagus, Rome, Villa Doria Panfili (ibid., 348, no. 46, pl. 104b and fig. 111; cf. C. Robert, III, 2, no. 283); JOSHUA - Horses of quadriga, possibly derived from the quadriga, Pelops sarcophagus, Brussels Museum (Krautheimer 1956, 348, no. 47, pl. 109 and fig. 103; cf. Robert, III, 3, no. 329); Man carrying rock on shoulders, copied from the servant, Meleager sarcophagus, Rome, Villa Doria Panfili (Krautheimer 1956, 349, no. 50, pl. 108b and fig. 111); DAVID - Warrior seen from the back, possibly derived from the Barbarian Battle sarcophagus, Rome, Villa Borghese, formerly in the atrium of St. Peter's (ibid., 349, no. 52, pl. 114a and fig. 113; cf. ibid., 341-342, nos. 13-15); FRAME - Samson, mainly derived from a bronze statuette of Zeus, but also recalling, in pose, the drunken Dionysos on the Bacchic sarcophagus in the Vatican (ibid., 349, no. 53, pl. 127b and figs. 143-144; cf. Ameling, II, 313, no. 102, pl. 24); Prophetess, possibly derived from a Bacchic sarcophagus, now lost (?), formerly Rome, Palazzo Gentili

Continued
to have been displayed in Rome. Other of Ghiberti's motifs derive from sarcophagi visible in Tuscany and elsewhere. Many of his antique motifs are free variants rather than straight copies, or represent fusions of, or transmutations from, more than one classical source. Others cannot be traced back with confidence to a single source, since they derive from sarcophagus types mass-produced in antiquity. Others yet again can be regarded as mere *invenzioni all'antica*. These and further possibilities have been brilliantly discussed by Krautheimer. In other respects, the antique influences in Ghiberti's mature art are at once more covert and more all-embracing. The overall figural compositions of the Gates of Paradise, 'rich with very many figures' as Ghiberti boasted in his autobiography, and so radically different

(Krautheimer 1956, 349-350, no. 54, pl. 125a and fig. 140); Miriam, derived from a maenad with tambourin on a Bacchic sarcophagus, possibly the specimen now lost, fragments of which are preserved in Rome, Villa Aldobrandini (ibid., 350, no. 57, pl. 129a and fig. 145; cf. Matz-Duhn, II, no. 2265); Noah, possibly derived in part from a river-god such as the *Marforia*, now Rome, Capitoline Museum, formerly near S. Martina (Krautheimer 1956, 341, no. 60, pl. 122b; cf. Jones, Cat. Capitoline, 21, no. 1, pl. 1; Helbig, II, 1193); Noah's wife, derived from a figure of Gaia, possibly that on a partly lost Proserpina sarcophagus, remnants, Paris, Louvre, which in the early 15th century was at SS. Cosma e Damiano (Krautheimer 1956, no. 61, pl. 123b and fig. 142; cf. Robert, III, 3, no. 359).

102. Ibid., 14. The claim also calls to mind the 'copiousness' extolled by Alberti as the first prerequisite of *istoria* in Book II of the *Della Pittura*: 'Quello che prima dà voluptà nella istoria viene dalla copia et varietà delle cose; come ne' cibi et nella musica sempre la novità et abondantia tanto piace quanto sia differente dalle cose antique et consuete, così l'animo si dileta d'ogni copia et varietà piace. Dirò io quella istoria essere copiosissima in quale, a suo luoghi, sieno permisti vecchi, giovani, fanciulli, donne, fanciulle, fanciullini, polli, catellini, ucciellini, cavalli, pechore, hedifici, province et tutte simili cose. Et loderò io qualunque copia quale s'apartenga a quella istoria...' (pp. 91-92).
from the congested scenes of the North Doors of the Florentine
Baptistery, are inconceivable without recourse to the liberating
influence of Roman relief-art. Of course, antique influences in
Ghiberti can be traced back as far as the competition relief of 1401,
with the figure of Isaac derived from an antique torso,\textsuperscript{103} and they
become relatively profuse during the late phase of his work on the
North Doors (c. 1415-1420).\textsuperscript{104} But it is only in the 1430's that the
art of antiquity becomes the dominating force. It is only then,
moreover, that specifically Roman prototypes, rather than sources
which Ghiberti could have drawn upon in Tuscany and elsewhere, begin to
predominate in his classicizing repertoire. Of these prototypes by
far the most numerous are antique sarcophagus reliefs visible in Rome.
Ghiberti's study of them was evidently comprehensive: Adonis, Bacchic,
Battle, Marine, Meleager sarcophagi — he covered them all. 'In fact,'
writes Krautheimer, 'there is scarcely a group of Roman sarcophagi known
to us today with which he was not familiar. His portfolios must have
overflowed with drawings of these works...'\textsuperscript{105}

Krautheimer also speculates on the possibility of Ghiberti
having engaged on this study in association with Pisanello.\textsuperscript{106}
Certainly, the antiquarian activities of Gentile da Fabriano, Pisanello,
and Ghiberti, as we are able to reconstruct them, centering as they did
round Roman sarcophagi, and dating, we may conclude, to the later stages
of Martin V's pontificate, are notably homogeneous. It is, perhaps,
useful to distinguish in them, divergent though the aims and styles of

\textsuperscript{103} Krautheimer 1956, 279, 339, no. 1, pls. 2b, 26a and fig. 102.
\textsuperscript{104} Ibid., 283-284, 339-342, nos. 3-20.
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid., 287-288.
\textsuperscript{106} Ibid., 288.
Gentile and Ghiberti were, paradoxically, of International Gothic. For it was in the very nature of this style to evolve, and, by means of pattern-books, to disseminate, a shared vocabulary of pictorial expression, and, for such purposes, it can be appreciated how the quasi-stereotyped forms of Roman relief could appeal. Moreover, Roman sarcophagus reliefs, previously enthused over, we recall, by Dondi's sculptor-friend, and praised in equally enthusiastic terms by Chrysoloras, represented, in the absence of classical paintings, the most accessible models for antique istoria. They offered, to the artists of the early Quattrocento, a new vocabulary of emotionally-charged gesture and deportment, which could be translated, seemingly without dislocation, since it expressed the primary human emotions in an archetypal manner, from the language of Greek mythology to that of the Bible: thus, Eve emerges in the voluptuous form of a floating nereid; the Entombment echoes with the wild lamentation for Meleager.

107. See supra, chap. II. 2 (b); Panofsky 1965, 208-209 and note 1.
109. The concept of the istoria, based, partly at least, it would seem, on Roman sarcophagus reliefs, is formulated by Alberti in Book II of the Della Pittura. See supra, note 102, and infra, chap. IV. 4.
111. Krautheimer 1956, 344, no. 25, pl. 83b and fig. 124.
The activities of Gentile da Fabriano, Pisanello, and Ghiberti in Rome prompt the question whether other artists were engaged in similar *Antikenstudium* at the same time. Much, indeed, has been written about Masaccio in this respect.\(^{113}\) Yet, on the whole, his direct borrowings from the antique are, in Panofsky's phrase, 'either doubtful or insignificant'.\(^{114}\) There may be reminiscences of a *Venus pudica* in the Brancacci Expulsion of Eve, but these are more likely to derive from a Trecento source than direct from the antique.\(^{115}\) Similarly, the strigilated sarcophagus depicted as the base of the throne in the London *Madonna* of 1426 is so anomalously rendered as to make its derivation straight from the antique improbable; in any case, the type is too ubiquitous for Masaccio's usage to be considered, from our point of view, significant.\(^{116}\) It has been proposed that the naked Christchild eating grapes in the same panel was inspired by a putto eating grapes in a late antique sarcophagus, of which there exists a drawing by Pisanello.\(^{117}\) Perhaps more convincing is the suggestion that the Christchild in the Uffizi *Madonna with St. Anne* derives from a Hellenistic sculpture of a naked boy holding the neck of a goose, of which there exists a Roman copy in the Uffizi.\(^{118}\)

None of these influences presupposes a specifically Roman

\(^{113}\) Contributions to the problem of Masaccio's influence by the antique include: Mesnil 1926; Offner 1959; Fremantle 1969; Polzer 1971.

\(^{114}\) Panofsky 1965, 167.

\(^{115}\) Ibid., 167, note 2.

\(^{116}\) Ibid., 168.

\(^{117}\) Berti 1967, 44, 63, note 163 and fig. 12; Polzer 1971, 36, note 5. On Pisanello's drawing in the Musée Bonnat in Bayonne (no. 1212), see further Degenhart and Schmitt 1960, 114-115 and fig. 91.

\(^{118}\) Panofsky 1965, 167, note 2; Fremantle 1969, 40-41.
source, and the one or two Etruscan models that have been postulated for Masaccio\textsuperscript{119} would tend to reinforce the view that he came under the influence of the antique in a Tuscan milieu. Yet that Masaccio had been in Rome was attested by both Manetti and Vasari,\textsuperscript{120} and it is now generally accepted that he died there. Unfortunately, the facts to support such a visit to Rome at the end of his life are as threadbare as the rest of Masaccio's biography.\textsuperscript{121} On 27 July 1427 he personally deposited his \textit{portata al catasto} in Florence.\textsuperscript{122} Later, under the date of 18 November 1429, his name was cancelled from the \textit{campione} of this \textit{portata}, with the marginal note 'dicesi è morto a Roma...'.\textsuperscript{123} On the basis of this cancellation, and the later testimony of his younger brother that Tommaso died at the age of twenty-seven,\textsuperscript{124} most authorities are inclined to put his death in 1428 in Rome, but, as Krautheimer has pointed out, there is nothing to preclude Masaccio having died there as late as November 1429.\textsuperscript{125}

Still more problematical is the question of any earlier visit Masaccio may have made to Rome, possibly in connection with the S. Maria Maggiore altarpiece.\textsuperscript{126} The claim that he was in Rome in 1425 has been strongly denied by Procacci.\textsuperscript{127} But Vasari, it may be recalled, affirms that it was from Rome, where he had gone 'per imparare e superar
gli altri', that Masaccio was recalled to take Masolino's place in the Brancacci Chapel. This traditional view has received some support from Longhi and Clark. It has recently received added confirmation from the suggestion that Masaccio's Tribute Money was, in its composition, influenced by a now lost fresco of St. Paul preaching to the Hebrews in Jerusalem formerly in S. Paolo fuori le Mura (destroyed in the fire which gutted the nave of the basilica in 1823).

Masolino, too, according to Vasari, went to Rome with the primary intention of studying antiquities, and while there executed some frescoes in the Orsini residence on Monte Giordano: 'Et andatosene a Roma per studiare, mentre che vi dimorò fece la sala di casa Orsina vecchia in Monte Giordano.' It was only on his return to Florence, says Vasari, that he was commissioned to paint the Brancacci Chapel. Such an early visit to Rome has been supported, on stylistic grounds, by both Longhi and Krautheimer, associated by both with the inception of the S. Maria Maggiore altarpiece. Yet Masolino's main Roman period was undoubtedly during the years 1428-31, when he was engaged on the S. Clemente frescoes.

129. Ibid.
130. Clark 1951, 344; Longhi 1952, 8ff; cf. Krautheimer 1956, 320; Hartt 1959, 163. For a fuller discussion of the arguments in favour of such an earlier visit by Masaccio to Rome, see infra, Appendix B.
133. Ibid.
135. See infra, Appendix B.
136. Masolino's activities in Rome are the subject of a recent monograph by Vayer 1962b, which I have not been able to obtain for consultation. See also Golzio and Zander 1968, 207-214.
pupil of Ghiberti,\textsuperscript{137} may well have shared his master's interest in Roman reliefs, though antique motifs in his post-Roman period are admittedly hard to identify. One instance is afforded by the figure of a catechumen removing his shirt, seen from the rear, in Masolino's Castiglione d'Olona frescoes, probably deriving from a figure in a Roman sarcophagus relief.\textsuperscript{138}

Masolino's frescoes in the Baptistery of Castiglione were commissioned by the same Cardinal Branda, for whom he had already decorated the chapel in S. Clemente, and who was one of the most conspicuous patrons among the distinguished cardinalate of Pope Martin V.\textsuperscript{139} Into his distant hometown of Castiglione d'Olona Branda imported the post-Schism culture of Rome, as it had developed under the aegis of Martin V,\textsuperscript{140} and left, among the Baptistery frescoes executed for him by Masolino, a tribute to this inspiration in the form of a panorama symbolically of Jerusalem but actually of Rome.\textsuperscript{141} It may be dated to 1435.\textsuperscript{142} This is more in the nature of an enlarged (100 x 120 cm.) \textit{veduta} than a circular \textit{stadtplan}, in the manner, for instance, of the Taddeo di Bartolo fresco of 1414 at Siena,\textsuperscript{143} the only other

\textsuperscript{138} Kennedy 1964, 38.
\textsuperscript{139} On Cardinal Branda, see the short \textit{Vita} in Vespasiano, \textit{Vite di Uomini Illustri}, 70-72; Guiraud 1909, 106-110.
\textsuperscript{140} Cardinal Branda's buildings at Castiglione d'Olona are lauded by Francisco Pizolpasso, Bishop of Pavia, in a letter dating to January 1432, published by Paredi 1961, 181-192; discussed as an example of encomiastic civic description by Onians 1968, 225-226.
\textsuperscript{141} On Masolino's frescoes at Castiglione d'Olona, see Barili 1938; Tossca 1946. On the panorama of Rome: Frutaz 1962, LXX, I, 128-129, II, tav. 152; see also Vitzthum 1926; Hermanin 1927; Salmi 1927-28, 234; Amadei 1932, 18-19; Scarafoni 1939, 69, n. 117; Micheletti 1959, 42-43, tav. 62.
\textsuperscript{142} Frutaz 1962, I, 128.
\textsuperscript{143} \textit{Ibid.}, LXXVII, I, 125-126, II, tav. 149.
frescoed view of Rome dating to the first half of the Quattrocento. The panorama is emphatically not a tribute to ancient Rome, but to the Renaissance city Masolino, under Cardinal Branda's patronage, had lived and worked in; it even includes, in a prominent position, to the right of the column of Marcus Aurelius, a fortress-like building to be identified with the medieval Palazzo Orsini on Monte Giordano, in which, claims Vasari, Masolino painted frescoes. A further architectural complex, close to the Column of Trajan, has been identified by Frutaz with the Palazzo Colonna, the residence of Martin V from 1424, but this is more doubtful, and the detail too indistinct to give any indication of its aspect. Behind may be made out five white columns joined by an architrave, a reference, in this context, presumably to the then extensive ruins, at the back of SS. Apostoli, of Caracalla's Temple of Serapis. Other ancient monuments included in the panorama are the two triumphal columns, part of the Aurelian Walls, and, in the background, a stretch of the Aqua Claudia. Behind it is a large imposing basilica, presumably S. Giovanni Laterano, to the right of

144. For miniatures depicting Rome during the first half of the Quattrocento, ibid., LXXVI-LXXXIII, I, 123-133, II, tav. 148-154.
145. Ibid., II, tav. 152.
147. Frutaz 1962, I, 129.
148. Nash, II, 376-383. It was below the ruins of this temple that Prospero Colonna erected the polychrome ornamental stairway praised by Flavio Biondo: R.I., I. 100; cf. CTR, IV, 283, note 3; Lanciani 1902-12, I, 51; Gregorovius, VII, 589, 787.
149. The location of this basilica in Masolino's panorama behind the Aqua Claudia seems to preclude the possibility that it represents S. Clemente, Branda's titular basilica in Rome.
which, towards the top of the fresco, is the Capitoline Hill, with the
Aracoeli and the prominent Palace of the Senators (as rebuilt by
Boniface IX), distinguished by its tower and open loggia.\textsuperscript{150}

Though Masolino's panorama undoubtedly incorporates some
personal observations of contemporary Rome, the detail is sufficiently
inaccurate, and the topography sufficiently haphazard, to make it
unlikely that Masolino based it on in situ drawings of an actual
townscape as seen from the Castel S. Angelo. The Pantheon, for
instance, is aligned back-to-front, and its pronaos is depicted as
quadra style instead of octa style.\textsuperscript{151} The Aurelian Walls, noticeably
mis-aligned, are furnished at regular intervals with the peculiarly
medieval pointed turrets also characteristic of circular plans of Rome
during the first half of the Quattrocento.\textsuperscript{152} These and other
anomalies prompt the hypothesis that Masolino based his panorama on an
existing plan of Rome, adapting it to give the spurious impression of a
consistent perspective. There are, indeed, close similarities between
Masolino's fresco and Leonardo da Besozzo's miniature of Rome in the
Crespi Collection.\textsuperscript{153} According to Toesca, the latter derives from a
lost Florentine original.\textsuperscript{154} Vitzthum, however, the first to recognise
Masolino's townscape as a view of Rome, was inclined to look to the North,

\textsuperscript{150} On the aspect of the Palazzo Senatorio at this time: Pietrangeli
1960; cf. Golzio and Zander 1968, tav. XXIII.

\textsuperscript{151} The anomaly is not restricted to Masolino: Taddeo di Bartolo
equipped the pronaos of the Pantheon with only three columns; cf.
Frutaz 1962, II, tav. 149. The miniatures of Pietro del Massaio
and the plan of Alessandro Strozzi also show the Pantheon as
404.

\textsuperscript{152} Ibid., 404; cf. Frutaz 1962, II, tav. 148-150.

\textsuperscript{153} Vitzthum 1926, 403-404; cf. Frutaz 1962, LXXXII, I, 131-132, II,
tav. 154.

\textsuperscript{154} Toesca 1912, 489.
suggesting that the type of Hausermeer depicted in the Castiglione fresco was influenced by Netherlandish painting, which Masolino may well have come under the influence of in Lombardy, as a parallel, he points to the densely packed housing in the townscape of Jan van Eyck's Ca d'Oro Crucifixion. Certainly, there existed a lively tradition of topographical townscape in both Netherlandish panel painting (e.g. the Rollin Madonna) and miniatures (e.g. the Très riches Heures du Duc de Berry). But there is also evidence of an autocthonous tradition of topographical townscape in Trecento Florence, which no doubt Masolino was familiar with. Whatever his exact source, it is striking to observe that the origins of the Roman veduta, in the work of Masolino, Leonardo da Besozzo, and (later) of Benozzo Gozzoli, like the origins of sarcophagus-relief study in Rome, have a notably International Gothic pedigree.

155. Vitzthum 1926, 405-408.
156. Cf. Ibid., Abb. 4.
157. The miniatures of the Très riches Heures depict not only the Duc de Berry's chateaux, but also a circular plan of Rome: Frutaz 1962, LXXVI, I, 123-124, II, tav. 148.
158. On the panorama of Florence in a fresco of 1342 in the Loggia del Bigallo, see Gadol 1969, 162 and fig. 49; Brucker 1969, 7 and fig. 16. Besides, the Trecento painter, Ambrogio Benincasa, is reported to have painted a view of Florence, which a contemporary describes as showing 'tutta la città di Firenze, cioè tutte le mure e la loro misura, tutte le porte e loro nomi, tutte le vie e piazze e loro nomi, tutte le case...': Gadol 1969, 164, note 29. On the townscape of Siena in 1340 incorporated in Ambrogio Lorenzetti's Allegory of Good Government, and the same artist's panel representing a city by the sea thought to be Telamone in Tuscany (Siena, Pinacoteca), see Links 1972, 13-18.
159. Gozzoli's veduta of Rome is included as a backdrop to the scene of St. Augustine's departure from Rome for Milan in the frescoes in the choir of S. Agostino at S. Geminiano (1465), and is the only other panorama of the city of the period comparable to Masolino's: Frutaz 1962, LXXVI, I, 136-137, II, tav. 156. For further comparanda one must look forward to Attavante's superb panorama of Rome (1483) as seen from Monte Mario included in the background to a miniature of the Crucifixion now in the Museum of Le Havre, undoubtedly the most accurate veduta of Rome to be produced in the course of the 15th century: Frutaz 1962, XCIII, I, 146-147, II, tav. 163.
The conclusions reached above on the beginnings of artistic Antikenstudium in Rome may now briefly be summarised. The Manetti-Vasari tradition that Brunelleschi and Donatello spent any prolonged time investigating the antiquities of Rome during the first decade of the Quattrocento has been found, on chronological, stylistic, and historical grounds, unacceptable. Such an investigation is more likely to have taken place during the period 1430-1433. This is consistent with what is known, and with what may be reasonably inferred, about other artists working in Rome at much the same time. Gentile da Fabriano was at work on the Lateran frescoes in 1427. Pisanello is known to have worked in Rome between 1431 and 1432. Ghiberti is likely to have visited Rome in c. 1429. Masaccio died in Rome between 1428 and 1429, but possibly visited the city earlier in the decade. Masolino was at work in Rome from 1428 to 1431. These visits of Florentine artists to Rome, prompted both by Martin V's restauratio and the quickening interest in Roman antiquities, fall into the period of relative political stability in Rome between the return of Martin V in September 1420 and the flight of Eugenius IV from the city in June 1434. It is a period also marked by the efflorescence of humanistic archaeology in Rome.

3. Humanists in Rome: the development of curial antiquarianism

The community of artists working in Rome in the period 1420–31 was maintained by the patronage of Pope Martin V and that of his
Cardinals. The study of the antiquities of Rome which they undertook was consequently a direct outcome of Martin's return to Rome and part of the *restauratio* he initiated. The same applies (mutatis mutandis) to the community of humanists employed in Martin's Curia.

Martin V's own contribution to the humanistic recovery of Rome has generally, and perhaps unjustly, been dismissed as negligible. It was Voigt's conclusion that the Pope had little taste for science and letters.\(^{160}\) What is known of his personal literary tastes tends to bear this judgement out. He was evidently fond of encyclopaedias. Marc Dykmans has recently published, from François de Conzié's accounts,\(^ {161}\) a bill dated 1 October 1418 for 8 florins for the purchase of a horse, which was specifically commissioned to remove a small selection of suitable *thesauri* from the mainly abandoned, and dispersed, papal library at Avignon: \(^ {162}\)

> 'Item, eodem anno 1418, et die prima mensis octobris tradidi mandato domini mei, Hugoni Bondii ..., pro empcione unius equi, empti pro portando libros captos in thesauraria palacii apostolici Avenionensis, pro domino nostro papa, per Johannem Silet, alias Sanctificetur, videlicet unum Speculum vstoriale de iiiii\(^ {2}\) voluminibus, Catholicum, et Inventarium omnium bonorum palacii apostolici Avenionensis ...

\(^ {160}\) Voigt 1893, II, 24.

\(^ {161}\) François de Conzié, Archbishop of Narbonne, became Papal Camerarius under John XXIII and retained the post until his death in 1431, but he did not follow Martin V back to Rome: Hofmann 1914, II, 87.

\(^ {162}\) By the end of the 14th century the papal library at Avignon contained some 2000 codices. Roughly half of them were removed by Petrus de Luna, the antipope Benedict XIII, and taken to Peñiscola: Galindo Romeo 1929, 83-188; Felzer 1947, 179-180. An inventory dating to 1411 lists what remained behind at Avignon. This inventory (Bibl. Vaticana, Arch. San Pietro A 76) has now been published by Maier 1963; it lists 882 *libri*. During the course of the ensuing two centuries these holdings were further eroded, and by 1594, when another inventory of the Avignon library was prepared, only 329 codices were left: Maier 1952.
The Speculum historiale of Vincent of Beauvais and the Catholicon of Jean Balbi mentioned in this account, as well as the Avignon inventory, were evidently dispatched. And on the basis of a horseload of encyclopaedias, Dykmans has generously supposed that Martin V was "le fondateur, en somme, de l'actuelle Bibliothèque du Vatican." To be just, Martin went somewhat further. As he had done for the papal archives, he provided shelving, and other furnishings, for his collection of encyclopaedias in the Vatican Palace. Other documents dating to 1421 and 1428 refer to additional books in the library, and by the close of his pontificate there may, at a guess, have been upwards of a hundred items in the collection, including the copy of Martianus Capella in Dresden noted by Mintz and Fabre. But even by November 1443, when the first

164. Mintz and Fabre 1887, 3; Maier 1963, 104; Dykmans 1968, 253.
165. Ibid., 258.
166. Mintz and Fabre 1887, 4: 13 Nov. 1420. "Richal'do de Aquisgrani in regis'to bullarum scrip'torii pecuniarum summas in'scriptas ... pro rebus et operibus inscriptis, vidi'licet: in primis pro parvis tabulis et lignis positis ad solarium regestri supplicationum bol. 53, monete currentis Romane ... Item quos dedit magistro Johanno magistro lignaminum pro lignis dicte thesaurar's."
   (Ibid., f. 160v).
   (Archivio di Stato, Depositeria de Bart. de' Bardi, 1428-1429, f. 110v).
168. Ibid., 2 and note 2.
inventory was drawn up,\textsuperscript{169} the Vatican Library contained only 340 items, and it was left to Nicholas V, possibly the most distinguished bibliophile of all popes, to boost holdings to the point where they could, in quantity, compete with, and generally exceed, those of the great monastic and secular libraries of the day.\textsuperscript{170}

Nevertheless, Voigt's judgement of Martin's philistinism has rightly been questioned by Jean Guiraud, on the grounds that the Curia at the time employed a number of well-known humanists, whose literary careers, and accomplishments, Voigt himself described.\textsuperscript{171} In Pastor's view, it was not so much philistinism as moral tone that kept Martin aloof from them, and he professes to be shocked that the Pope could admit such a disreputable character as Poggio into his service.\textsuperscript{172} But the facts speak for themselves: Martin, if he was not an adherent of the new learning, was astute and broadminded enough to recognise intellectual talents in others, and to make use of them.

Poggio Bracciolini, the doyen of the curial humanists, and the most conscientious antiquarian among them, had come to Rome as \textit{scriptor} already in 1403, under Boniface IX.\textsuperscript{173} Under John XXIII he was also employed in this office.\textsuperscript{174} But John's eclipse at Constance interrupted his career. For four rather miserable years Poggio tried to make a living for himself in England,\textsuperscript{175} before eventually returning to Rome. On his arrival there in February 1423 he sent a jubilant letter to

\begin{footnotes}
\item[169] Ibid., 9-33.
\item[170] Ibid., 34-114.
\item[172] Pastor 1899, I, 256-258.
\item[173] Voigt 1893, II, 7-8.
\item[174] Ibid.
\end{footnotes}
Niccoli, and in May of the same year could report to him, in a further letter, that he had already been appointed Apostolic Secretary, perhaps, as Tommaso da Rieto claimed, through the recommendation of Cosimo de' Medici. His reputation as a scribe no doubt also helped.

Poggio's curial responsibilities were evidently not too onerous. They left him time to indulge in his favourite study, the study of antiquities. Poggio, we recall, had already begun collecting inscriptions in Rome during the first decade of the century, and he continued to do so, incorporating them in one of the earliest epigraphic syllogai of the Renaissance. In his pursuit of epigraphy Poggio was not content to remain within the walls of Rome. He made several antiquarian excursions into the Campagna, seeking out Roman ruins and transcribing the inscriptions associated with them. He sent joyful reports of these trips to Niccoli. In the summer of 1424 he went with the Pope and the Curia on an excursion to Tivoli, from where he made a trip to Rieti, transcribing a long inscription 'prope Titur in sepulcro iuxta pontem Lucanum'. During the summers of 1426 and 1428 he accompanied the Pope to the Colonna fortress at Genazzano, visiting Frascati in the former year, and in August

---

176. Poggio Bracciolini, Epistolae, I (II. 1), 85-86; cf. Voigt 1893, II, 9; Walser 1914, 84.
177. Poggio, Epistolae, I (II. 2), 87-89; cf. Walser 1914, 85.
178. Gabotto 1892, n. 2 and 3; Walser 1914, 85.
181. See supra, chap. III. 2.
182. Ibid., 144-145; Weiss 1969, 147. See supra, chap. III. 2.
183. See infra, chap. VI. 2.
185. Sylloge Poggiana, no. 81, C. I. L., VI, Pars I, XXVIII-XL. See infra, chap. VI. 2.
186. Poggio, Epistolae, I (III. 1), 186; (III. 19), 218; cf. Walser 1914, 88.
187. Walser 1914, 141.
making a two-day excursion to Ferentino and Alatri in the company of Bartolomeo da Montepulciano. At Ferentino Poggio admired the ancient town wall, and the rectangular tower with two surviving antique inscriptions, which he transcribed. A third, lengthy, and dauntingly abbreviated inscription he copied outside the town on the vertiginous cliff-face of Monte della Lata, under the sweltering midday sun, and later told Niccoli of the difficulties encountered:

'Extra urbem prope muros in parte praerupta montis excisum est saxum secus viam, ad quod ascenditur cum difficultate in hanc formam. Intus est epitaphium, quod ad te transmitto quod ut opinor, placebit etiam stomacho nauseant. Sed vide, ut recte intelligas eas abbreviationes, sunt enim multae, et quid tibi de eo videatur responde. Fuit mihi summus labor, legere has litteras, primum illas, quae sunt in terri arcis, cum sint a visu remotae, et magna ex parte consumptae vetustate, deinde eas, quae sunt in saxo illo; pluribus enim horis insudavi, et sudavi quidem in meridie ad solem. Sed tamen labor omnia vincit.'

In one of the more diverting scenes of early archaeology in Rome, Poggio, as he later described it to Niccoli, also attempted in the same years to clear the inscription over the Porta Tiburtina of shrubbery, a labour of love greeted with laughter by the girls who happened to be passing by:

'Pridem aliud epigramma summo cum labore purgato muro excerpsi, quod antea propter hederam et virgutla nunquam potui legere: praeteribant plurimae feminae, nam id est in porta, qua itur Tibur, et quidem forma conspicua, credi.sne me id pro mala fortuna advertisse? Adstabant nonnullae, ridebantque velut inanem meum laborem: ego eas ibidem jocans ridebam.'

Other early Quattrocento reports mention the difficulties of reading inscriptions because they were obscured by foliage.
In the summer and autumn of 1429 Poggio went on a long excursion that took him first, in the company of Cardinal Brandi, to Monte Cassino, where he found, and borrowed, a codex of a hitherto unknown classical source, and one which was to have by no means negligible repercussions on the study of the ancient monuments of Rome, namely the *De Aquiseductibus* of Frontinus. After transcribing the MS., Poggio returned it to Monte Cassino, where it still remains. His subsequent use of it as a source in his *De varietate Fortunae* will be discussed below. At Monte Cassino Poggio also managed to acquire a marble bust of a woman, found, as he tells Niccoli, while the foundations of a house were being dug:

'Expiscatus sum ibi caput marmoreum muliebre cum pectore incorruptum; mihi quidem placet: inventum est autem his diebus, cum eruerentur fundamenta cujusdam domus.'

From Monte Cassino Poggio went on to Anagni and Ferentino, and in the late autumn he was staying at Terranuova. During the following summer, while Martin V escaped the summer heat at Grottaferrata, Poggio went on a fortnight's antiquarian trip through Latium, visiting Tusculum and the Castelli Romani, seeking out Roman ruins. A Roman villa at Grottaferrata itself, the extensive ruins at Tusculum,
the Thermae and Stadium and related antiquities at Albano were all investigated by him at this time. These annual excursions of Poggio effectively inaugurated the archaeological exploration of the Campagna, and his pioneering work was later followed up, amongst others, by Alberti, Biondo, and Pius II. Poggio's contribution to the study of the antiquities of Rome itself is dealt with separately below.

Among his humanistic colleagues in the Curia was Cencio de' Rustici, the student of Francesco da Fiano and of Chrysoloras, Poggio's companion at Constance and his fellow-explorer among the codices of S. Gall. Cencio became Apostolic Secretary to Martin V in November 1417, and remained in the secretariat till 1443, two

---

202. At Albano Poggio investigated the Thermae, the Stadium, and an unspecified wall built of square blocks: Epistolae, I (IV. 13), 326; cf. Walser 1914, 144. In a description of the amphitheatre attributed to Fra Giocondo, reference is made to a previous survey of the amphitheatre made by a 'Poggio lateratissimo'. Walser 1914, 144, note 2, thought (contra Huelsen) this could not have referred to Bracciolini, but his objections (namely, that Poggio does not explicitly mention the amphitheatre in the above letter, and that the name is too common to necessarily refer to him) are hardly convincing. On the amphitheatre at Albano, see also Pius II, Commentaria, 563. On Cardinal Ludovico Trevisan's conservation of the Roman aqueduct and other ancient monuments at Albano, see Flavio Biondo, Opera, Italia Illustrata, 319; cf. Weiss 1969, 108, 113.


204. See, in particular, the letter of 13 Nov. 1444 to Leonello d'Este, Marquis of Ferrara, enthusiastically describing Roman ruins encountered in the Campagna during the course of a hunt organized by Prospero Colonna in honour of Borso d'Este: Nogara 1927, 154-159. In a letter of 12 Sept. 1461 to Gregorio Lolli, Biondo gives a description of some ruins near Tivoli, clearly those of Hadrian's villa: Nogara 1927, 194-202; cf. Weiss 1969, 106.


206. See infra, chap. VI. 2, chap. VII.

207. On Cencio and Fiano, see supra, chap. III. 2 (a).


209. Sabbadini 1905-14, I, 77-78.

years before his death. Though Cencio's activities as a humanist are somewhat obscure, and his literary output slight, he was held in high repute. Erudite in jurisprudence as well as in classical literature, both Latin and Greek, and a stylish Latinist, he had much to recommend him to Martin V, but whether his bitter opposition to the destruction of the antiquities of Rome, and papal responsibility for it, had any effect on the Pope is not recorded.

Also in the secretariat at this time was Antonio Loschi, secretary under Gregory XII, notary and abbreviator under John XXIII, and, like Poggio and Cencio, employed at the Council of Constance. He was appointed Apostolic Secretary to Martin V in December 1418, and remained in this post till his death in 1441. Loschi, a Lombard chancery-humanist well-versed in the political polemics that flourished among the rival states of Italy during the Schism, as well as a competent poet in both Latin and volgare, was used by Martin V in a way which shows that the Pope was not unappreciative of the empirical value of humanistically trained bureaucrats. He sent Loschi on important missions to Milan and Budapest. When he was not employed in such diplomacy or the more humdrum work of the Curia, Loschi liked to indulge in essentially light-hearted disputations with his friends in

211. Ibid. Bertalot 1929-30, 209.
212. Ibid., 210-217.
213. Ibid., 224-225; Baron 1966, 312-313.
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the Curia, disputationes which, as we know from Poggio's De varietate Fortunae, also revolved, on a more serious plane, round the antiquities of Rome. This dialogue will be discussed in a later chapter, but here attention may also be drawn to another dialogue recorded by Poggio, which throws, incidentally, some light on Loschi's vision of a renascent city, against which, as in Biondo's Roma instaurata, his idea of the Rome of antiquity may be judged. In Poggio's De Avaritia of 1428, which purports to record an after-dinner conversation between Andrew of Constantinople, a Dominican official of the Curia, and the three papal secretaries, Loschi, Cencio de' Rustici, and Bartolomeo da Montepulciano, it is Loschi who attempts (in a playful manner) to defend the pursuit of wealth as an honourable activity, and he does so by arguing that it is the necessary precondition of urban civilization. Cities, he contends, could not be maintained by recluses and mendicants. If everyone produced only for his own needs, the virtues of mercy, charity, generosity and liberality would be denied. The magnificence of cities would be removed, the ornaments of cult destroyed, no temples or arcades built, and all the arts would come to an end:

'Tolletur usus gratissimarum virtutum populo, misericordiae videlicet, et charitatis, nullus erit neque beneficus, neque liberalis. Quid enim dabit alteri, cui nihil ad dandum superest? Quomodo munificus esse poterit qui tantum possidet, quantum sibi soli sufficit. Auferetur magnificentia omnis civitatum, tolletur cultus atque ornatus, nulla aedificabuntur templum, nulli porticus, artes omnes cessabunt...'

221. See infra, chap. VII, passim
222. Poggio, Opera (1538), 2-3L
224. Poggio, Opera (1538), 13.
Bartolomeo Aragazzi da Montepulciano, in whose vigna near the Lateran this conversation is alleged to take place, was another of the luminaries drawn into John XXIII's secretariat. He, too, was at S. Gall with Poggio and Cencio in 1416. On Pope John's deposition, he soon managed to attach himself to the entourage of Martin V, with whom he returned to Rome, entering the Curia as protonotary and referendary, and becoming an Apostolic Secretary in 1421. Bartolomeo, like Loschi, combined the talents of the humanist and the jurist, and he became one of the most influential men in the Curia during Martin's pontificate. He also took an interest in antiquities, and in 1428, as has already been noted, accompanied Poggio on his antiquarian excursion to Ferentino and Alatri, copying Roman inscriptions. He died in the following year, and was buried in his native town, his memory honoured with one of the most beautiful of early Quattrocento tombs, sculpted by Michelozzo between 1427 and 1437, and dismantled in the 17th century. 

Associated with this group of eminent curial humanists during the 1420's was the young and precocious Lorenzo Valla, who was brought

225. Ibid., 2; cf. Voigt 1893, II, 26.
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232. The monument was seemingly commissioned by Aragazzi himself from the joint studio of Donatello and Michelozzo in or shortly before 1427. Leonardo Bruni, who saw parts of the monument being transported in a cart to Montepulciano, was prompted to dilate, in a letter to Poggio of 1430-31, on the vanity of sepulchral monuments: Bruni, Epistolae, II, 45-48; cf. Baron 1928, 210. On the monument in general: Pope-Hennessy 1958, 290-291; Ibid., 1964, I, 100-103, with further bibliography; Holmes 1969, 194-195.
up in Rome, and whose family were connected to the Curia in a number of ways. In his De Voluptate of 1431, a dialogue in the mold of Poggio's De Avaritia, Poggio, Cencio, Loschi, and Valla's late uncle (also secretary to Martin V) figure among the protagonists. Though Valla's interest in antiquity was philologically, and not archaeologically, rooted, there is one passage in the De Voluptate which strikingly reflects contemporary interest in the iconography of the antique relief-sculpture visible in Rome. He describes a relief of Diana, Actaeon and Nymphs purportedly found on Monte Celio, as a simulacrum of Ovid's treatment of the same mythological scene in the Metamorphoses: '... in monte Celio simulacrum Dianae in fonte se lavantis cum caeteris nympharum comitatu, qualem Actaeon deprehendit.'

Valla's philological preoccupations, none the less, hardly fall widely outside the orbit of the 'curial antiquarianism' of the 1420's. For if the 'archaeology' of Petrarch and his followers was concerned, above all, with deeds (the heroic deeds, namely, that had raised Rome to greatness), that of Poggio and his circle tended to revolve around words. The word was enshrined in the inscription, and it was the inscription which was the sine qua non of the 'curial antiquarianism' of the 1420's and 1430's. The ruins of ancient Rome were memorable, not so much because in their midst had been enacted the exemplary history of the Roman Republic, but because the commemorative labels attached to them could send, like newly deciphered texts in cuneiform, intelligible messages across the dark intervening centuries. In his De varietate Fortunae Poggio expresses astonishment that even so learned a man as Petrarch was
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unable to read the inscription on the Pyramid of Cestius, thus leading him to subscribe to the popular notion that it was the Tomb of Remus. Poggio made no such error. Epigraphy thus became for him a primary tool in dismissing the medieval fallacies that had become attached to the ancient monuments of Rome, and more correctly understanding their age, attribution, and original function. It was in epigraphy that the archaeology of structures, as opposed to the archaeology of portable antiques, was grounded during Martin V's pontificate. The discovery of classical texts in monastic libraries and of classical inscriptions in Rome and the Campagna may, for this reason, be envisaged as complementary processes. Out of them arose the development of a humanistic script, based both on Carolingian miniscule and the majuscule encountered in Roman epigraphs.

4. The rapprochement between humanists and artists

Richard Krautheimer has raised the possibility that Leon Battista Alberti, whose arrival in Rome is conventionally dated to 1432, when he entered the Curia as abbreviator, actually first came to Rome in 1427 or 1428, and stayed there, except for the trip to the

236. CTR, IV, 232-233.
237. On Poggio's invention of a humanistic script, its miniscules deriving from MSS. of the 11th and 12th centuries, see Ullman 1960, 21-57. 'His majuscules are an entirely different matter,' writes Ullman (ibid., 54). 'With one exception, all his manuscripts reveal capitals based on inscriptions rather than on manuscripts.' Cf. Gombrich 1967, 76-78.
238. Mancini 1882, 100; Mancini 1887, 190ff (papal bull of Oct. 1432 appointing Alberti abbreviator); CTR, IV, 209; Grayson 1960, 703-704; Santinello 1962, 47; Gadol 1969, 5.
Netherlands in 1431-32, till 1434. The assumption principally rests on the volgare preface of the Della Pittura, written in 1436 and addressed to Brunelleschi, in which Alberti praises several Florentine artists, among them Masaccio, whom, Krautheimer contends, Alberti could only have known in Rome. This chronological clue contained in the preface is, indeed, reinforced by the general tenor of Book II, in particular, of the Della Pittura, which arguably reflects the literary, and theoretical, equivalent of the Antikenstudium in Rome discernible in the works of Gentile da Fabriano, Pisanello, and Lorenzo Ghiberti. In Book II Alberti discusses the concept of the istoria in a way which is not only reminiscent of the 'copiousness' and animation of Ghiberti's Gates of Paradise, but which itself seems to reflect familiarity with Roman sarcophagus reliefs. In one instance, in fact, the resemblance is explicit. Alberti refers to an istoria of Meleager in Rome, which is praised for its representation of deadness:

'Lodasi una storia in Roma nella quale Meleagro morto, portato, adgrava quelli che portano il peso et in sé pare in ogni suo membro ben morto: ogni cosa pende, mani, dito e capo; ogni cosa cade languido...'

This istoria was identified by Janitschek with either a Meleager sarcophagus in the Museo Chiaramonti of the Vatican or that in the Barberini collection. But it might also be the same Meleager

240. Ibid., 317-318 and note 12.
241. Ibid., 318.
244. On Masaccio in Rome, see supra, chap. IV. 2.
246. See supra, note 102.
249. Alberti, Della Pittura, ed. Malle, 89.
250. Janitschek ed., Leone Battista Alberti's kleinere Kunsttheoretische Schriften,
sarcophagus drawn upon by Ghiberti in the Moses panel of the Gates of Paradise.\textsuperscript{251} Unfortunately, Alberti does not actually state that he had inspected such a relief with his own eyes, and it is possible, pace Krautheimer,\textsuperscript{252} that he could have derived his knowledge of it at second-hand.

The more general coincidences between Alberti's theory ofistoria, as outlined in the Della Pittura, and Ghiberti's reliefs for the Gates of Paradise, whether or not they reveal the former's presence in Rome before 1430, are clearly symptomatic of the gradual rapprochement between Florentine humanists and artists discernible in the 1420's and 1430's.\textsuperscript{253} Though it is naturally to Alberti himself, at once humanist, theorist of art, and architect, that the most credit for this process must be accorded, Ghiberti, too, after his second visit to Rome, attempted, not unsuccessfully, to don the garb of the humanist in the compilation of his Commentarii.\textsuperscript{254} The relevant terminus post quem is given by his effort, in January 1430, to negotiate the loan of Aurispa's Athenaios manuscript.\textsuperscript{255}

Even before this date some exchange of views between artists and humanists in Rome may be inferred. In September 1430, we recall, Poggio reveals that he had consulted Donatello about a piece of antique sculpture in his possession.\textsuperscript{256} His Florentine correspondent, Niccoli,
according to Vespasiano, was on intimate terms with Brunelleschi, Donatello, Luca della Robbia, and Ghiberti.\textsuperscript{257} It may be said that the factor which above all brought such disparate people together was a common admiration for antiques and a common desire to collect them. Niccoli's own collection was famous.\textsuperscript{258} Vespasiano attests that those who wished to please him 'gli mandava o statue di marmo, o vasi fatti dagli antichi, sculture, epitafi di marmo, pitture di mano di singolari maestri, e di molte cose di musaico in tavolette.'\textsuperscript{259}

Poggio, too, collected antiques with great enthusiasm, though his love of classical art was tinged by a residual sense of shame. Many, he confessed, suffered from other diseases, but his was to admire, perhaps excessively and more than a learned man should, the marbles carved by great artists:

'Multi variis morbis laborant; hic praecipue me tenet, ut nimium forsan, et ultra quam sit docto viro satis, admirer haec marmora ab egregiis artificibus sculpta.'\textsuperscript{260}

Poggio's attempts to gratify this taste, and so to build up his own collection, need not be dealt with here.\textsuperscript{261} By the end of his life his collection was, by all accounts, considerable, and in one of his later dialogues, the De Nobilitate of 1440, Lorenzo de' Medici and Niccoli are spurred into discussion by an inspection of Poggio's statues, arranged (in a suitably classical manner) around the garden of his villa near Florence.\textsuperscript{262}

\textsuperscript{258} See Weiss 1969, 182-183.
\textsuperscript{259} Vespasiano da Bisticci, \textit{Vite di Uomini Illustri}, 443.
\textsuperscript{260} Poggio, \textit{Epistolae}, I (IV. 15), 331.
\textsuperscript{261} See Krautheimer 1956, 303-304; Weiss 1969, 183-184.
\textsuperscript{262} Poggio, \textit{Opera} (1538), 65.
Both Poggio and Cosimo de' Medici, as we have seen, consulted Donatello about their respective collections of antiques. But artists were not simply consultants. They, too, were eager to collect. Both Donatello and Jacopo della Quercia seem to have acquired several pieces of antique sculpture.  

More remarkable was the collection amassed by Lorenzo Ghiberti. In 1434 it was seen in Ghiberti's house by Ciriaco d'Ancona, and on Ghiberti's death in 1455 was valued at no less than 1,500 florins. Later the collection was sold to Giovanni Gaddi (1491-1541), and subsequently dispersed, though Schlosser attempted to reconstruct its appearance. The collection consisted comprehensively of bronzes, marbles, vases, cameos, and the famous so-called Letto di Policleto relief. Recently, Trude Krautheimer-Hess has published a group of documents dating from October 1496 in the Archivio dello Spedale degli Innocenti, which also mention among Ghiberti's possessions a ring with an antique cameo showing a putto standing on a running horse.

The collection of portable antiquities joined artists, humanists, and rulers together in a common pursuit, and it is striking how swiftly it became, during the first three decades of the century, a fashionable activity. Even more remarkable is the essentially Florentine character of this floruit: the great Florentine artists and humanists of
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the early Quattrocento all seem to have collected antiques. Moreover, they all looked to Rome, cynosure of the trade in antiquities. It was in Rome that Ghiberti kept an eye out for newly excavated antiques, and that Brunelleschi and Donatello were dubbed 'quelli del tesoro'. Florentine artists and humanists alike flocked to Rome to the call of Martin V's restauratio. The Florentine intellectual domination of Martin's Curia can be felt in Poggio's bantering correspondence with Niccoli anticipating the latter's first visit to Rome in 1424: 'Together we shall seek out all the remnants of antiquity...' Even Cosimo de' Medici became involved in this Florentine investigation of the antiquities of Rome. Poggio tells Niccoli, in familiar terms, of his presence in the city. Indeed, both Cosimo and his brother Lorenzo are known to have visited Rome several times during the 1420's. Between 1424 and 1427 the former was in Rome at least three times, staying, on his last visit, for several months (November 1426 to the spring of 1427). During its course he was escorted by Poggio on an antiquarian excursion to Ostia and Porto, which Poggio describes in a letter of June 1427 to Niccoli. The chief purpose of this excursion (like others of Poggio), the hunt for inscriptions, proved mainly abortive. They found that a temple to be identified with the Temple of Vulcan at Ostia, had been demolished for lime, and no inscription was left. But on the Via Ostiensis they did manage to find one inscription on what was evidently a Roman funerary
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stele or plaque, carved with the fasces:

'Cum invenimus ad videndum portum Cosmum, et ego, nulla invenimus epigrammata; nam templum illud, quod isti pro calce demolientur, est sine epigrammate: epigramma vero, quod est in via Hostiensi iuxta ripam fluminis, alias ad te misi: id est in sepulcro quodam, quod est ex solo lapide marmoreo, ubi et fasces sunt sculpti.'

Ostia had been extensively quarried for marble at least since the 12th century, and was, in the Quattrocento, an obvious place for both the collector and the epigraphist to go. It may be recalled that previously Leonardo Bruni, in a letter to Niccoli from Rome, had mentioned that he had been promised a cameo or intaglio which a Roman had uncovered while digging at Ostia. Later Lorenzo the Magnificent obtained several objects from Ostia, and the site continued to be plundered of its antiquities (spectacularly by Gavin Hamilton) into modern times. Whether Cosimo de' Medici obtained any antiques either from this source or from Rome is not known. But it seems likely that either he or his son Piero, whose cumulative collection of intaglios, cameos, and gems was, in its day, incomparable (including, as it did, Cosimo's cornelian with Apollo and Marsyas mounted in gold by Ghiberti and the Tazza Farnese, valued at the staggering sum of 10,000 florins) kept agents in Rome for this purpose.

276. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 18-26, passim.
277. See supra, chap. IV. 1.
278. Müntz 1888, 57, 70, 76.
279. Meiggs 1960, 103-104.
282. It seems likely that the larger part of the Medici collection was accumulated by Piero rather than Cosimo himself, since when Ciriaco d'Ancona visited Cosimo's collection in 1433 he apparently saw only precious table plate and no antiques at all: Müntz 1888, 3-4; cf. Krautheimer 1956, 300. The first inventory of Piero's collection, dated 1456, lists 19 cameos and hundreds of ancient coins, but by 1464, when a second inventory was drawn up, the number of cameos had increased to 29: Müntz 1888, 1ff, 38-39.
Though cameos, intaglios, and other portable antiques were eagerly sought after by both Florentine humanists and artists, and though this collecting enthusiasm did indeed promote a rapprochement between them, it is as well to observe that their respective spheres of interest in Roman antiquities remained otherwise mutually exclusive, if complementary. The humanists of the Curia tended to approach antiquities through the inscription, artists through the historiated relief. These were the literary and pictorial aspects to the development of archaeology in early Quattrocento Rome. It was not until the following century, with the advent of the professional antiquary, that both aspects were eventually merged.  

283. See Mandowsky and Mitchell 1963, 19ff, on the professional antiquary in Italy after Raphael's death.
CHAPTER V

NICOLÒ SIGNORILI AND THE ANTIQUITIES OF ROME

1. Signorili and the Commune

In chapter I. 3 an attempt was made to sketch out the origins and early history of what may be termed 'communal antiquarianism' in Rome: in other words, the interest in the antiquities of the city shown by the Romans themselves. During the Trecento, as we have seen, this tradition was fostered both by Giovanni Cavallini, 1 and, more spectacularly, by his contemporary, Cola di Rienzo. 2

Yet 'communal antiquarianism' in Rome hardly survived into the following century. It shrivelled away with the disintegration of the commune itself during the Schism and the suppression, or appropriation, of the once-autonomous institutions of Roman municipal government by the 'Roman' Popes of the later Trecento. What remains of its original mode in the treatise compiled during the later years of Martin V's pontificate by the Roman, Nicolò Signorili, bears only the illusory traces of the communal spirit. In effect, this work, though at some pains to proclaim the rights of the Roman people, is a reflection, not of communal liberty, but of the autocracy in Rome of the Pope who had commissioned it, Martin V. 3 By the close of his pontificate Martin held all the strings of the communal government. He appointed all its officials, judicial, administrative, and fiscal. 4

1. See supra, chap. II. 2 (b).
2. See supra, chap. I. 3 (c).
The proceedings on the Campidoglio, traditional seat of the Commune, were now effectively controlled by the Apostolic Chamber.⁵

To be sure, this curtailment of the liberties of the commune had not been achieved single-handed. It had, to a large degree, already been accomplished by Boniface IX.⁶ Nor is the decline of the commune purely a Roman, it is an Italian phenomenon of the early Quattrocento. In the words of Peter Partner, 'all that was most liberal in the constitution of the Italian city state had by this time been either suffocated by the oligarchy or cut out violently by the signori.'⁷

Martin V's domination over Rome was neither won so drastically, nor was it resisted. The reasons are not hard to find. In place of anarchy, he instituted government. He regularised the internal management of the city, brought back law and order, and made Rome a fit place again in which to live.⁸ Moreover, if he controlled, he was also careful to preserve the offices of the municipal government. He even augmented them.⁹ In this way, the amour propre of the guardians of Roman particularism was humoured, and the illusion of a flourishing commune maintained.¹⁰ In itself, the fact that the Pope should commission Nicolò Signorili, himself a Roman municipal official, to write a book in which (inter alia) the by-now moribund rights and privileges of the Roman people are solemnly rehearsed is an indication

---

⁵ Ibid., 150, 165.
⁶ See supra, chap. III. 2.
⁷ Partner 1958, 159.
⁸ Cf. Infessura, Diario, 23.
⁹ On the re-introduction of the Magistri viarum, see supra, chap. III. 3.
that his authority in Rome was won with diplomacy rather than force.

Little is known of Signorili's life. Like Cola di Rienzo, he was trained as a notary. The 'Nicolaus Antonij Singiorilis notarius de regione Montium', who, in a testament dated 19 April 1400, named the beneficiaries to whom his property was to be bequeathed, may be identified with him. His signature, as a notary, subsequently appears in a privilegium of the guild of the Ars Bobacteriorum, dated 16 December 1407. In a building contract dated 22 January 1408, issued on behalf of the Società del Santissimo Salvatore ad Sancta Sanctorum, his signature also occurs, both as notary of the transaction, and as secretary of the Society in question. At an unspecified date, Signorili added to his functions that of caporione of the regio Monti, the largest of the medieval regions of Rome (straddling the Coelian, Viminal, Esquiline, and Quirinal hills). It is in this rôle that we encounter him in the preface to a statutory provision, drafted in 1425 by Cencio de' Rustici, in itself a token of Martin's civic restauratio and of the influence the Pope exerted over the officers of the commune:

"In privato et generali dictae urbis consiliis, de mandato et assensu nobilium virorum domini Iohannis de Baroncellis, legum doctoris, Egidii Sansae et Laurentii Petri Omiaisancti, magnificorum dominorum conservatorum Cameræ dictae urbis, senatum regentium, nec non Nicolai Signorilis"

11. Lanciani 1902-12, vol. I, 41. Lanciani thought this document referred to a different member of the family, perhaps Signorili's uncle, but it seems implausible that there should have been two Nicolò Signorilis, both notaries in the regio Montium at the same time.
13. Corbo 1967, 342: '... prout de predictis patet in locatione superinde confecta facta sub anno Domini mille CCCO VIII, mensis januarii die XXII, de qua patet manu Nicolai Signorilis, notarii et secretarii dicte Societatis.'
Signorili's evident cooperation with the Pope brought him a further post, that of scriba senatus, or, as he described it in the prooemium to the treatise under review, 'secretarius incoliti Magistratus alae Urbis'. The post was equivalent to that of town clerk. The date of Signorili's death is not recorded. In the same prooemium, however, he mentions Giovanni Dammari, Gregorio Marcellini, and Giovanni Paolo della Torre as conservatores of the city. The former two are known to have held this post in 1431, and though they may have also held it during a previous year, for which no records survive, the fact suggests that Signorili may have survived the death of Martin V himself on 20 February 1431.

2. Date, Commission, and Character of Signorili's Treatise

By the same token, we may suppose that the compilation of the treatise, to which this prooemium belongs, dates to the later stages of Martin's pontificate. Valentini and Zucchetti date it to the later part of 1430. The work was dedicated to Martin V, who had initially

16. CTR, IV, 162.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid., 157-158.
19. Ibid., 158.
commissioned it. 20

Though Valentini and Zucchetti declare the work to have 'carattere organico', 21 it shows unmistakable signs of piecemeal compilation. In the MSS. of the complete work twelve main components may be detected:

a) Prooemium.
b) Proclamation of the rights and privileges of the Roman people.
c) Historical survey of the legendary origins of the city, and the growth of Rome under the kings, consuls, and emperors.
d) Description of the walls, gates, hills, palaces, temples, and triumphal arches of the city, with a short account of Monte Testaccio.
e) Text of the Curiosum.
f) Classical encomia of Rome.
g) The officials of ancient Rome.
h) Account of the imperial donations to the Papacy and the growth of the patrimonium.
i) Encomium of Roma sacra and papal supremacy.
j) List of the archbishoprics and bishoprics of the Roman church in Italy, Europe, and ultra mare.
k) List of churches in Rome.
l) Catalogue of relics preserved in the churches of Rome.

To the above may be added a further item (m), namely the epigraphic sylloge, encountered in MSS. of the Descriptio Urbis Romae (on which, see infra). This will be dealt with separately in the following chapter. Of the other twelve components, only two (d and e) are strictly relevant

20. Ibid., 162.
21. Ibid., 159.
for our purposes here, but the textual context in which the
topographical material on Roman antiquities occurs is revealing also
of the intellectual context in which Signorili conceived them.

The work, indeed, was not conceived primarily as a
description of Roman antiquities. The primary aim, as Signorili
explains in his proemium, was to compile a book, 'in quo iura,
jurisdictiones et honores, aliaque tributa, sublimitates, et census
quae huic inclitae urbi conveniunt', 22 since the books in which this
information had previously been gathered had perished during the
disturbances that had shaken Rome in recent times. 23 In other words,
Signorili was commissioned to compile a census-book, in the manner of
the late 12th century Liber Censuum of Cencius Camerarius. 24

The original MS. of the Liber Censuum, Vat. Lat. 8486, was
in the possession of the Apostolic Chamber by 1193. 25 In the 14th
century, however, it was removed to Avignon, and did not re-enter the
Vatican Library till the time of Sixtus IV. 26 Similarly, the early
13th century codex, Florence, Riccardiana MS. 228, taken from Rome,
still appears as Item No. 1 in the 1411 catalogue of the Avignon
Library. 27 It was apparently brought back to Rome on the accession of
Martin's successor, Eugenius IV, since a bull of the latter dated
March 1431 was inserted into it (the last addendum, in fact). 28 Its
return must surely postdate the compilation of Signorili's treatise.

22. Ibid., 162.
23. Ibid. Signorili's allusion, in this context, to the novitates
that had afflicted Rome should, more particularly, refer to the
disturbances that had shaken the city during the Schism.
24. On the Liber Censuum, see, apart from the edition of Fabre and
Duchesne, CTF, III, 193-209; Huelen 1927, V-VI.
27. Ibid., 29-30; Maier 1963, 114.
The fate of the other early MSS. of the Liber Censuum need not be recounted here. But it may be concluded that it was, as Signorili suggests, the absence in Rome of such a census-book, a basic reference work of the Holy See, that prompted Martin V to commission a replacement.

The Liber Censuum contains (inter alia) lists of the archbishoprics and bishoprics of the Roman church, a text of the Mirabilia, excerpta on ecclesiastical history, the Ordo Romanus, lists of churches in Rome, a chronicle of the Popes, Charlemagne's donation to Adrian I and other imperial concessions to the Papacy, and assorted cartularies. A comparison with the contents of Signorili's work shows that they are generically related. More particularly, the incorporation of a text of the Mirabilia in the Liber Censuum offers a clear precedent for the inclusion of a similar description of the monuments of Rome in Signorili's work. Signorili, in this respect, belongs, as both antiquarian and ecclesiastical archivist, in the medieval tradition of the Roman census-books.

3. The MSS. Problem

The extant MSS. of the work under consideration fall into two

29. See ibid., 30-35.
30. Ibid., Text, 1-247.
31. Ibid., 262-272.
32. Ibid., 284-289.
33. Ibid., 290-314. The Ordo Romanus lays down the processional routes to be taken by the Popes on the great feast-days, and the ceremonies accompanying them.
34. Ibid., 300-304.
35. Ibid., 317-330.
36. Ibid., 345-379.
37. Ibid., 379-600.
groups. Firstly, there are those MSS. containing the description of the antiquities of Rome proper, with the addition of the epigraphic sylloge (components d-g, m). To the texts contained in such MSS. may properly be given the title *Descriptio Urbis Romae eiusque excellentiae*. Secondly, there are the MSS. containing Signorili's complete treatise, as outlined above (components a-l). These may be described with the title *De iuribus et excellentiis urbis Romae*. The confusion in the modern literature between these two titles, and the texts they represent, stems from a failure to distinguish between the two species of MSS.

Of the MSS. of the *Descriptio*, the earliest are preserved in the Vatican Library: namely, Codex Chigiano I. VI. 204 and Vat. Lat. 10687. The contents of the former can be described as follows:

- f. 1r - 3lr, *Descriptio Urbis Romae eiusque excellentiae* (f. 1r, the 13 regions of Rome; ff. 1v-2r, the gates of Rome; ff. 2v-4v, the Curiosum; ff. 4v-5r, the palaces of Rome; ff. 5v-6r, the temples of Rome; f. 6r, the Circus of Tarquinius; ff. 6v-8r, triumphal arches; ff. 8r-9v, 'Nota de universali magnificentia urbis Romae'; ff. 9v-10r, 'De nominibus officiorum urbis'; ff. 10v-3lr, the epigraphic sylloge);
- ff. 32r-40r, Marsilius of Padua, *De translatione imperii romani*;
- ff. 40r-41r, 'Testimonia Lentuli, Pilati et Flavii Josephi de Christo';
- ff. 41r-47r, Quotations from Claudian, Cyprian, and Lactantius;
- ff. 47r-49, 'Jacobi Lubaei epistula de sacerdotio Christi'; ff. 50r-53r, 'Regna quae fuerunt de origine mundi'; ff. 53v-55v, *Notae Valerii*

---

38. The title of Codex Chigiano I. VI. 204.
40. See, in particular, CTR, IV, 161.
Probi, \[1\] ff. 58r - 62v, De marmoreis Voluturhenis tabulis; \[2\] and ff. 63r - 68v, Regiones urbis Romae. From Codex Chigiano I. V. 204 stems Chigiano I. V. 168.

The other Vatican MS. of the Descriptio, Vat. Lat. 10687, is also miscellaneous in character. It entered the Vatican Library in 1904 and comes from the library of S. Nicolò dell'Arena at Catania. \[3\] Its contents, similar to Chigiano I. VI. 204 (from which it probably stems), \[4]\ can be described as follows: ff. 1r - 30v, Descriptio Urbis Romae eiusque excellentiae (f. 1r, the regions of Rome; ff. 1v - 2r, the gates of Rome; ff. 2v - 5r, the Curiosum; ff. 5r - 6r, the palaces and temples of Rome; f. 6, the Circus of Tarquinius; ff. 6v - 8r, triumphal arches; ff. 8v - 9v, encomia of Rome; f. 9v, 'De nominibus officiorum urbis'; ff. 10r - 30v, the epigraphic syllogae); ff. 32r - 40r, Marsilius of Padua, de translatione imperii; ff. 40v - 41r, 'Testimonia Lentuli, Pilati et Flavii Josephi de Christo'; ff. 41v - 44r, 'Series regnorum, regum et imperatorum'. \[5\]

Both these MSS., Chigiano I. VI. 204 and Vat. Lat. 10687 have been the objects of some misguided chronological speculation. On the

\[1\] On Poggio Bracciolini's discovery of a MS. of the Notae juris of Valerius Probus, see infra, chap. VI. 2 and note 40. The Chigiano text doubtless derives from this. For this and other 15th century MSS. of the Notae juris, see Mommsen 1864, 269-270, 303-304.

\[2\] This short treatise, from the pen of Annius of Viterbo (1432? - 1502), describing an alleged find of Etruscan antiquities at Viterbo, has now been separately published by Weiss 1962, 107-120, in an edition based on Chigiano I. VI. 204, and its derivative, Chigiano I. V. 168, ff. 32v - 39r. The treatise, dating to 1492-93, transcribes inscriptions, which were actually faked, in a mixture of bad Greek and pseudo-Etruscan gibberish, by Annius himself. Two of them, carved in alabaster, are still to be seen in the Viterbo Museum. See Weiss 1962, 102 and plates. On the forgeries of Annius in relationship to the origins of Etruscology, see Weiss 1969, 119-120.

\[3\] Vattasso 1905; Vattasso and Carusi 1920, 663.

\[4\] Silvagni 1924, 179.

\[5\] Vattasso and Carusi 1920, 663-665.
basis of the list of emperors contained in each, with its open-ended termination at Charles IV, and also the coat-of-arms displayed within the initial R(oma) on f. 1r of the latter MS, De Rossi dated them respectively to 1344-47 and 1378. This conclusion in turn prompted him to attribute both the Descriptio and the sylloge to Cola di Rienzo. The thesis was adopted, and elaborated, by Henzen and reformulated by De Rossi again in his Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae.

The extremely shaky assumptions on which this thesis rested were effectively demolished by Angelo Silvagni in a cogent paper of 1924. Silvagni refuted De Rossi’s implicit methodological assumption that the Series regnorum and the Descriptio were chronologically homogeneous, and that the terminus post derived from the one must necessarily implicate the other. The assumption is discredited on palaeographical grounds alone: Chigiano I. VI. 204 incorporates four unrelated scripts, none of the Trecento. In any case, the Series regnorum is more likely to have been conceived as an appendix to the Marsilius of Padua tractatus contained in both Chigiano I. VI. 204 and Vat. Lat. 10687 than to belong with the Descriptio. The work of Marsilius deals with the translatio imperii from the Romans to the Greeks, the Greeks to the Franks, and from the Franks to the Germans.

46. Silvagni 1924, 178.
47. De Rossi 1871, 3ff.
48. Ibid., 11-17.
49. C.I.L., VI, Pars l, XV-XVI.
50. De Rossi 1857-88, II, 316-32Q.
51. Silvagni 1924, passim.
52. Ibid., 178-181.
53. Ibid., 178.
54. Ibid., 179. Text of the De translatione imperii included, for instance, in Goldast (M.), Monarchiae Romani Imperii, II, Frankfort, 1614, 147-153.
it post-dates the *Defensor pacis* (which it names twice), and must belong to the period between 1324, the conventional date for the completion of the *Defensor pacis*, and 1330, the year of Marsilius' death.\(^{55}\) This period corresponds to the upper and lower termini suggested by the *Series regnorum*: 1313 and 1347.\(^{56}\) For this reason, the date of the *Series regnorum* may be judged to be quite independent of the *Descriptio*.

The dating of Vat. Lat. 10687 on the basis of the coat-of-arms displayed in the initial R(oma), with a tiara and crossed keys above and an imperial eagle below, is equally suspect. De Rossi, following Aloysius della Marra, thought it was the coat-of-arms of Urban VI.\(^{57}\) But Vattasso and Carusi denied that this was the case.\(^{58}\) The crossed keys and imperial eagle are, indeed, more likely to symbolise the papacy and empire in general than to represent a particular coat-of-arms.

Yet the strongest, indeed overwhelming, argument against De Rossi's dating of Chigiano L. VI. 204 and Vat. Lat. 10687 is the recognition that both are palaeographically of the first half of the

---

55. Silvagni 1924, 179.
56. Ibid.
57. De Rossi 1857-88, II, 318. The dating of the Catania MS. to the pontificate of Urban VI did not, indeed, originate with Aloysius della Marra, since Sarazanius, in his commentary on the works of Damascus of 1638, mentions a 'veterem codicem manuscriptum cui titulus Descriptio Urbis Romae, qui liber sub Urbano VI papa scripta fuit, quem nos habemus'; a reference in fact, to the same MS. Cf. De Rossi 1857-88, II, 318. Cf. also the early note, possibly of Sarazanius, on Vat. Lat. 10687, f. 45v: 'Hic liber, ut apparat ad finem, in qua est catalogus Imperatorum fuit compositus Carolo IV Imperatore qui ab anno dm 1348 ad ann. 1380 imperavit, ac Urbano VI Papa, cuius insigne apparat in prima litera maiuscula operis huius.' 58. Vattasso and Carusi 1920, 663.
Quattrocento. They neither belong to the period of, nor do they incorporate the works of, Cola di Rienzo. And the grounds for assuming that the compilation of the *Descriptio Urbis Romae* long antedates its insertion into Signorili's complete treatise can no longer be sustained.

Of the surviving MSS. of the complete treatise, the *De iuribus et excellentiis urbis Romae*, the earliest is commonly accepted as being the one preserved in the Archivio Colonna, II. A 50. This is a paper MS. containing 61ff., written in an italic script, datable to the period 1430-50. In the autograph introductory note which he appended to it, De Rossi explained why he thought it was not the presentation copy to Martin V. The grounds for so thinking are threefold. Firstly, Archivio Colonna, II. A 50 is not written on vellum. Secondly, it contains many errors of transcription, especially of proper names. Thirdly, it is incomplete: a collation with the Bruti MS. indicates that the catalogue of relics exists in the Colonna MS. in an abbreviated form.

The other MSS. date to the 16th and 17th centuries: Vat. Lat. 3536 from the library of Cardinal Antonio Carafa (Cardinal 1568-91), a generally reliable text; the codex of the Biblioteca Brancacciano of Naples, L. C. 35; Vat. Lat. 6781, with Panvinio's interpolations;

60. Huelsen 1927, XI, states the Colonna MS. was written towards the end of the 15th century, but De Rossi was more probably correct in concluding, in his prefatory note to the MS., that it was 'manifestamente scritto nella prima metà del secolo XV'.
61. It should also be noted that parts of the Colonna MS., at least, are a palimpsest; the underlying Gothic script is clearly apparent, even on microfilm, on ff. 1-3.
Ugonio's heavily interpolated holograph transcript in the Biblioteca Oliveriana of Pesaro; the already mentioned codex found by De Rossi in the private library of the Signori Bruti; finally, a fragment preserved in Vat. Lat. 7191.62

The *De iuribus et excellentiis urbis Romae* was never printed. The only modern edition of the work, that of Valentini and Zucchetti (1953),63 is much abbreviated. It includes the prooemium, most of the description of Roman antiquities, the catalogue of Roman churches, and the epigraphic *sylloge* (components a, b, k and m), but omits components b, c, e, f, g, h, most of i, j, and the greater part of l. Valentini and Zucchetti claim to have derived their partial text from Vat. Lat. 10697 and Chigiano L VI. 204,64 but since these are shorn of the prooemium and the catalogue of churches, their edition appears to derive from a *contaminatio* of the MSS. of the *Descriptio* with an unspecified MS. of the *De iuribus*, presumably either that in the Archivio Colonna or Vat. Lat. 3536. The two are not actually conflated, but simply conjoined.65

The catalogue of churches, it may be noted, was separately published in 1887 by Armellini, in a confused edition derived from the Bruti MS., collated, in part, with the Archivio Colonna MS.66 In the second edition of *Le chiese di Roma* of 1891, this text was superseded by a more acceptable one derived from Vat. Lat. 3536.67 The same catalogue

---

63. CTR, IV, 162-208.
64. Ibid., 161.
65. i.e. MS. of the *De iuribus*: CTR, IV, 162-191; MS. of the *Descriptio Urbis Romae*: Ibid., 191-208.
66. Armellini 1887; cf. Huelsen 1927, XL
67. Armellini 1891; cf. Huelsen 1927, XL
has also been published by Huelsen, in an edition based on the Colonna MS., collated with Vat. Lat. 3536, 6781, and the Brancacciano codex.\footnote{Huelsen 1927, XI, 43-49.}

The synopsis and discussion of the \textit{De iuribus} given below are also based on the Colonna MS., but the quotations have, in all cases, been checked against Vat. Lat. 3536 for possible variants.

4. \textit{Synopsis}

A synopsis of Signorili's \textit{De iuribus et excellentiis urbis Romae}, with particular emphasis on its topographical aspects, may now be attempted.

The fulsome dedicatory prooemium opens with Signorili, 'secretarius incliti Magistratus almea Urbis', making his obeisance to the recipient of his treatise, Pope Martin V. He explains that Gregorio Marcellini, Giovanni Dammari and Giovanni Paolo della Torre, conservators of the city,\footnote{On the dates when Marcellini and Dammari held this office, see Salimei 1935, 178; CTR, IV, 157-158. On the office of the \textit{conservatores}, see Gibbon, VII, 292; Gregorovius, VI, 439.} had ordered him on behalf of the Pope to prepare a single book in which were gathered together the laws, jurisdictions, honours, and other tributes, distinctions, and censuses of Rome, since the books in which all this information had previously been gathered had been lost in the many turmoils that had so sadly afflicted the city in the past:

\begin{quote}
'Sanctissimo in Christo Patri et beatissimo domino nostro domino Martino divina providentia Papae quinto servulus Sanctitatis vestrae Nicolaus Signorilis, secretarius incliti
\end{quote}
Magistratus almae Urbis, post humilem recommendationem et vestrorum pedum oscula beatorum. Magnifici viri, dominus Gregorius de Marcellinis, Johannes Damari et Johannes Paulus della Torre, Conservatores Camerae dictae urbis, michi pro parte vestrae Beatitudinis mandaverunt, ut unum codicum ordinare deberem, in quo iura, iurisdictiones et honores, aliaque tributa, sublimitates, et census quae huic inclitae urbi conveniunt, et debentur, de quibus in scriptis nunc memoria non habetur, quoniam temporum praeteritorum faciente nequitia, et novitates plurimas, quae urbem ipsam, heu proh dolor! multipliciter afflexerunt, ea volumina, in quibus redacta fuerunt haec recurrit, sunt amissa, unde cumque possim colligere, ac in dicto codice in scriptis redigere procurarem."70

Having outlined the task in hand, Signorili goes on to declare, at some length, how unequal he was to it. He confesses his untrained intellect to be incompetent to describe the pre-eminences, honours, dignities and sublime powers pertinent to such a city as Rome:

'Sanctum quidem propositum, Pater sancte, et ab omnibus commendandum est, sed meis debilibus humeris ingens pondus. Ad redigendum enim praeminentias et honores ac dignitates et sublimes potentias convenientia tantae urbi, quae diffuse dudum per mundi climata imperium super cunctas nationes obtinuit, meus certe rudis non sufficit intellectus.'71

How could Signorili condense into a small book the sublimities of Rome which the great writers of Roman antiquity, and other innumerable authors, rhetors, orators and distinguished scholars had toiled to collect together in the countless books they had written through the ages?:


1. Sic.

70. Arch. Col., f. 1r; CTR, IV, 162.
71. Ibid.
72. Arch. Col., f. 1r-v; CTR, IV, 162-163.
Full of his own inadequacy, Signorili likens himself to a rowing-boat, rudderless, without any wind to fill the sails, and hesitant to navigate on such a vast ocean. But duty prompts; he is ready not only to sail through the sea, but also, should his Holiness demand it, to fly, like Dedalus, through the air:

'At mea parva cymba, temonis remorumque suffragio destituta, et modice a ventis inflata vela, dubitat in tam vasti maris pelago navigare. Tandem spiritu prontitudinis exhortatus, et in mea mente revolvens quod meum est, haud tantum per ipsum pelagus navigare, verum volitare per aëra venti, Dedalus, si vestra michi Sanctitas id iuberet, promptus...'73

Signorili then compares what he hoped to accomplish with map-makers who assemble numerous fragments together to make a picture of the earth:

'... sed id faciam quod solent qui terrarum situs brevi pictura depingunt et, ut breviter concludam, tantarum rerum fragmenta recondens.'74

At the outset, nevertheless, one thing was demonstrably true, namely that Rome, in both spiritual and temporal matters, was the supreme city on earth, seat of the empire and of the apostolic succession. No wonder, therefore, that it had been so divinely exalted and favoured, as head of the world and head of the faith, mother of the laws, home of the commonwealth, and mistress of peoples, and recognised as such both by law and the universal utterance of speech:

'Et si non qua debeo, saltem qua potero, facultate studebo voluntatem vestrae Beatitudinis adimplere ab hoc incipiens, Pater sancte, unum esse firmum, et probabili argumento, ac sine dubitatione verissimum, ymo adeo cunctis nationibus manifestum, quod probatone non indiget, Romam scilicet solam esse, quae in spiritualibus et temporalibus, in terris de iure praecipua dignitate refultget, cum ibi summi apostolatus et excelsi imperii solia sint locata. Et ob hoc sequitur, haud mirum, quod urbs ipsa tam sublimibus decorari muneribus, talibus insigniri titulis, et tam grandi excellentia, divina permittente clementia

73. Arch. Col., f. lv; CTR, IV, 163.
74. Ibid.
meruit sublimari, ut caput orbis, caputque fidei, mater legum, 
et communis patria ac domina gentium, et magistra, tam ex 
dispositione legum, quam universo sermonis eloquio 
nuncupatur..."75

Turning from Rome's universal status to its internal government, 
Signorili reminds the Pope, who through the city was considered to be lord 
of the world, and was revered as Roman leader by the munificence of mighty 
kings and princes, that he ought to hold it dear, to preserve its honours 
and dignities, and not permit it, a city which ought to be honoured by 
all, to be abused by his own subjects. And if certain of them had risen 
against it, like children of iniquity, and taken away its laws and 
privileges,76 nevertheless God, by whose dispensation the city had its 
origin, and merited to be elevated above all other dominions, was 
immutable. His works would remain firm. Both as seat of the apostolic 
succession and of the imperial dignity, the city would endure, and would 
easily be able to regain its lost distinctions, honours and rights and 
restore them to the possession of any office which had been seized:

'Nam Te, qui per eam orbis dominus reputaris, ut Romanum 
Praesulem magnorum Regum et Principum munificentia reveretur, 
et ideo eam teneris, et debes caripendere, et in suis 
honoribus et dignitatibus conservare, nec illam permettere a 
suis subditis vilipendi, quae debet ab omnibus rationabiliter 
honorari. Et si nonnulli huiusmodi subjectorum per tempora 
contra urbem ipsam, velut iniquitatis alumpni, surrexerint, 
et eius honores ac iura subtraxerint, quae ob hoc sint hodie 
in aliqua magna parte tiramnica fraude aut violentia seu 
dolositate subtracta, vel aliter forsitan diminuta, vivit tamen 
in aeternum Deus, cuius dispositione benigna urbs ipsa initium 
habuit, et habere meruit super aliis omnibus principatum, 
apostolicaque sedes, cuius principaliter interest, et imperialis 
dignitas, quas in eadem nullo umquam tempore defecturas 
cælestis altitudo consilii mirabiliter stabilivit, in earum 
roboris firmitate perdurant, quae facile poterunt, ut tenentur 
(divina pertinente clementia) sua sublimitates, honores, et 
iura cuncta recuperare subtracta, et eam reinte~are ad 
possessionem, occupatae cuiuslibet dignitatis.'77

75. Ibid.
76. An allusion to events in Rome during the Schism.
77. Arch. Col.,ff. lv–2r; CTR, IV, 163-164.
From the destiny of the city of Rome Signorili turns to that of Pope Martin V. It was his destiny to be the restorer of Rome's honours. God had raised him to the summit of the papacy, a man whose family traced its origin to the princes of Rome. Thus, a son and prince of Rome had become pontiff and father of this distinguished city:

'Siquid vestrae beatitudini, Pater sancte, creditur divinitus reservatum, cum ipse Deus omnipotens personam vestram ad apicem summii apostolatus assumpsit, quae ex Romanorum prosapia principum traxit originem, ut nihil deficeret quin melius possit supra dictae urbis honoribus, et commoditibus provideri, scilicet per te, Pater sancte, qui de Romano alumnno, Romanoque princepe summis Romanus Pontifex, ac huius inclitae urbis pater et sponsus verissimus factus es.'

Signorili entreats Martin to succour his most beautiful spouse, Rome, now robbed of much of its strength: 'Succurre speciosae tuae, nam ipsa iam nunc multis viribus spoliata... He urges the Pope to take up the defence of his legitimate wife, and restore her to her lost honours and dignities: '... et oppressae tuae legitimae coniugis defensionem assumas; ac eam in suis amissis honoribus, et dignitibus restaures et reponas.'

The restoration of Rome would redound to Martin's honour and fame: 'Quae, si recte perspicitur, ad vestrae Sanctitatis honorem, decus, commodum, atque famam tendere videbuntur.'

At the close of the prooemium Signorili reverts to his proposition regarding the work in hand. He explains that at the
beginning of the old census-book, which had been lost during the Roman revolutions, there had existed a preface, which had frequently been read by many citizens, and from them Signorili had managed to glean the information which follows:

"At, ut ad propositum revertatur, in principio censuarii antiqui dictae urbis, iam in novitibus Romanis amissi, repperi esse scriptam quandam praefationem a multis civibus saepe lectam, et per me inde exemplatam particulariter, tenoris in effectu et continentiae subsequentis." 83

The De iuribus et excellentiis urbis Romae opens with an account of the political, juridical and fiscal rights and privileges of the civitas Romana and their territorial extension 'infra centesimum lapidem'. 84 These, since the translation of the Empire to the West, included the right of the Roman people to make their own laws:

"Sed inter caeteralilia privilegia Romani populi in corpore iuris scripta reperitur etiam, quod hodie postquam Imperium fuit translatum in principem populus Romanus potest legem condere." 85

Rome's privileged status as a city was shown by the fact that it was simply known as The City, 'dicendo tamen simpliciter urbem sine alterius nominis expressione', 86 and also by the fact that if you write Rome backwards you spell Amor. '... per excellentiam solum intelligitur de Roma, cuius retro silabicatum tum nomen sonat Amor.' 87

We now enter on section (c), as outlined above, dealing with the origins and early history of the ancient city of Rome, and beginning with the popular medieval legend of the foundation of Rome by

83. Arch. Col., f. 2v; CTR, IV, 165.
84. Arch. Col., f. 2v.
85. Arch. Col., f. 3r.
86. Arch. Col., f. 3v.
87. Ibid.
Noah. The account is derived from a source Signorili calls 'Estodius' - the same source, in fact, quoted by the Graphia Aureae Urbis, 88 Martinus Polonus, 89 and Giovanni Cavallini, 90 in the similar, though not identical, accounts they give of Noah's foundation of Rome. No author with the name Estodius, Escodius or Hescodius has been traced. 91 The legend, as recounted by Signorili, tells how, after the sons of Noah had built the Tower of Babel, Noah sailed with them to Italy, and founded a city where Rome now stands, calling it Noe after his own name, the actual spot being still (in Signorili's day) called Archa Noe, though some called it the arcus Nervae after the inscription to be seen there: 92

'Haec licet ut dicit Estodius, initium habuerit à Noe, qui postquam filii eius edificaverunt turrim, ubi fuerunt linguae confusae, quia terra illa ante constructionem turris eiusdem, erat unius labii, ut habetur in Genesi cap. XI, cum aliquibus navigia ingressus mare transiens ... Italiam venit, et in eo solo, ubi Roma est, civitatem construxit, quam ex suo nomine appellavit Noe, in eo videlicet loco, ubi Hodie Arca Noe muncupatur. Licet secundum alias arcus Nervae dicitur propter epitaphium ibi scriptum: 93

Thereafter, Janus, the son of Japhet and grandson of Noah, built a mausoleum on the other side of the Tiber, on the hill which Janus called Janiculum after his own name: 'Ac demum Janus filius Japhet nepos Noe quoddam mausoleum prope construxerit ultra Tyberim in quodam monte, ex

88. CTR, III, 77.
89. Martini Oppaviensis Chronicon, 399.
90. CTR, IV, 25.
91. On this source see Nichols 1889, 2, note 2; Graf 1915, 65; CTR, III, 77, note 2.
92. The Arca di Noè, an archway in the Forum of Nerva, was demolished in the early 17th century, but its aspect is known, for instance, from the Anonymus Escurialensis drawing: Egger 1931-32, II, Taf. 40. As this drawing indicates, the inscription alluded to by Signorili was not on the arch itself but on the frieze of the adjacent Temple of Minerva; in the drawing only the fragment IMP. NERVA remains. The full inscription, in honour of Nerva, is, however, transcribed in the Sylloge Signoriliana, no. 24, C.I.L. VI, Pars 1, XX = C.I.L. VI, no. 953. See also Platner-Ashby, 228; Nash, I, 433; CTR, IV, 25, note 1.
93. Arch. Col., f. 3v.
Signorili continues, as does the Graphia, by recounting the supplementary legend of how Saturnus, expelled from Crete by his son Jupiter, sought refuge in the land of Janus, and built there a shrine on the hill, now called the Capitol. For this reason, it was also called Mons Saturnalis. Subsequently, Jupiter himself arrived, and having killed his father, ordered that the temple be called the Temple of Jove:

"... postea Saturnus ... expulsus a Jove eius filio de insula Creta veniens permissione Jani patrui sui, ibi prope arcem construxerat in monte, ubi nunc est Capitolium, secundum Trogum Pompeium, lib. XLIII. Ex quo dictus est Mons Saturnalis. Licet postea ex alia causa dicatur Tarpeia. In quo postea Juppiter veniens, et Saturnum inde deiciens, secundum Trogum, eundem templum Jovis mandavit arcem ipsam de caetero nuncupari."

Thereafter, Italus, King of the Syracusans, with the permission of Janus and Saturnus, built in Trastevere across the river Albula, now called Tiber, a city which he afterwards called Itala after his own name:

"Demumque Italus Rex de Siracusis ad Janum veniens in eo loco, ubi est nunc Transtiberim, civitatem quam Ravenniam, id est refugium, atque ripam navigantium, et per Albulae fluvium, qui Tyber hodie dicitur, venientium de dictorum Jani et Saturni permissione construxerit, quam postea a suo nomine Italam appellavit."

Then Janus, son of Pichi, and grandson of Saturnus, built under the Mons Saturnalis a dwelling, which he called Aurelia, in which was kept the shrine of the gods, its location now being marked by the church of

94. Ibid.
95. Cf. CTR, III, 78; Martini Oppaviensis Chronicon, 398.
96. Pompeius Trogus, XLIII. 1.
97. Arch. Col., f. 3v.
98. Ibid. The so-called Urbs Ravennatium in Trastevere appears to be an early medieval corruption of the Castra Ravennatium, presumably the barracks assigned to the sailors of the Ravenna fleet, listed in the Breviarium of the Regionaries: CTR, I, 163 and 188. Cf. Flavio Biondo, R.I., L 31; Jordan, II, 327-328; CTR, I, 163, note 3; Platner-Ashby, 108.
Then Latinus, the son of Hercules, who was later to become king of the Latins, and, according to Lactantius, was the first to devise an alphabet of the Latin language, erected a huge palace and other dwellings near the Porta Latina:

'Latinusque demum, qui secundum veram opinionem, non Fauni filius, sed nepos, qui ex Hercule, et filia Fauni stupro conceptus extitit ... veniens prope portam Latinam in loco videlicet ubi Antiniarum dicitur, ingentia palatia edificavit, et habitationes varias, mira pulchritudine decoratas, qui postea Latinorum factus est rex, et primus alphabetum linguae latinae dicitur invenisse secundum Lactantium.'

Then, after the destruction of Troy, when Aeneas had come to Italy with the Trojans, his daughter came to that part where Rome stands, and founded a mausoleum on the Aventine near the bank of the Tiber, and lived in it:

'Tempore quo Priamus Rex Laumedonte Rex in Troya regnabat postquam destructa Troya Enea in Italiam veniente cum Troyanis eius filia in dictis partibus ubi Roma est, veniens prope ripam Tyberis in Aventino monte mausoleum condiderit, et habitaverit in eodem.'

---

99. On the church of S. Basilio, founded over the remains of the Temple of Mars Ultor on the Forum of Augustus, see Huelsen 1927, 206, no. 12.
100. Arch. Col., f. 3v.
101. Lactantius seems to make no such statement. Indeed, he follows Virgil in making Latinus the son of Faunus: Divin. inst., L. 22; cf. Vergil, Aen., VII. 47. On Latinus as eponymous hero of the Latin people, see Pauly-Wissowa, 12. 1, 928ff.
102. The term Antiniarum was applied in the later Middle Ages to the Baths of Caracalla; see, for instance, CTR, IV, 27 and note 1 (Cavallini), and ibid., 73 (Dondi).
103. Arch. Col., f. 4r.
104. Ibid.
There follows the legend of Romulus and Remus, derived from Livy, supplanted by Eutropius, Orosius, Solinus, St. Augustine, and Florus. In the year 752 E.C. Romulus and Remus founded a city, which Romulus, after he had killed his brother, joined up with other settlements in the area, surrounding it with a wall, and thus reducing it to a single city, which he called Rome after his own name in the eighteenth year of his life:

'Anno videlicet Septingentesimo quinquagesimo secundo ante nativitatem Chrysti civitatem condiderunt, cui Romulus ceso Remo eius fratre ictu baculi pastoralis, ut solus potiretur Imperio omnia dicta loca inibi habitata coniungens, et muris cingere incipiens, in unam civitatem reduxit, quam ex suo nomine, Romam voluit nuncupari Anno eius aetatis XVIII, secundum Eutropium libro primo.'

Signorili continues his account of the city of Romulus, mentioning, by the way, the imposing ruins in the vicinity of S. Maria Nova, which he wrongly identifies as the Temple of Peace, rather than that of Venus and Rome, and making a further confusion between this and the Temple of Romulus:

'Templum Pacis edificans eo videlicet loco ubi prope ecclesia sanctae Mariae Novae est. Quod quantae magnitudinis, quantae pulchritudinis, ac firmitatis extiterit docet ipsa ruina.'

Signorili continues with an account of the kings of Rome, citing where possible the buildings associated with each of them, and thus showing the gradual growth of the early city. Thus, after Livy,

105. Livy, I. 4-15.  
110. Florus, I. 1.  
111 Arch. Col., f. 4r.  
to Tarquinius Priscus was attributed the erection of the Circus Maximus and the institution of the Games: 'Circum maximum edificavit. Ludosque magnos instituit.'\(^{113}\) And, again following Livy, Servius Tullius was credited with having enlarged the city by joining up the Quirinal, the Viminal and the Esquiline, and surrounding the city with a ditch and rampart: 'Quirinalem et Viminalem aliter dictum Exquilium montes urbi eidem coniunxit, et agerem fossamque fecit.'\(^{114}\) With the banishment of Tarquinius Superbus, Signorili brings his survey of the Roman kingdom, and the enlargement of Rome associated with it, to a close by noting how the seven principal hills now contained within the ancient walls of the city came to be interconnected:

'Et ipsorum tempore regum omnia dicta loca, quae hodie inter antiqua menia continetur, invicem sunt coniuncta, quae Romam faciunt, quae septem collis\(^1\) civitas etiam nuncupatur a septem montibus principalibus, qui in ea sunt principaliter interclusi.'\(^{115}\)

These seven montes Signorili now proceeds to list, noting, in the medieval fashion, the derivation of their respective names,\(^{116}\) as well as their relationship to the modern rioni; in the case of the regio Montium, which Signorili himself represented, he observes that on its banner were depicted three hills, on account of the three hills included in the rione, the Quirinal, Viminal, and Caelian:

'Mons Quirinalis qui hodie dicitur Lamesa\(^{117}\) situs supra

1. Sic.

\(^{113}\) Arch. Col., f. 5r.
\(^{114}\) Arch. Col., f. 5v.
\(^{115}\) Ibid.
\(^{116}\) Cf. Boccaccio, De montibus, etc., and Cavallini, Polistoria: supra, chap. II. 2 (b); and CTR, IV, 41-45.
\(^{117}\) The term Lamesa, or La Mesa, rightly belongs not, as Signorili has it, to the whole of the Quirinal Hill, but to the imposing fragment of Caracalla’s Temple of Serapis overlooking the Palazzo Colonna. Biondo, R.L., L 100, assumes the name to be a corruption of Maecenatia, and Leon Battista Alberti of Mensa Neronis: CTR, IV, 220, 283. For other usages, and corruptions, in the Renaissance, see Gregorovius, VII, 787 and note 2; Jordan, II, 528; Nash, II, 376.
ecclesiam XII Apostolorum.

Mons Viminalis à viminibus astae Romuli, quae cum Romulus fixisset in dicto monte ubi nunc est ecclesia sanctae Mariae maioris vimina misit et floruit ad designandum quod imperium urbis quam ipse considerat floreret ut floruit. 118

Qui mons etiam dicitur Exquilus propter cadavera mortuorum quae inibi de suscitatis remanebant, videlicet in eo loco in quo Letarna dicitur. 119

Mons Cellius, ubi est ecclesia sancti Stephani in celionmonte, qui continet etiam ecclesiam Lateranensem. Et isti tres montes continentur in regione Montium. Et ideo dicta regio tres montes in eis banderia dedit.

Mons Palanteus1 et palatium dicitur ab Evandro eius edificationem taliter appellat. 120

Mons Saturnalis, qui dicitur et Tarpeya, ubi nunc est Capitolium a Saturno dictus, qui primus in eo arcem construxit, 121 et ii duo montes in regione Campicelli continentur.

Mons Aventinus ab Aventino Silvio in dicto monte sepulto dicitus, 122 qui continentur in regione Ripae.

Mons Janiculus sic dicitus à Jano 123 qui inibi primus edificavit contentus in regione Transtyberim. 124

Signorili now turns to the expansion of Rome overseas during the period of the Republic, and the more spectacular expansion under the Empire, quoting the opening of the preface to Florus' epitome. 125 From this basis Signorili proceeds to expatiate on the glories of imperial Rome, as well as to rehearse the reasons for the greatness of imperial Rome advanced by the classical authorities, Christian as well as pagan;

1. Mons Palatinus, Vat. Lat. 3536, f. 7v.

118. Signorili's etymology of the Mons Viminalis is somewhat at variance with the classical authorities, Varro, V. 51, and Festus, p. 376, both of whom derive the name from the osiers on the hill and the shrine of Jupiter Viminius; neither state that the osiers were planted by Romulus. Cf. Jordan, L 3, 373; Platner-Ashby, 581.

119. The term Letarna does not seem to occur in other medieval and early Quattrocento topographical sources, nor does Signorili's etymology of the Mons Exquilius appear to have a classical source (cf. Varro, V. 49; Ovid, Fasti, III. 245), but, ironically, the derivation of the name from a purported necropolis in the area has been made respectable in modern times: see Platner-Ashby, 202-203.

120. Cf. Varro, V. 53. On the disputed etymology of Palatine, and variations of the name, see Platner-Ashby, 375; Jordan, I. 1, 182-183.


123. Cf. Varro ap. Augustus, civ. Dei, VII. 4; Solinus, II. 5; Macrobius, L 7. 19; Ovid, Fasti, L 245.

124. Arch. Col., ff. 5v-6r.

125. Arch. Col., f. 6v.
he quotes from Quintilian, Valerius Maximus, Apuleius, Vegetius, Josephus, St. Augustine, and Orosius. The section concludes with a brief apostrophe to Rome, preferred above all other nations, exalted by God, who allowed his Son to be born, and to be crucified, under the Empire of him who gave a census to the Roman people:

'O felix secundum leges Romanorum genus cunctis aliis nationibus anteponendum. O felix Roma, quam mundi creator excelsus deus te in tam grandi fastigio tantarum sublimitatum erexit, quod sub toto Imperio eius filium constituit incarnari qui Romano Imperio censum dedit et pro salute humani generis sub eodem Imperio voluit crucifigi...'

In the following section, Signorili returns to the topography of the city, beginning with a consideration of its ideal position in central Italy, set about by mountains, close to the sea and served by the Tiber. It was placed in the most fruitful part of Latium, a land blessed with abundant natural resources, with fruits and trees, suitable for both cattle and agriculture, well-supplied with fish and game, with vineyards and other crops necessary to sustain human life:

'Et primo, Romam esse secundum Livium in medio florentis Italiae situatam, montibus mirabilibus circumsertam, mari vicinam adeo quod possint ad illam necessaria per flumen Tyberis per eis medium defluens, faciliiter deportari, nec tantum admodum quod possit ob nimiam vicinitatem adventu navium venientium titubare. In Latio positam, in ea videlicet parte, quae opima frugibus arboribusque, et alendis est apta pecoribus et iumentis, avium ferax ita, atque piscibus et animalibus adventendis abundans, dives lactis atque melliis, et diversis piscosis fluminibus atque lacubus circumdata, clarissimorum aquarum fontibus praemunita, nec vinearum fertilitium expers, sed vino saluberrimo multipliciter et abundans, et aliis granosis fructibus ad humanam vitam necessariis et opportunis.'

126. Arch. Col., ff. 7r–8v. Quintilian, Pro Milite Declam., Ill. 14; Valerius Maximus, II. 7. Exe. 2; Apuleius, Apologia, 18. 3; Vegetius, I. 1; Josephus, Jewish War, Ill. 107 (Latin translation); St. Augustine, De civ. Dei, V. 13, V. 18–19, XVIII. 22; Orosius, VI. 22.
127. Arch. Col., f. 8v.
128. Livy, V. 54. 4.
129. Arch. Col., f. 9r.
We now enter upon the Descriptio urbis Romae proper, beginning 'Roma, altissimis firmata muris', the incipit, in fact, of those MSS. containing the Descriptio alone. Part of the Descriptio derives explicitly from Martinus Polonus, and hence from the Graphia. It opens with the measurements given by Martinus for the walls of Rome:

'Roma, altissimis firmata muris, habet per circuitum, ut Martiniana describit, spatium XXII. miliariorum praeter Transtiberim et civitatem Leoninam cum quibus extenditur usque ad XLII. miliaria. Et in moenibus dictae urbis sunt trecentae sexaginta turres, terribiles et mirabili altitudine eminentes.'

Besides Martinus Polonus, the Descriptio makes use of, and indeed incorporates, a text of the Curiosum, one of the two late antique catalogues of the monuments of Rome, arranged within the fourteen Augustan regions of the city. Another text of the Regionaries, as we have seen, had already been reproduced in the Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis and the Descriptio, like the Tractatus, attributes the authorship of the work to Paul the Deacon. Signorili introduces the Curiosum with a view to contrasting its fourteen regions with the thirteen regions of medieval Rome, which he proceeds to list:

'Quae tota civitas distincta est in tresdecim Regiones, quamvis Paulus dyacomus in XIII. scribat. Quae XIII. regiones tali ordine describuntur:

---

130. Cod. Chigiano I. VI. 204; Vat. Lat. 10687.
132. Arch. Col., f. 9r; CTR, IV, 166. The exaggeration of the circuit of the Aurelian walls (22 miles) in Martinus Polonus, as in the Mirabilia (cf. CTR, III, 17) may have originated, as De Rossi thought, in a misapprehension of the measurements given by Pliny, N. H., III, 5, 66; see De Rossi 1879, 68. But one may note the statement of Olympiodorus preserved by Photius that 'the Wall of Rome, measured by Geometer Ammon at the time when the Goths made their former raid upon Rome, was shown to be twenty-one miles in extent.' Olympiodorus, frg. 45 = Photius, Myriobiblia, 80; cf. Richmond 1930, 35.
134. See supra, chap. III. 2.
Signorili now reverts to a question he has already touched upon, namely the relationship of the seven hills of Rome to the modern **rioni**:

'Inter quas septem principales montes, quos suprascripsimus, continentur, videlicet: Mons Quirinalis, Mons Viminalis seu Exquilis, et Mons Caelius in regione Montium; Mons Saturnalis qui et alio nomine Tarpeia dicitur, ac Mons Palanteus, qui dicitur palatium, in regione Campitelli; Mons autem Aventinus in regione Ripae, et Mons Ianiculus in regione Transtiberim.' 136

At this point, Signorili intrudes a passage of rather more personal interest. He describes the composition of the civic **Consiglio privato** 138 and the election of the **caporioni** who served on it. Each of the regions of the city, he explains, had a head, who, during his elected term of office, was called **caput regionis** (or **caporione**), and was invested with the region's banner. The **caporioni** of the thirteen regions served on the **Consiglio privato**, along with 26 other citizens, two of whom belonged to the nobility (the **Caballaroei**, as they were popularly called), and the rest to the populace. Signorili

136. Arch. Col., f. 9r-v; CTR, IV, 166. On the medieval regions of Rome, see Re 1889; Duchesne 1890; cf. the catalogue of the regions in the early Trecento De Nominibus Regionum Urbis Romae contained in Vienna, Nationalbibl., Lat. 1180 (Rec. 3167a): CTR, III, 169-173. On the relationship of the medieval **rioni** to the 14 ancient regions of the city, see Jordan, II, 315-328.
137. Arch. Col., f. 9v; CTR, IV, 166.
punctiliously concludes this excursus by describing the order of precedence of the *caporioni*, first in precedence being the region he himself represented, Monti:

'Quarum quidem regionum quaelibet habet caput unum, qui nunc quolibet semestri per regimen deputatur, qui caput regionis nuncupatur, et tenet banderiam regionis eius et curam habet quilibet regionis suae. Et est de privato consilio urbis, una cum XXVI aliis civibus, quorum duo videlicet de nobilibus ipsius urbis, Caballarotis vulgariter nuncupatis, alteri vero de popularibus eliguntur, qui ad secretum urbis consilium deputantur. Pro consilio autem generali sunt alii ordinati, prout inferius des cribetur, et, ne ordo dictorum capitum regionum praetermissatur, infra scripto sunt ordine describendi; videlicet pr<em>im<em>us in ordine Caputregio regionis Montium, ... (etc.)'\(^{139}\)

There follows a catalogue of the gates into Rome. Though not derived from Martinus Polonus,\(^{140}\) this is similar, in content and order, to the listing of gates in both *Mirabilia* and *Graphia*, namely 12 city gates and 3 Transtiberine gates.\(^{141}\) But Signorili's list differs slightly in nomenclature: Porta Sancti Pauli / Capena; Appia; Latina; Metrovi; Sancti Iohannis / Asinaria; Maiore / Lavicana / Collina; Sancti Laurentii / Taurina; Domnae / Numentana; Salaria; Pinciana; Populi / Flaminea; Castelli; Portuensis; Sancti Pancratii; Septignana.\(^{142}\) To these, however, Signorili adds the names of the four Leonine gates, omitted by both the *Graphia* and Martinus Polonus (though the latter does note: 'Trans Tiberim sunt portae tres et in civitate Leonina tres.')\(^{143}\) Porta Milvia; Viridaria; Pertusi; Terionis.\(^{144}\) Furthermore, he also appends two other gates, which were no longer open,

---

139. Arch. Col., f. 9v; CTR, IV, 166-167.
140. Cf. Martini Oppaviensis Chronicon, 400.
141. Cf. CTR, III, 17-18, 80.
142. Arch. Col., f. 10r; CTR, IV, 167-168.
143. Martini Oppaviensis Chronicon, 400.
144. Arch. Col., f. 10r; CTR, IV, 168-169.
having been walled up: the Porta Libera, already mentioned by
Cavallini\(^{145}\) and the *Tractatus*,\(^{146}\) which can be identified with the
Porta Ardeantina;\(^{147}\) and the so-called Porta delli Cavalieri, which
Signorili locates between the Porta Sancti Laurentii and the Porta
Domnae, and which was probably the Porta Clausa (or Chiusa) adjacent
to the Castra Praetoria,\(^{148}\) the same gate, in fact, which Poggio
located between the Porta S. Agnese and Tiburtina.\(^{149}\) Signorili notes
that it served a military purpose:

>'Et ultra dictas portas sunt etiam duae aliae, quae hodie
remurate sunt, quarum una intra portam Sancti Pauli et
portam Appiam est, quae dicitur porta Libera, quia per
eam transitum faciebant servi quando per dominos a
servitute liberabantur et fiebant liberi. Alia vero est
intra portam Sancti Laurentii et portam Domnae, unde
transitum faciebant illi qui militabantur et accedebant in
quodam parco ibidem facto ad probandum illos qui erant
militandi; quae porta adhuc hodie dicitur delli Cavalieri.'\(^{150}\)

Turning from the gates of Rome to the monuments inside the
city, Signorili begins by reproducing a text of the *Curiosum*, attributed,
as has been noted, to Paul the Deacon: 'De his vero quae in civitate
maneant, aliqua sunt dicenda. Et primo a Paulo dyacono incipiendo
est, quem sic scripsisse repperio.'\(^{151}\) After quoting the *Curiosum* in
full,\(^{152}\) Signorili reverts, as a source, to Martinus Polonus, from
whose listing of Roman palaces and temples he explicitly derives his
own.\(^{153}\) But he has somewhat condensed Martinus' text, omitting, for

\(^{145}\) CTR, IV, 29.
\(^{146}\) CTR, IV, 112.
\(^{147}\) Platner-Ashby, 403; Richmond 1930, 217-219.
\(^{148}\) Richmond 1930, 181-184.
\(^{149}\) CTR, IV, 243-244.
\(^{150}\) Arch. Col., f. 10r-v; CTR, IV, 169.
\(^{151}\) Arch. Col., f. 10v; CTR, IV, 169.
\(^{152}\) Arch. Col., ff. 10v-12v.
\(^{153}\) Arch. Col., f. 12v: 'in Martiniana repperio'.
instance, the legend of Praxiteles and Phidias associated with the Dioscuri, and he has introduced, at the same time, several variants and interpolations. Otherwise, Signorili's sections on the palaces and temples of Rome, like that of the Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis, is in the tradition of the Periegesis of the Mirabilia, and need concern us no further here. The account of the Circus Tarquinius, which follows, was also derived by Signorili direct from Martinus Polonus.

The ensuing catalogue of triumphal arches in the city is, however, not to be found there, though both the Mirabilia and the Graphia include lists of triumphal arches in Rome. But Signorili's account derives from neither of these. It is more comprehensive. Nine arches are described, their location and their dedication, together with a transcript of the inscriptions associated with seven of them. The arches are as follows:

1. 'Arcus triumphalis Camilli dicitur esse in platea Camigliani, et ego puto verum esse propter vocabulum loci qui dicitur Camigliano, corrupto vocabulo, qui dicit debet Camilianus.' Signorili's mistaken

154. Martini Oppaviensis Chronicon, 401-402.
155. E.g. of the Temple of Jupiter under the Capitol and the sculpture of a recumbent river-god, known as the Marforio, now displayed in the cortile of the Capitoline Museum (Helbig, II, no. 1193), Signorili notes: 'aliud dicti Iovis ubi est sepulcrum eius de marmore qui dicitur Marforius retro Capitolium' Arch. Col., f. 13r; cf. Martini Oppaviensis Chronicon, 401. Signorili also interpolates, between the Templum Concordie and Templum Ceres et Telluris, the 'Templum monete prope dictum locum qui dicitur la zecca'; Arch. Col., f. 13r; cf. Martini Oppaviensis Chronicon, 401. On the Zecca antiqua, a pile of ruins beside S. Adriano on the Forum, see Gregorovius, VII, 588, note 2; CTR, IV, 159, note 1.
156. CTR, IV, 125-150. But this is even more heavily interpolated than the version of the Periegesis given by Signorili.
159. Arch. Col., f. 14r; CTR, IV, 192.
assumption that Camigliano represents a corruption of Camillus seems to perpetuate a long-standing medieval derivation. The arch may be identified with the Arcus ad Isis attached to the Temple of Isis and Serapis on the Campus Martius, demolished at the end of the 16th century. 160

2. 'Arcus Iulii Caesaris factus fuit in loco ubi nunc est ecclesia Sanctae Martinæ, qui fuit destructus, sed adhuc apparent inibi fundamenta verissime demonstrantia fuisset arcum triumphalem.'161 Signorili locates this arch to the vicinity of S. Martina under the Capitol, where, he says, its remains were to be seen. These were possibly the remains of the Arcus M. Aurelii on the Clivus Argentarius.162

3. 'Arcum Pompeii puto fuisset illum qui dicitur de Trofoli, situm in regione Columnae, quia ibi dicitur fuisset palatium eius, licet sit in platea pontis Sanctae Mariae alius arcus in quo sic scriptum repperio: DIVVS AUGVSTVS PONT. MAX. EX. S. B. REFECT. Sed ego dictum arcum non fuisset triumphalem credo, sed forte factum Octaviano propter constructionem pontis.'163 Signorili identifies the Arch of Pompey with the arch adjacent to S. Lorenzo in Lucina, later called the Arco di Portogallo, and demolished in 1662.164 In the Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis it is called the Arcus Tropholi, and attributed to Drusus Germanicus.165 But in both the Mirabilia and the Graphia the arch is described as 'arcus triumphalis Octaviani'.166 At the same time,

162. Jordan, II, 414; Platner-Ashby, 35. Cf. the Arcus Iulii Caesaris recorded by the Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis, CTR, IV, 118.
164. Gregorovius, VII, 776; Platner-Ashby, 33; CTR, II, 290, note 1; Nash, I, 83-87.
165. CTR, IV, 119.
166. CTR, III, 19, 81.
Signorili dismisses the identification of the arch of Pompey with the arch then extant in the Forum Boarium facing the Ponte Rotto. The *Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis* refers to this as the 'Arcus marmoreus triumphalis in platea pontis Sanctae Mariae' and mentions the inscription recording an Augustan restoration, the same inscription, in fact, transcribed by Signorili above. Signorili seems to be correct in assuming that this was not a triumphal arch, but formed part of the bridge-complex constructed by Augustus.

1. 'Arcus Titi Vespasiani situs prope ecclesiam Sanctae Mariae Novae in quo scriptum est... (the inscription follows: *C.I.L.*, VI, 945). I.e. the Arch of Titus on the Via Sacra.

2. 'Arcus factus per S. P. Q. R. in honorem Lutii Septimii et Marcii Aurelii Antonini Pii, situs retro Capitolium prope Sanctum Adrianum, in quo scriptum est... (the inscription follows: *C.I.L.*, VI, 1033). I.e. the Arch of Septimius Severus in the N.W. corner of the Forum.

3. 'Arcus alius eisdem factus per artistas et negociatores urbis, situs ad Sanctum Georgium ad Velum Aureum, in quo scriptum est... (the inscription follows: *C.I.L.*, VI, 1035). I.e. the Arcus Argentariorum in the Forum Boarium.

---

167. Platner-Ashby, 398.
174. Platner-Ashby, 43-44; Nash, I, 126-130.
7. 'Arcus alius factus in honorem Constantini, situs prope Coliseum, in quo scriptum est... (the inscription follows: C.L.L, VI, 1139).\textsuperscript{177} I.e. the Arch of Constantine.\textsuperscript{178}

8. 'Arcus alius factus in honorem Galieni imperatoris, situs ad ecclesiam Sancti Viti in Macello, ubi est scriptum... (the inscription follows: C.L.L, VI, 1106).\textsuperscript{179} I.e. the Arch of Gallienus, erected on the site of the Porta Esquilina, and now situated in the Via di S. Vito.

9. 'Arcus alius quem nescio cui factum, situs prope ecclesiam Sanctae Mariae Scolae Grecae, ubi scriptum est... (the inscription follows: C.L.L, VI, 1385).\textsuperscript{181} The inscription, in this case, only records a restoration, and Signorili admits he does not know to whom the arch was originally dedicated. In fact, this was probably not a triumphal arch at all, but belonged to an aqueduct (evidently the Aqua Appia) near S. Maria in Cosmedin.\textsuperscript{182} The same arch is described by the Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis and by Poggio.\textsuperscript{183} Biondo, who reports its demolition c. 1444-46, implies that it formed one of several.\textsuperscript{184}

There were many other things, Signorili goes on, that contributed to the glory of the city and which could not be mentioned. But one proof of its great dignity was Monte Testaccio, so-called from the sherds of vases, which had been thrown there so as to form a hill.\textsuperscript{185}

\textsuperscript{177} Arch. Col., f. 14v; CTR, IV, 194.
\textsuperscript{178} Platner-Ashby, 36-38; Nash, I, 104-112.
\textsuperscript{179} Arch. Col., f. 14v; CTR, III, 194.
\textsuperscript{180} Platner-Ashby, 39; Nash, I, 115-117.
\textsuperscript{181} Arch. Col., f. 14v; CTR, IV, 194.
\textsuperscript{182} Marchetti 1915, 112-113; Platner-Ashby, 40; CTR, III, 62, note 3.
\textsuperscript{183} CTR, IV, 121, 232.
\textsuperscript{184} Biondo, R.I., I. 20-21. Note that the Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis includes two arches in the vicinity of S. Maria in Cosmedin: CTR, IV, 121.
\textsuperscript{185} Signorili's account of Monte Testaccio, omitted by Valentini and Continued
Signorili follows the popular explanation that these vases had been used to transport the annual tribute to Rome from all parts of the world. Moreover, he notes, to remove any doubt in the matter, that if anyone were to excavate fragments of these vases he would find written on them the names of the provinces from which this tribute came - a reference, no doubt, to amphorae-stamps:

'Multa quidem alia ad decus pertinencia civitatis, et eius excellendiam quis narrabat. Sileantur alia. Solum unum maxime dignitatis argumentum est verissimum. Mons scilicet excelsus Testatiae ad testis vasorum dictus, quorum fragmenta ad constitendum montem huiusmodi iactabantur, in quibus de orbis partibus universis census annuati portabantur ad urbem, et ideo mens ipse omnis terra noncupatur. Si quis autem tantae rei esset incredulus, potest se ad hoc faciliter declarare, fodiendo ex dictis fragmentis, in quibus repiperiet scripta nomina provinciarum, quae census huiusmodi destinabant.'

Signorili's understanding of Monte Testaccio as a visible symbol of Rome's political supremacy, rather than as a rubbish-dump, prompts him to quote extensively from the Variae of Cassiodorus on the wonders of the city. Other adulatory opinions of Roman supremacy voiced by Livy and Cicero lead on to a brief listing of the offices of Roman government up to the time of Constantine. There follows

Zucchetti, is published separately in Preller 1846, 201; see also Jordan 1867, 413; Jordan, II, 393.

186. Cf. Pier Paolo Vergerio, CTR, IV, 98: 'In eadem parte est mons mamfactus, qui Testaceus appellatur, eo quod sit totus ex fragmentis vasorum fictilium, quibus tributa provinciarum et regum urbi inferebantur.' Flavio Biondi, R.L., III, 74, later contested this absurd explanation, arguing that the tribute was collected in the provinces by quaestors, and not in fictile vases, but in leather sacks.

187. On Monte Testaccio, composed entirely of fragments of amphorae and doli, see Platner-Ashby, 512; Nash, II, 411-413. On the inscriptions inscribed on the necks or handles of these jars, see C.I.L., XV, 491-659. See also Gregorovius, II, 407-408.

188. Arch. Col., ff. 14v-15r.


190. Livy, V. 20. The Cicero quotation I have not been able to trace.

191. Arch. Col., f. 16r.
an account of Constantine's conversion, and his alleged donation to the Roman Church. This, in turn, leads Signorili on to trace subsequent donations granted by the Carolingians and Ottonians and Henry I, and hence to show the extent of the patrimonium under Stephen II, John VII, and Hadrian I; all this information was doubtless derived by Signorili, directly or indirectly, from one of the Roman census-books.

The historical survey of the growth of the patrimonium again points to Rome's privileged status, a city ordained by God to be both head of the true faith and of the whole world, consecrated with the blood of the holy apostles and martyrs, and splendidly endowed with so many marvels and ornaments that the soul of the onlooker was dazed:

'Haec est enim illa felicissima Roma, quam ipse deus omnipotens totius orbis ac orthodoxae fidei voluit esse caput. Haec est illa Roma sanctissima, quam in fidei firmamentum elegit, et beatorum apostolorum ac martyrum et sanctorum suorum sanguine consecravit. Haec est illa civitas gloriosa, quae tot et tantis divinis dotari muneribus, totque mirabilium rerum splendoribus illustrari, et tot ornamentorum fulgoribus meruit decorari, quod in stuporem inducitur animus intuentis.'

Signorili now quotes in toto Petrarch's description of Rome from Ep. fam. VI. 2, with the incipit 'Vagabamus pariter in ille urbe tam magna'. Petrarch's description, we may recall, culminates in a brief enumeration of Rome's most sacred places, and this gives Signorili occasion to add his own encomium of Roma sacra, glorified by God and

---

192. Arch. Col., ff. 16r-19r.
198. Chr., IV, 9-10.
chosen as his apostolic seat to be ruled in perpetuum by his vicars on earth, and never to be relinquished:

'Non igitur mirum, si Deus omnipotens dictam urbem tot excellentiis, totque et tam amplis muneribus ampliavit, quam caput fidei esse voluit, et in qua imperium solum, ut apostolicam sedem perpetuus stabilivit, et voluit quod per suos vicarios perpetuo regeretur, qui nullo umquam tempore eam relinquere tenerentur.'

Signorili goes on to recount how St. Peter was directed to Rome and how Christ appeared to him.

Thus, Rome was divinely protected and defended by the canonical successors of St. Peter, the true vicars of Jesus Christ, 'quibus omnis terrena potestas subdita est'. The argument for both the temporal and the spiritual sovereignty of the Papacy is now developed, first with recourse to late antique sources, and then by rehearsing the rights historically due to the Popes for confirming, and investing, both prelates and emperors. The canonically elected Roman Pope had principality over all prelates and clerics. There could be no prelate unless elected and confirmed by the Pope. Equally, the election of emperors was historically the prerogative of the Roman soldiery or people. And although this right had subsequently been brought into contempt, and hence surrendered to the prelates and princes of Germany, the Emperor had still to seek confirmation and coronation from the Pope in Rome:


199. Arch. Col., ff. 23v-24r.
201. Ibid.
202. Ibid.
praelatus, nisi aut eligatur, aut saltem confirmetur per eum, aut habentes potestatem ab ipso. Item in electione et confirmatione, ac coronatione Imperatoris. Nam licet hactenus Romanorum Imperator per Romanos milites, aut Romanum populum eligeretur. Tandem ad obviandum scandalis, quae in contemptione huiusmodi electionis veniebat, Romanus populus quibusdam Praelatis et Principibus Alamanniae, Imperatorem eligendi dederunt pro certo tempore potestatem. Nihilominus Imperator ipse est in urbe per Romanum Pontificem confirmandus, et etiam coronandus...

The temporal dominion of the Papacy was also revealed by the Christian kings subservient to it. These are listed by Signorili in order of precedence. In addition, to the Papacy belonged the right to appoint monarchs to the feudatory thrones of Jerusalem, Sicily, Aragon, Sardinia and Hungary, a right implicit in the diplomatic customarily employed in the papal briefs directed to them. Signorili illustrates the point by quoting the titles adopted by Martin V in his correspondence with them, and with other emperors and kings. Proof of the Pope's temporal supremacy was also afforded by the territories paying feudal tribute (tallage etc.) to the Papacy. Signorili lists them. This, in turn, is followed by lists of the archbishoprics and bishoprics of the Roman Church in Italy, Europe, and ultra mare.

Such are the premises that lead Signorili to proclaim unreservedly that the whole world was subject, in both spiritual and

1 Sic. Vat. Lat. 3536, f. 33v, ditto.

204. Arch. Col., ff. 24v-25r.
205. Ibid.
206. On tallage accruing to the Apostolic Chamber during the pontificate of Martin V, see Partner 1958, 111-118.
207. Arch. Col., f. 25r-v.
208. Arch. Col., ff. 25v-32r.
temporal affairs, de facto and de jure, to the jurisdiction of Rome:

'Bene quidem conclusititur ex praemissis, et verissimis ac fortissimis argumentis ostenditur, totum orbem terrarum esse Romanae jurisdictioni subjiciendum, tam in spiritualibus quam in temporalibus, quod non potest alia tergiversatione celari, et prout potest etiam per iuris et facti allegationes ostendi.'

Signorili now turns his attention to another concern of the medieval census-books, namely the catalogue of Roman churches. After listing the five patriarchal basilicae of Rome (the Lateran, St. Peter's, S. Paolo fuori le Mura, Sta. Maria Maggiore and S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura), he proceeds to catalogue the titular churches of the Cardinalate. He then interrupts his catalogue for a brief excursus on the methods and ceremonies of papal elections. Returning to the churches of Rome, he explains that these are divided into three parts, the three traditional partes, in fact, of the Fraternitas Romana, S. Tommaso, SS. Cosma e Damiano and SS. Apostoli:

'Super quo est notandum quod in urbe ipsa sunt infinitae ecclesiae, quas repperio tripartitas in tres videlicet partes: videlicet in partitam Sancti Thomae apostoli, Sanctorum Cosmae et Damiani, et duodecim Apostolorum.'

Though the churches of the city are divided into these three regional sections, the following catalogue of them follows no discernible topographical system. Nor is it entirely complete.
To the catalogue of churches is appended a detailed church-by-church catalogue of relics preserved in Rome. This constitutes, in length, by far the most substantial section of Signorili's treatise. The treatise then ends with a final brief apostrophe to Roma sacra, chosen by God to be the abode of his saints, and elevated above all other cities of the world: 'O felix Roma sancta, inclyta et beata, quam ipse Deus omnipotens in domicilium sanctorum suorum elegit, aliisque urbis Orbis praeposuit'.

5. Discussion

The preceding synopsis should make clear the miscellaneous character of Signorili's treatise, a character, as has been suggested, shaped in the medieval mold of the Liber Censuum. The first question that arises is one of authorship. Can it be assumed that Signorili was responsible for the whole work? The inclusion of a text of the Curiosum, the explicit borrowings from Martinus Polonus and the source known as Estodius, the numerous quotations from classical and medieval sources, as well as Signorili's own admission in the prooemium that he had indirectly derived some information, at least, from a lost Roman census-book, all indicate that his rôle was rather one of compiler than

217. Arch. Col., ff. 36v-61v. N.B. Valentini and Zucchetti in CTR, IV, 188-191, give only the headings of the relic-list, and omit the actual catalogue entirely. Huelsen 1927, 50-52, provides an index of the relic-list with reference to the Colonna LB.

218. Arch. Col., f. 61v; CTR, IV, 191.
Even the epigraphic sylloge that bears his name, as will be argued in the following chapter, is, in all likelihood, the work of another.

In this case, it may be wondered whether the *Descriptio Urbis Romae* itself may not also have been borrowed, and simply incorporated in Signorili's treatise. The MSS. of the *Descriptio* are not, indeed, associated with Signorili's name. Yet, as we have seen, De Rossi's assumption, on palaeographical grounds, that the compilation of the *Descriptio* is independent of, and antecedent to, that of Signorili's *De iuribus*, does not stand up to scrutiny. On the contrary, there is a strong piece of internal evidence in the *Descriptio*, overlooked by both De Rossi and Silvagni, that it was actually composed by Signorili, though the greater part of it is admittedly little more than a reworking of Martinus Polonus: that is, the section on the regions of Rome, on the office of the caporioni, and the precedence of the caporione of Monti, which seems to reveal Signorili's hand.

If the *De iuribus* as a whole may be judged to be in the tradition of the *Liber Censuum*, the *Descriptio* belongs to that of the *Graphia* as transmitted by Martinus Polonus. The latter, in the Dugento, it may be recalled, began his *Chronicon* with an account, comparable to Signorili's, on the origins of Rome, followed by chapters on the gates, palaces, and temples of the city, followed, in turn, by an historical account of Rome under the kings and consuls. The context is analogous to that of the *Descriptio* in Signorili's treatise.

A further precedent for Signorili's treatise may be adduced,

---

219. Cod. Chigiano I. VL 204, f. 1r; Vat. Lat. 10687, f. 1r; CTR, IV, 166-167.
namely the \textit{Polistoria} of Cavallini.\textsuperscript{221} Much of the antiquarian content of this work - its legendary account of the origins of Rome,\textsuperscript{222} its sections on the gates, hills and the medieval regions of the city,\textsuperscript{223} as well as its pervasively encomiastic treatment of the rights and privileges of the Romans - recalls Signorili's work. The comparison, in this case, is hardly in Signorili's favour, since, in its topographical aspect, the \textit{De iuribus} is less comprehensive and generally less learned than the \textit{Polistoria}.\textsuperscript{224}

One exception, at least, may be made to this judgement. The short account of Monte Testaccio does show an independent recourse to archaeological evidence (i.e. to inscribed potsherds), even if, in this case, the deduction made from it is wrong. Another exception might be thought to be Signorili's treatment of Roman triumphal arches. But precisely because this betrays the advanced influence of the epigraphic activity in early Quattrocento Rome, which we associate, above all, with Poggio, it cannot be thought to be Signorili's own work. Indeed, of the nine arches he describes, the seven accompanied with transcripts of their inscriptions are precisely those arches included in the \textit{Sylloge Signoriliana},\textsuperscript{225} which, as will be argued below, was not Signorili's work at all.

In other respects, Signorili demonstrably shares more with the spirit of the \textit{Graphia} than he does with the humanistic antiquarianism of his day. Though his treatise does show a certain familiarity with

\textsuperscript{221} CTR, IV, 11-54. See also \textit{supra}, chap. II. 2 (b).
\textsuperscript{222} CTR, IV, 25-27.
\textsuperscript{223} CTR, IV, 27-53.
\textsuperscript{224} Cf. their respective treatment of the gates of Rome: CTR, IV, 27-41, 167-169.
\textsuperscript{225} Cf. \textit{Sylloge Signoriliana}, nos. 1-7, G.L., VI, Pars 1, XVI-XVII; and Signorili, \textit{supra}, nos. 3-9; CTR, IV, 193-194.
humanistic learning (e.g. his quotations from Livy, and his reproduction of a text of the *Curiosum*), it has neither been properly assimilated, nor adequately respected. Thus, he prefers to base his survey of the legendary origins of Rome on a medieval source rather than on Livy. In style, too, Signorili falls far short of the curial humanists of his day. The prooemium itself, with its forced metaphors and leaden flights of rhetoric, is a kind of travesty of a humanist's dedicatory preface.

There is, indeed, in the *De iuribus et excellentiae urbis Romae*, a fundamental disparity, even disjunction, between its humanistic or proto-humanistic elements and the traditional procedures of the 'communal antiquarianism', to which Signorili was nominally heir. To the obsolete *testimonia* of Martinus Polonus, Estodius, and the census-books, he has attempted, promiscuously, to wed the new-fangled epigraphy and classical scholarship, introduced into Rome by the humanists employed in Martin V's Curia. But at heart he belongs, both by allegiance and learning, with the Roman antiquarians of the Trecento. A municipal official, with parochial interests, Signorili is unlikely to have had any close connections with the far more cosmopolitan, discriminating, and erudite antiquarian circle comprised of Poggio Bracciolini and his colleagues in the Curia.

This view will be reinforced, in the ensuing chapter, by a consideration of the epigraphic *sylloge* attributed to Signorili.
CHAPTER VI

THE RISE OF ROMAN EPIGRAPHY

Something has already been said of the importance of epigraphy to the development of humanistic antiquarianism during the first three decades of the Quattrocento in Rome.¹ It now remains to look at the earliest syllogai of Roman inscriptions in more detail, though not to such an extent as to trespass onto the terrain of the classical epigraphist, or to traverse ground already covered by De Rossi, Henzen, Silvagni, and Ziebarth.²

1. The so-called Sylloge Signoriliana

The corpus of Roman inscriptions known as the Sylloge Signoriliana, incorporated in the two MSS. of the Descriptio Urbis Romae already discussed,³ was attributed by De Rossi to Cola di Rienzo.⁴ This view, though demonstrably based on false assumptions, still finds protagonists today.⁵ In fact, De Rossi, in his pioneering study of 1852, had previously given the sylloge to Nicolò Signorili, under whose name it is found in two further MSS., Vat. Lat. 3851 and Cod. Mediceo Palatino 188.⁶ Subsequently, in a paper of 1871, persuaded by an erroneous dating of Cod. Chigiano L VI. 204 and Vat. Lat. 10687

1. See supra, chap. IV. 3.
2. De Rossi 1852, passim; De Rossi 1857-88, II, 316-342; Henzen in C.I.L., VI, Pars I, XV-XLI; Silvagni 1924, passim; Ziebarth 1902 and 1913, passim.
to the Trecento, De Rossi revised his opinion, and now gave the initial compilation of both **sylloge** and **Descrip**tio to Cola di Rienzo. 7

This revised hypothesis was adopted by Henzen in C.I.L, 8 and reformulated by De Rossi himself in the **Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae**. 9 Here De Rossi postulated a scheme of three successive recensions through which the 'sylloge inscriptionum confecta a Nicolao Laurentii' ostensibly passed: 10

1. First Recension represented by Codex Barb. Lat. 1952, ff. 170-175, with a partly obliterated superscription dated 1409: '... Romae reperta in annis Domini mille CCCCVIII et omnium archuum triumphalium et aliarum scripturarum et Sant' Ioannis in Laterano tabule enea. ' 11

On a collation with codices of the second and third recensions, De Rossi restored the missing **incipit** as 'Epitaphia portarum, pontium, aquarum ductuum ... Romae reperta etc. ' 12

2. Second Recension, associated with texts of the **Descrip**tio Urbis Romae, represented by Cod. Chigiano I. VI. 204, and the codex from S. Nicolò dell'Area, now Vat. Lat. 10687, dated by De Rossi respectively to c. 1347 and 1378. 13 Further MSS. of this recension were identified by De Rossi in the Biblioteca Civica of Turin 14 and in the 16th century Cod. Chigiano I. V. 168. 15

3. Third Recension, that made by Nicolò Signorili, represented by Vat. Lat. 3851, with the undated **subscription** (f. 50r), in which

---

7. De Rossi 1871, 3ff.
8. C.I.L., VI, Pars 1, XV-XVI.
Signorili claims to have compiled the *sylloge* himself: 'Epitaphia in aliquibus arcubus triumphalis ac pontibus aquarumque ductibus atque sepulcris et aliis nonnullis locis, tam in alma Urbe quam in aliis partibus, ad commendationem famamque senatus populi Romani ac pontificum et imperatorum aliorumque virorum illustrium commendationem dignorum facta, in praesenti libello, prout potui, ego N. Signorilis de Urbe, ad delectationem legentium recollegi.'

Vat. Lat. 3851 contains, in addition, a text of the *Notitia* (ff. 40r-42v), a numerical account of the walls of Rome taken from the *Mirabilia* (f. 42v), a list of Popes (ff. 42v-43r), and the *Libellus Bedae de Situ Terrae Promissionis* (ff. 44v-50r). Further MSS. of this recension were identified by De Rossi in Mediceo Palat. 118 (15th century), Traiectino Lat. 59 (15th century), and Vat. Otto. 2970 (16th century).

To either the first or third of these recensions, De Rossi attributed the 'Epitaphia antiqua in tabulis Romanae Urbis' known to have existed in the distinguished Roman library of Cardinal Giordano Orsini, a library which, in itself, provides an excellent instance of the growing interest in Roman antiquities and topography during the early Quattrocento.

De Rossi's scheme of three recensions, the first and second attributed to Cola di Rienzo, and the third to Signorili, has been shown by Silvagni to be without adequate palaeographical or historical

16. Ibid., 319.
19. Ibid.
A revised assessment of the earliest MSS. of the syllogi may begin with the recognition that none of them can antedate the Quattrocento. It is reasonable to suppose, in turn, that the date of 1409 inscribed on Cod. Barb. Lat. 1952, which De Rossi thought was merely the date of transcription, actually represents the date of compilation. Indeed, De Rossi was not mistaken in perceiving in Barb. Lat. 1952 textual indications that this was the recensio prima, although, in his view, it postdated the earliest MS. of the recensio altera by over half a century. The text of the sylloge in this MS. is the most faithful to the inscriptions it reproduces, as well as being, in content and arrangement, the most archaic. De Rossi's recensio altera, hence, represents a re-arrangement and amendment of the first with a few additions. This recension was then appended to the texts of the Descriptio Urbis Romae, which, as has been argued above, is a work of Nicolo Signorili. The association with Signorili is made explicit in another recension, independent of the Descriptio, contained in Vat. Lat. 3851.

The Sylloge Signoriliana consists of 81 items, of which 59 are monumental Latin inscriptions from ancient Rome and its environs. In addition, there are 7 Latin inscriptions from Arezzo, Nepi, Fara Sabina, and Ancona; 7 Greek inscriptions from Rome, Naples and Capua; and 8 medieval inscriptions from Rome. The contents of the

24. See supra, chap. V. 5.
25. S. L.I., VI, Pars 1, XVI-XXVI.
27. Nos. 63-69.
sylloge are presented below, in tabulated form, in Appendix C.

The title of the sylloge, as we have seen, derives from Vat. Lat. 3851. Yet the earliest presumed codex of the sylloge, Barb. Lat. 1952, dated 1409, bears no reference to Signorili's authorship. In any event, it precedes that of Signorili's De iuribus et excellentiis urbis Romae by some two decades. The suspicion, prompted by the MSS., that Signorili was not, in fact, the original author of the sylloge, as he purported to be in the subscription to Vat. Lat. 3851, is borne out by the actual contents. Two elements, in particular, are irreconcilable with what is known of Signorili's situation and culture: the Greek inscriptions, and the inscriptions from outside Rome. Signorili would have had neither the competence nor the opportunity to transcribe these. They are clearly the work of a humanist, able to transcribe Greek.

The assumption that the sylloge was compiled in 1409 by a humanist working in Rome, and presumably attached to the Curia, may be reinforced by the recognition that the transcripts in Barb. Lat. 1952 approximate most closely both to the original texts of the inscriptions and to the transcripts included in the Sylloge Poggiana. In some respects, the two syllogai are complementary. Silvagni, indeed, concluded that the so-called Sylloge Signoriliana conserves, to an unverifiable degree, the fruits of Poggio's epigraphic activity before 1414 (the year of his departure for Switzerland).

If the author of the sylloge was a colleague or a follower of

29. On the date of Signorili's treatise, see supra, chap. V. 2.
30. Weiss, who unreservedly accepts the sylloge as Signorili's work, concedes that the Latin translation following the Greek inscription of the Temple of the Dioscuri at Naples (Cod. Barb. Lat. 1952, f. 174v) cannot have been by Signorili himself: Weiss 1969, 146 and note 9.
32. Silvagni 1924, 183.
Poggio in Rome, it is hardly likely to have been Signorili, who was generally out-of-touch with the humanistic culture of his day. Moreover, as has been shown from a study of the De iuribus et excellentiis urbis Romae, Signorili was not averse to borrowing materials indiscriminately from other sources, and so to accuse him of plagiarising the sylloge that now bears his name ('con una disinvoltura non insolita nella letteratura epigrafica', as Silvagni remarks with acerbity), is hardly injudicious. Nor can Signorili's learning and his known antiquarian procedures (deriving, in essence, from the Mirabilia) be easily reconciled with a sylloge, which pre-eminently reflects the field-archaeology of the day, founded, above all, by Poggio. To regard Signorili, under such circumstances, as one of the founding-fathers of Renaissance epigraphy would be absurd. Since the notion is perpetuated by the commonly accepted title of the sylloge, it may be advisable to seek an alternative name. This may most sensibly derive from the earliest MS. of the sylloge: Barberiniana.

2. Sylloge Poggiana

Whoever its compiler, the Sylloge Barberiniana can be connected, directly or indirectly, with the first phase of Poggio Bracciolini's epigraphic activity in Rome. As has already been mentioned, Poggio had compiled a small sylloge of Roman inscriptions as early as 1403, soon after his first arrival in Rome. This he sent to Coluccio Salutati, who had apparently requested him to send copies of ancient inscriptions.

33. Ibid.
Nothing is known of the contents of this sylloge, but Salutati, on receiving it, thanked Poggio and complemented him on his productiveness:

\[ \text{'Ago gratias de cascis illis titulis, quos tam copiose, tam celeriter transmisist. Video quidem te pauco tempore nobis Urbem totam antiquis epigrammatibus traditurum.'} \] 36

Such epistolary evidence for the dissemination of Poggio's earliest sylloge can be substantiated by what is known of the way Poggio lent out his later sylloge among his colleagues. It was presumably in this manner that the basis, at least, of the Sylloge Barberiniana was laid.

This first phase of Poggio's study, and transcription, of the ancient inscriptions of Rome was interrupted by political upheavals, which, ironically enough, had the fortuitous effect of revolutionising practically the entire spectrum of Italian humanism of the Quattrocento, including epigraphy. On 7 June 1413, threatened by the imminent occupation of Rome by Ladislaus of Naples, Pope John XXIII with his entire curia left the Vatican for the palace of Count Orsini of Manupello. 37 The following day, in the footsteps of Innocent VII, he perilously escaped to Viterbo. 38 The precociously brilliant humanistic culture which he had implanted in Rome was uprooted overnight. Poggio, Bruni, Vergerio, Cencio de' Rustici, Aragazzi, and other humanists employed in the Curia accompanied or followed the Pope to Constance, where, on 22 May 1415, he was formally deposed. 39

It was while in attendance at the Council of Constance that

---

37. Gregorovius, VI, 627.
38. Ibid., 628.
39. Ibid., 645.
Poggio's epigraphic pursuits were stimulated and enlightened by two finds. One was of a codex containing at least a part of the Notae juris of Valerius Probus, an invaluable guide to the system of abbreviations encountered in Roman inscriptions. The other find was of a fragment of an ancient sylloge similar to that in the Carolingian codex (no. 326) at Einsiedeln. This 'parvum quaternionem epitaphia' Poggio abstracted and took back to Italy. In April 1432 Ambrogio Traversari indicated to Poggio, who was then in Rome, that this sylloge, evidently written in Carolingian miniscule, was at the time in the Camaldulensian monastery in Florence:

'Quaternionem solum ac vetustissimum, in quo plura epigrammata Romanae Urbis scripta sunt non maiusculis sed communibus litteris, inquires ... eique restitues, nam suus est. Erat in cellula nostra et, credo, facile reperietur.'

That it was left behind at Terranova near Florence with the rest of his library is revealed by Poggio himself in two letters dating to 1451. One is addressed to Augustino Villa:

'Itaque mitterem ad te libenter epitaphia illa quae petis, si mecum essent; sed illa reliqui una cum reliquis meis librís in patria natalís soli. Quare nequeo ad praesens satisfacere non tuae solum sed etiam meae in hac re voluntati. Sed res parvula est.'

The other letter, dated 22 January 1451, is addressed to Philippo Tifernati, who had also inquired after the sylloge:

40. On the discovery of the Notae juris by Poggio rather than Ciriaco d'Ancona, see Sabbadini 1903, 194-295. On the codex of the Notae juris in the library of Pizzolpasso, see Sabbadini 1905-14, I, 121; Paredi 1961, 126 (the MS. is now Ambrosiana, I. 115. Sup.). For further 15th century MSS., see Mommsen 1864, 269-270. See also Weiss 1969, 147, 165.
42. De Rossi 1857-88, II, 11.
43. Traversari, Epistolae, II (XI, 27), 512.
44. De Rossi 1857-88, II, 11.
45. Poggio, Epistolae, III (IX, 16), 35.
In both these letters Poggio admits that the sylloge was small.

Though the parent codex of this sylloge was left behind in Tuscany, Poggio evidently had a copy of it, since it became subsequently incorporated in his own amplified sylloge of Roman inscriptions, an apograph of which De Rossi identified in MS. Vat. Lat. 9152, ff. 27r-38v. This is a 15th century MS., corrupt and fragmented. The sylloge consists of two parts, of which the first corresponds to items 6-51 of the Einsiedeln sylloge (omitting nos. 9-11, 13, 18-20, 23, 28-29, 36, 40-41).

Poggio began compiling the second part of the Sylloge Poggiana, as represented in Vat. Lat. 9152, at an unspecified date after his return to Rome in 1423, assimilating, no doubt, some of the small collection he had previously made and sent to Salutati, and expanding it to include inscriptions copied by him in the Campagna. The sylloge had evidently been completed by the time of Pope Martin V's death on 20 February 1431, since in the dialogue of Book I of the De varietate Fortunae, written shortly afterwards, Poggio is complemented by his colleague, Antonio Loschi, on the inscriptions, both from within Rome and outside it, he had collected together into a small book.

---

46. Ibid. , III (X. 17), 38.
47. De Rossi 1852, 105-173.
49. C.I.L., VI, Pars 1, XXIX-XXXV.
50. Ibid. , XXXIX-XL, nos. 81-84. On Poggio's transcripts of inscriptions near Tivoli in 1424 and at Ferentino in August 1428, see supra, chap. IV. 3.
51. CTR, IV, 233; cf. De Rossi 1857-88, II, 339. For the quotation, see infra, chap. VII. 2 (a).
Poggio, in reply, proudly declares that he had dug many things out of darkness and exposed much that had been obscured by shrubbery, and that he had published the inscriptions entire 'so that if the Romans destroy them, as we have often seen them to do, at least the memory of the inscriptions may survive.' The three inscriptions from Ferentino included by Poggio in his sylloge (nos. 82-84), as well as the inscription from the Porta Tiburtina (no. 36), were only transcribed in 1428. They provide a terminus post quem for the completion of the sylloge as a whole, which may be dated to 1429-30.

There is no doubt that the Sylloge Poggiana was influential. Its contents were digested by several epigraphists of the later Quattrocento. Shortly after its compilation Ciriaco d'Ancona, when in Rome, is known to have studied it, and copied parts of it into his Commentaria. This Ciriacan redaction, with the Einsiedeln excerpt omitted, was identified by De Rossi in Cod. Angelicanus D. 4. 18, ff. 1-13. From this codex and Vat. Lat. 9152 Henzen traced two lines of recension, the one (a) transmitted through Ciriaco, Feliciano, Marcanova et al, and the other (b) deriving from the Vatican MS and transmitted through Iucundus and Mazochius. Since neither Vat. Lat.

52. On Poggio's clearance of the inscription over the Porta Tiburtina, see supra, chap. IV. 3.
53. CTR, IV, 233. See also infra, chap. VII. 2 (a).
54. C.I.L, VI, Pars 1, XXXIX-XL.
55. Ibid., XXXIII.
57. De Rossi 1857-88, II, 339. On the Codex Angelicanus, a late MS. (c. 1500) bearing the name of Francesco Contarini, whose family once had dealings with Ciriaco, see Ziebarth 1913, 198; Bodnar 1960, 104-105.
58. Henzen 1866-68, 227ff; C.I.L, VI, Pars 1, XXVIII.
9152 nor Angelicano D. 4. 18 is complete, the Sylloge Poggiana, as it existed in Poggio's own day, cannot be reconstructed in its entirety. A collation of the two MSS. produce a total of 87 inscriptions. These are briefly described, with relevant concordances, below in Appendix D. Of the total, almost half (41 items) are contained in the Sylloge Einsidlensis. They were copied by Poggio not from the stones (many of which were lost) but from the 'vetustissimum quaternionem' he had retrieved from Switzerland. Of them, the first six items represent early Christian inscriptions from Rome. Of the remainder of the sylloge no less than 28 items are also contained in the Sylloge Barberiniana. At the end of the sylloge are assembled a dozen inscriptions from Roman monuments elsewhere in Italy: from Arezzo, Ancona, Nepi, Ravenna, Perugia, Terni, Benevento, Tivoli, and Ferentino. Since Poggio is not known to have visited Ancona, Ravenna, or Benevento, the inscriptions from these places may have been supplied by friends; the first probably derives from Ciriaco, native of Ancona.

59. A full concordance of the Syllogai Barberiniana and Poggiana with those of Ciriaco, Marcanovo, Feliciano et al is given, in tabulated form, by Ziebarth 1913, 246-249.
60. C.I.L., VI, Pars 1, XXIX-XXXV. For a concordance between Einsidlensis and Poggiana, see infra, Appendix D.
61. C.I.L., VI, Pars 1, XXIX-XXX.
62. See infra, Appendix D, with concordance.
63. C.I.L., VI, Pars 1, XXXVIII-XL, nos. 73-84.
64. Walser 1914, 146.
3. Ciriaco d'Ancona in Rome

It is to Ciriaco d'Ancona that we must now turn. Like Poggio, Ciriaco's interest in antiquities was centred in epigraphy, and his archaeological investigations, whether in Italy or on his extensive travels in Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean, were dominated by his hunt for inscriptions. In Rome, too, he was concerned to compile a *sylloge*, a task he promoted by copying the two previous *syllogai* of Roman inscriptions (Barberiniana and Poggiana) into his *Commentaria*.

In 1421 Ciriaco, born into a well-to-do family of Italian merchants, was appointed financial adviser to Cardinal Gabriel Condulmieri, legate of the Marches under Martin V, and later (as Eugenius IV) to become that Pope's successor. Condulmieri had begun, in the same year, the reconstruction of the harbour at Ancona, then, as now, graced by Trajan's splendid triumphal arch. With Ciriaco business and recreation were easily reconcilable: while supervising the finances of the harbour-project, he investigated the arch, and enthusiastically transcribed its inscription. It was to become for him the paradigm of all inscriptions, and invariably headed the *excerpta* he made for his

65. The basic and most comprehensive account of Ciriaco's life and travels remains De Rossi 1857-88, II, 356-387. A new edition of, and commentary on, Francesco Scalantoni's *Vita* of Ciriaco is still eagerly awaited. See also Ziebarth 1902; McKenzie 1952; Ashmole 1956 and 1959; Mitchell 1960, 470-483; and Bodnar 1960, with other literature.


67. C.L.L., IX, 5894. One of Ciriaco's holograph transcripts of this inscription is preserved in a Vatican codex of Giannozzo Manetti's *De illustribus longaevis*, Palat. lat. 1603, f. 112v. See Campana 1959, 484, and tav. XXXVI. For further copies, either in Ciriaco's own hand or copied from him: *ibid.*, 485-492.
friends from his own extensive epigraphic collection. 68

In 1424 Condulmieri returned to Rome, and in December of the same year Ciriaco followed in his footsteps. Accepted as the Cardinal's guest, he remained in the city for forty days. He spent the time indefatigably scouring Rome and its environs on horseback in the hunt for antiquities and their associated inscriptions. In the partial biography of Ciriaco written by his colleague, Francesco Scalamonti, and largely culled from Ciriaco's own diaries and letters, 69 these antiquarian excursions are described as follows:

'... quotidie magnam per urbem niveo suo devectus equo quidquid tantae civitatis reliquum extaret, venerandae suae veterinitatis templa, theatra ingentiaque palatia, thermas, mirificos oblyiscos et insignes arcus, aquaeductus, pontes, statuas, columnas, bases et nobilia rerum epigrammata incredibili diligentia sua viderat, excutarat exceperatque, et ut postea ex his quaque digna conficere commentaria posset, fide quaque suis ordine litteris commendavit. At et cum maximas per urbem tam generosissimae gentis reliquias undique solo disiectas aspexisset, lapides et ipsi magnarum rerum gestarum maiorem longe quam ipsi libri fidem et notitiam praebere videbantur. Quam ob rem et reliqua per orbem diffusa videre atque litteris mandare proposuit. 70

Scalamonti, in this passage, refers to the inception of the Commentaria, the commonplace-book into which Ciriaco transcribed the inscriptions he found, together with other miscellaneous information, such as topographic descriptions and sketches of antiquities. The problem of Ciriaco's precise antiquarian pursuits in Rome, as elsewhere, is complicated by the fact that the Commentaria, which by 1441 had expanded to three large volumes and by the time of Ciriaco's death

69. Spadolini 1901; Campana 1959, 485; Bodnar 1960, note 1.
70. Scalamonti, Vite ... Kiriaci Anconitani, LXXII. Cf. C.L.L., VI, Pars 1, XL; Huelsen 1907B, 7.
(c. 1455) had apparently swollen to double that size, subsequently disappeared. Mommsen thought it was simply broken up and dispersed. Sabbadini advanced the more plausible theory that it was destroyed in the fire which gutted the Sforza library at Pesaro in 1514. Whatever the truth of the matter, the loss of the Commentaria means that any reconstruction of Ciriaco's Roman sylloge must substantially derive either from the excerpts he himself made for his friends or from the copies made by his followers. Since the task of ascertaining what constitutes a Ciriacan autograph, or what constitutes a redaction from it by another hand, is hazardous enough to muddle, or to intimidate, even the most exacting scholars, neither of these lines of transmission is free from doubt.

It has, nevertheless, been computed that Ciriaco's complete sylloge of inscriptions from Rome alone contained some 400 items. Not all were collected during his first visit to Rome. Ciriaco returned to the city in 1433, both to continue his epigraphic activities, and to act as cicerone to the visiting Emperor Sigismund,

74. Thus Saxl 1940-41, basically a study of the Codex Ashmolensis of Bartholomaeus Fontius, while conceding that a large part of the epigraphic collection 'contains what are undoubtedly Ciriacana', relegates a discussion of Fontius' exact dependence to a footnote: ibid., 30, note 2.
75. Ziebarth 1902, 224.
76. One inscription which Ciriaco cannot have transcribed during his first visit to Rome is one from the Theatre of Pompey (G.I.L., VI, 1193), recording a restoration under Arcadius and Honorius; this is only encountered in Codex Parmensis 1191, f. 98 (on the Ciriacan character of this MS., see Bodnar 1960, 106-110), but in his De varietate Fortunae Poggio alludes to the same inscription, indicating that it had only recently been excavated: 'Id ut credam, litterae quaedam adducunt, effossis nuper marmoribus, quae in eius collapsa porticus columnis immixa reperta sunt, incisae. Alterae, epigrammate effracto, genium theatric quodam praefecto urbis instaurabum ferunt, alterae a Symmacho urbis praefecto Honorio Augusto dicatum' CTR, IV, 239. Cf. De Rossi 1857-68, II, 359.
to whom he ruefully complained about the destruction of the antiquities for lime. In later life Ciriaco may have visited Rome on several occasions, partly in order to prevail upon Pope Nicholas V to undertake a crusade against the Turks. To the draft of the Itinerarium addressed to Eugenius IV in 1441, which contains an unreliable account of his travels up to 1435, and which was published by Mehus from the transcript of Ioannes Bononiensis (1498), Cod. Vat. Ottob. 2967, Ciriaco attached a small sylloge of 36 inscriptions from Rome, several of them from the early Christian basilicas. To these may be added the copies Ciriaco is known to have made from both the Sylloge Barberiniana and the Sylloge Poggiana. The former he may have transcribed already during his first visit to Rome. The latter, since it was only completed shortly before 1431, Ciriaco can only have copied, at the earliest, during his second visit to Rome in 1433. He evidently made some attempt to collate the readings given by both these earlier syllogai with the actual stones; as a result, the Commentaria must have contained, at times, three copies of a single inscription, the third being made by

78. Huelsen 1907B, 7. On Ciriaco's putative visit to Rome during the Jubilee of 1450, see De Rossi 1857-88, II, 374.
79. Of the known MSS. of the Itinerarium, the apograph Cod. Vat. Ottob. 2967, published by Mehus, represents Ciriaco's draft and was never actually sent, whereas the holograph Cod. Laurentianus 80, 55, dated 18 October 1441, a much truncated version, was in fact sent to Cosimo de' Medici; from it stems Feliciano's copy in Treviso, Biblioteca Capitolare, ms. L 138; on this latter MS., containing other Ciriacana, including Scalamonti's biography, see Mitchell 1961, 209.
Ciriaco directly from the stone. 83

Our knowledge of Ciriaco's collection of Roman inscriptions may further be substantiated from the later *syllogai* that incorporate material from it. 84 Among them, Cod. Angelicano D. 4. 18, 85 the anonymous Cod. Parmensis 1191, 86 the Berlin Hamiltonianus, 87 and the Redianus, now Cod. Laurentianus 10, 77, written in 1474 by Alessandro Strozza in Venice, 88 all contain, *inter alia*, transcripts from both the *Sylloge Barberiniana* and *Sylloge Poggiana*. 89 Cod. Hamiltonianus, dedicated by Ciriaco himself to Pietro Donato, bishop of Padua, was thought at one time to be a Ciriacan holograph, but the arguments for assuming that it was have now been undermined by Ashmole. 90 These and other Quattrocento *syllogai* containing material derived from Ciriaco have recently been re-examined by Bodnar, who has reconstructed their stemmatic recension from the *Commentaria*. 91

The MSS. evidence for the prolific dissemination of Ciriaco's collection of inscriptions among his followers is corroborated by some epistolary evidence to show that his Rome *sylloge*, in particular, was circulating in Lombardy and the Marches before 1461.

84. De Rossi 1857-88, II, 359, col. 2, note 3; cf. C.I.L., VI, Pars 1, XIV.
89. For details of the transmission of inscriptions from both *syllogai* through these and other MSS., notably the collections of Marcanova and Feliciano, see C.I.L., VI, Pars 1, XV-XL.
90. Ashmole 1959, 29-34.
91. Bodnar 1960, 73-120.
On 10 February of that year Lodovico Gonzaga, Lord of Mantua, wrote to Vincenzo Scalona, his agent in Milan, asking if the *sylloge* of inscriptions from Rome collected by Ciriaco in the possession of Francesco Sforza could be sent to Mantua, so that a copy could be made. To make the loan more attractive to Sforza, Gonzaga offered to have assembled for him an *addendum* of inscriptions absent from the *sylloge*:

'Dilecte noster. Perchè nui intendemo che 'l m.RO che era de Sforza se trova haver un libretto dove sono scripti molti epigrammati tolti a Roma per Chiarico d'Ancona et havendoni nuy novamente facto transcrivere uno hauto da Fiorenza, haveresassino a caro haver questo de Chiarico per far il nostro tanto più copioso; perchè voressimo tu pregasti da parte nostra il prefato maestro, che in servizio ne voglia impressare dicto libretto, che ne farà piacere assai, che come l'habiamo facto adoprar subito ge lo remandaremo, avisandolo che se 'l ge mancharà alcuno de questi epigrammati havemo nuy il faremo giongere suxo il suo. Vedi adunche mandarcelo più presto che puoi. Mant. X februarij 1461.'92

The letter is a fine testimony to Ciriaco's reputation as an epigraphist, and also to the fact that his *sylloge* of inscriptions from Rome was well known not only to Italian humanists of the mid-Quattrocento but to their patrons as well. This new courtly taste for ancient inscriptions was one which Ciriaco, in his trips round the courts of Italy, directly helped to foster.93

Though, as an epigraphist of Rome, Ciriaco decidedly followed in the footsteps of Poggio, in one important respect his type of antiquarianism was more original. He not only took copies of inscriptions, but he also made *in situ* drawings of antiquities. Unfortunately, his drawings relating to Rome have been lost and the slight information we have of them derives from copies made by his

---

93. Ziebarth 1902, 223.
followers. Though self-taught, in art as in scholarship, his ability as an artist received some flattering testimonials from contemporaries, including Giovanni Aurispa and Carlo Marsuppini.\footnote{De Rossi 1857-88, II, 381-382; Huelsen 1907B, 8-9.} Of the Ciriacan drawings of Roman antiquities known through copies, perhaps the best authenticated is the reconstruction of the Mausoleum of Hadrian included in the Codex Ashmolensis (f. 63r), which was compiled during the late Quattrocento by Bartholomaeus Fontius.\footnote{Saxl 1940-41, 32, 42; Ashmole 1959, 37-38, with a discussion of the relationship between this drawing and Filarete’s relief of Hadrian’s Mausoleum on the bronze doors of St. Peter’s.} More problematical are the drawings with allegedly Ciriacan prototypes made by the architect Giuliano di San Gallo and his son Francesco c. 1500 in the sketchbook, now Cod. Vat. Barb. Lat. 4424;\footnote{See Bodnar 1960, 110-111 and table XL.} among them is a drawing of the Porta Tiburtina, and underneath it (a typically Ciriacan anomaly) is shown a statue of a giant from Athens.\footnote{Ashmole 1959, 40 and plate XIVb.}

Other drawings deriving from Ciriaco’s Roman sketches doubtless exist, yet the thesis advanced by Christian Huelsen that the series of 18 drawings contained in the Modena codex of Giovanni Marcanova (ff. 25-44) are also his work is now generally discounted.\footnote{Huelsen 1907B, 6-8. Huelsen’s attribution of the Modena drawings to Ciriaco was first disputed by Venturi in 1910 (see Ashmole 1959, 37, note 1) and has never won general support.} Though the greater part of the epigraphic material in the codex (devoted to the Roman inscriptions of the cities of Northern Italy) apparently does derive from Ciriaco, and though there is, as Huelsen noted, some coincidence between Scalamonti’s list of the ancient
monuments of Rome studied by Ciriaco and the subject-matter of the Modena drawings (capriccie in which, inter alia, Monte Testaccio, the 'Palacium Cesaris', the Capitol, the Forum, triumphal arches, the statue of Marcus Aurelius, the Vatican obelisk, the Baths of Diocletian, and Castel S. Angelo occur), the drawings are too fantastic to betray any evidence of being based on first-hand familiarity with Rome. Since the Modena drawings demonstrably belong to the period 1452-65, they are also rather too late to be associated with Ciriaco. Even on the assumption that they are copied after Ciriaco, their style cannot easily be reconciled with what is known of Ciriaco's graphic style from autograph and other well-authenticated sources. The style of the Modena drawings is Paduan.

99. The drawings are reproduced, with commentary, by Huelsen 1907B, 24-36, tav. I-XVIII.
100. The Modena codex is inscribed on f. 10v with Marcanova's name and the date 20 November 1465. And the drawing of Castel S. Angelo of f. 39 includes the round tower of Nicholas V, with his coat-of-arms, and, on top, the statue of an angel, placed in position not earlier than 1452; the account for this statue, dated 25 June 1453, authorizing payment of 74 ducats to Giacomo d'Aquila, has been published by MIntz 1878-82, I, 153; cf. Huelsen 1907B, 34. The Modena drawings thus belong to the period 1452-65. Ciriaco died c. 1455.
101. Cf. in particular the sketches contained in the autograph Codex Ambrosianus-Trotti, 373, ff. 101-125 (dating to 1447-1448), reproduced by Sabbadini 1910; on the MS. see Bodnar 1960, 117-119. For Ciriacoan drawings existing only in copies, see also Ashmole 1956, passim; Ashmole 1959, 28-38.
102. Lawrence 1927, 129-131. On the derivation of the drawings in the Garrett MS. at Princeton from the Modena MS., see ibid., 127-128; Dennis 1927, passim. Unfortunately, the stylistic correspondences between the Modena drawings and those in the Florentine World Chronicle from the Ruskin Collection, now in the British Museum, already noted by Elizabeth Lawrence 1927, 129, are ignored by Degenhart and Schmitt 1968, I, 2. 566-620, 573-621, Taf. 385-439a, in their recent republication of the Florentine drawings.
There is one aspect of these drawings which does, in a more
general sense, call to mind Ciriaco. In the drawing of the Roman
Forum of f. 29, represented as a market-place, inscribed on the pedestal
of a statue is the decidedly spurious inscription: 'C. Camillius C. f.
Furio  v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) et
l(aribus) de s(uo).' The taste for fake inscriptions is one which
Ciriaco wholeheartedly shared. Sometimes it led to excess, as when he
purported to have found the epitaph of a mad Carthaginian called
Heliodorus at Gades in Spain. There are, besides, several fake
inscriptions purporting to come from Rome which are Ciriaca.n in origin;
they indicate that Ciriaco had a particular predilection for conjugal or
filial epitaphs of a rather enraptured type. But the predilection,
in this case, is not confined to Ciriaco, since the august Poggio himself
included precisely the same type of spurious sentimental epitaphs in his
own sylloge. The type calls to mind the equally spurious
'Epitaphium Lucretiae' allegedly found in Rome behind the church of San
Sisto in August 1426, and placed by order of Pope Martin V 'in sala que
dicitur de la fortuna'. The taste for such fake epitaphs

103. Huelsen 1907B, 6, 27, tav. 29.
105. C. I. L., VI, Pars 5, 7*-17*.
106. E.g. C. I. L., VI, Pars 5, no. 14*, included in the Ciriaca.n Cod.
Angelici f. 42: 'd. m / virginius filliae meae karissimae virgineae
nimia ob pietate propris meis manibus interemptae proh dolor
quantum fuit karissima in an. xvi iuventutis eius m. v d. iii.'
107. E.g. Sylloge Poggiana, no. 72: Vat. Lat. 9152, f. 35v: 'd. m / salustia phoebe sibi et petro/nio p. f. pal. rufo patri de suo/
et quintio repentinco coniugi / suo indulgentissimo et libert. /
libertabuaq. eor. et quibus donavi / donavero.' C. I. L., VI, Pars
1, XXXVIII nos. 69-71 of the same sylloge seem equally spurious,
but since they occur only in cod. Angelici, f. 9v and not in Vat.
Lat. 9152, are possibly Ciriaca.n interpolations.
108. Milan, Ambrosiana, MS. Trotti, 373, f. 90v: 'MCCCCXVI de mense
augusti. Epitaphium Lucretie compertum post templum S. Sixti ad
balnea antoniana quod papa martinus iussit locari in sala que
dicitur de la fortuna.' D. M S. Collatinus Tarquinus dulcissimae

Continued
commemorating the model heroines and spouses of antiquity also
anticipates the mood, at once funereal and enraptured, of the
_Hyperotomachia Polifili_.

4. Discussion

The taste for fake epitaphs shared by so many Renaissance
antiquarians reveals something of the psychology of epigraphy during
the period. Inscriptions constituted precisely that which humanised
antiquities; fakes capitalised on the sentimentalism thus engendered.
Through inscriptions the antiquarian could look beyond buildings or
monuments to the emperors who dedicated them or to the countless
ordinary men and women of antiquity who were enshrined in them.
Inscriptions gave voice to the tacit, and life to the inert. They
turned brick and stone into literate gestures of commemoration, whether
heroic or poignant, and communicated them to posterity. In the words
of Ciriaco d'Ancona, they could 'bring the names of cities back into
the light.' So emotional was the response they evoked, that the
appetite for them eventually found vicarious satisfaction in fakes.

That such an emotive power could, to the more discerning,
equally be conveyed by genuine inscriptions is implied by the feelings
of jubilation aroused by their discovery and decipherment. Poggio
clambering buoyantly to the top of the Porta Tiburtina to reveal its
inscription, Ciriaco mounting a ladder at Fano in 1423 to transcribe

meae coniugi et incomparabili lucreciae pudiciae decori et
mulierum gloriae quae vixit ann. xxii mens. v dieb. xvi.' Cf.
Trotti 373, f. 24v. = _C.I.L._ VI, Pars 5, 13*. Sabbadini 1933,
9, 17. The epitaph of Lucretia occurs in numerous _Ciriacan syllogai._

111. Poggio, _Epistolae_, I (III. 21), 222-223. On this episode, see
_supra_, chap. I. 3.
the inscription on the arch of Augustus and explicate it to the assembled crowd\textsuperscript{112} are instances of the mood of hilaritas inseparable from the epigraphic expeditions of the early Quattrocento. In neither case had the inscription the overtly political overtones exploited, out of self-interest, by Cola di Rienzo. The tendentious nature of Trecento epigraphy had been superseded by a more pervasively sentimental concern for the inscribed relics of the past.

The contrast, indeed, was even more fundamental than this. Though ancient inscriptions did arouse sporadic interest in the Middle Ages,\textsuperscript{113} their primary role as determining the date and attribution of the monuments they ornamented was invariably overlooked. In neither case could the identification of the Pyramid of Cestius with the Tomb of Remus, or of the Vatican obelisk with the Tomb of Julius Caesar, both shared by Petrarch and the Mirabilia,\textsuperscript{114} have arisen if attention had been paid to the explicit information conveyed by their respective inscriptions.\textsuperscript{115} The plain fact was that such inscriptions usually could not be understood. Poggio, who had the benefit of hindsight, and of both the Notae Juris of Valerius Probus and the Sylloge Einsiedlensis, could well afford to be amazed by Petrarch's inability to search out the inscription on the Pyramid of Cestius and thus controvert the popular opinion about it.\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{112} Mitchell 1960, 470.
\textsuperscript{113} On the imperial inscription from the Palatine recorded by Magister Gregorius, see CTR, III, 156. On aspects of Trecento epigraphy, see Weiss 1969, 18-28, passim, and on Petrarch's regard for ancient inscriptions, ibid., 36-37.
\textsuperscript{114} CTR, III, 17; IV, 6. CTR, III, 43-44; IV, 8.
\textsuperscript{115} C.I.L., VI, 1374, 882.
\textsuperscript{116} CTR, IV, 232-233.
The obscurities of Roman inscriptions, and the controversies aroused by their interpretation, may be illustrated by a later epistolary exchange between Ciriaco and Poggio. The former had sent Poggio an inscription from Aquileia with the words **IVNONIBUS SACRUM**. They aroused Poggio's incredulity. In an attempt to corroborate his reading, Ciriaco replied by notifying the other of an inscription from Parma in which the same reading **IVNONIBUS** allegedly occurred. 117

The correspondence is also indicative of the differences, indeed the antagonism, between the two. Goaded by a letter Ciriaco addressed on 30 January 1436 to Bruni criticizing his defence of Scipio Africanus and republicanism against Caesar and monarchy, 118 Poggio sought redress, as was his fashion, in character-assassination: Ciriaco was dismissed (in a letter to Bruni) in derisive terms, and his letter pilloried as a piece of impudence and literary ineptitude. 119 Ciriaco, of course, was not the solitary target of Poggio's vituperation (an essential ingredient of the polemics of the day), nor should it be allowed to poison our estimation of his undoubted merits as an antiquarian and epigraphist. Merely in the sense that through him were preserved numerous inscriptions that have subsequently been lost, his contribution was colossal. Nevertheless, to dub Ciriaco 'the

118. The autograph draft of Ciriaco's letter to Bruni formerly in the Rosenthal collection was partially published by Maas 1913. On the date of the letter, see Bodnar 1960, 23, note 2.
founder of archaeological science in the Renaissance is surely excessive. The basis of this science was epigraphy, and if anyone has a claim to be the progenitor of Renaissance epigraphy, it is Poggio, who compiled his first *sylloge* in Rome some twenty years before Ciriaco began work on his own. In any case, the same claim can hardly be made out for Signorili, who, in the magpie fashion characteristic of him, merely added his own name to an already existing *sylloge*. This, the *Sylloge Barberiniana*, as we have re-named it above, dates to 1409, and probably derives from Poggio himself.

This early *floruit* of epigraphy in Rome, during the first decade of the century, generated by Poggio, was blighted by the departure of Pope John XXIII for Constance, and the political turmoil which followed in its wake in Rome. It was only after Martin V's return to the city in 1420, and the re-gathering together of a humanistically-minded Curia, with Poggio as its doyen, that epigraphy could once again flourish. The period between December 1424, when Ciriaco began to compile his *Commentaria*, transcribing into it the earlier *Sylloge Barberiniana*, and February 1431, by which time, at the close of Martin V's pontificate, Poggio had completed his later *sylloge*, was marked by the renewed efflorescence of Roman epigraphy, with its incalculable contribution to the development of classical epigraphy in general, coterminous with the growth of other aspects, whether humanistic or artistic, of antiquarianism in Rome. This period in Rome, during the third decade of the Quattrocento, was clearly a decisive one both for the formation of the antiquarian culture of the Renaissance, and, by implication, for the further development of classical archaeology in its modern sense.

120. Mandowsky and Mitchell 1963, 8.
CHAPTER VII

THE DESCRIPTION OF ROME IN FOGGIO BRACCIOLINI'S

DE VARIETATE FORTUNAE

1. The De varietate Fortunae

(a) Date, Dedication, and Character

'In the last days of Pope Eugenius the Fourth,' so Gibbon begins the final chapter of his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 'two of his servants, the learned Poggius and a friend, ascended the Capitoline Hill; reposed themselves among the ruins of columns and temples; and viewed, from that commanding spot, the wide and varied prospect of desolation.'

It was, in fact, as the opening sentence of the *De varietate Fortunae* declares, rather during the last days of Pope Martin V that this important episode in the history of Renaissance antiquarianism purportedly took place. Martin V died in Rome on 20 February 1431. Poggio's discourse on the Capitoline Hill, and his dialogue with Antonio Loschi, may be dated to the autumn of the previous year; it cannot have taken place much earlier, since it contains a reference to Poggio's retrieval of the *De Aquaeductibus* of Frontinus from Monte Cassino in 1429. Book I of the *De varietate Fortunae* was presumably composed shortly after Martin V's death.

---

2. CTR, IV, 230. That Gibbon's assertion at the opening of chap. LXXI is a mere slip is indicated by note 51 to chap. LXV, where he more correctly states that 'the dialogue de Varietate Fortunae ... was composed a short time before the death of Pope Martin V, and consequently about the end of the year 1430.'
3. Poggio, Epistolae, I (III. 37), 284. The letter is dated 'IX. Julii 1429'. On the expedition, see also supra, chap. IV. 3.
Yet the work as a whole was not released until 1448, when it was dedicated to Pope Nicholas V, a year after his accession. Book III, which is devoted to a straightforward historical narrative of that Pope's predecessor, Eugenius IV (1431-1447), can only have been completed a few months beforehand. Book IV, the final book, has a terminus post quem of 1441, when Nicolò de' Conti, whose travels in the Orient it describes, arrived in Florence.

The composition of the De varietate Fortunae thus covered a period of some seventeen years. During this time, Poggio, not surprisingly, had second thoughts both about the scope of the work and its eventual dedication. That initially the De varietate Fortunae was conceived in two books only, devoted to the history of his own times, is revealed by Poggio himself in a letter of 14 September 1443 to Pietro del Monte, Bishop of Brixen. Five years later, however, in a letter of 28 February 1448 to Panormita, Poggio indicated that the work he was then in the process of editing had been enlarged to four books. Books I and IV, then, were evidently not part of the original scheme of the De varietate Fortunae. This conclusion is fortified by the sharp discrepancies in subject matter and literary mode between them and the two books they enclose.

4. See the closing pages of Book III, taking events up to the accession of Nicholas V: Poggio, Historiae de Varieitate Fortunae, 120-122. That Poggio was still busy editing the work in 1448 is shown by a letter of that year to Panormita: Poggio, Epistolae, II (IX. 23), 351: "Elidi quatuor libros de varietate fortunae, in quibus multa sunt cognitione digna." Cf. ibid., II (IX. 29), 363.

5. Poggio, Historiae de Varieitate Fortunae, 126; cf. ibid., Travelers in Disguise, ed. Hammond, XII. Further information contained in Book IV was gleaned from the Ethiopian delegation at the Council of Ferrara-Florence of January 1438 - July 1439.

6. Poggio, Epistolae, II (VIII. 46), 281.

Nor, it seems, did Poggio originally intend to dedicate the work to a Pope. That he had a lay patron in mind is implied both by the letter to Pietro del Monte of 1443 and by the secular tone of Book II; this opens with a short account of the unfortunate reign of Richard II of England, culminating in deposition and violent death. The exemplum seems to be aimed at an English patron, possibly Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester (1390–1447), or, more probably, his nephew, King Henry VI, the recipient of Frulovisi's Vita Henrici Quinti (c. 1437–1438), and a more active patron of Italian humanism than is generally supposed. In any event, Poggio changed his mind, eventually dedicating the De varietate Fortunae to Nicholas V, with whose munificence none of Poggio's erstwhile English patrons could possibly compete. Poggio had been befriended by Tommaso Parentucelli several

9. Poggio, Historiae de Varietate Fortunae, 40–44.
10. Weiss 1967, 20, states that, at Poggio's request, Richard Petworth showed the De varietate Fortunae to Gloucester, but the letter in question to Petworth, dated 30 July 1442, in fact refers to Poggio's De infelicitate princi;pum: Walser 1914, 458.
11. That Poggio originally considered dedicating the work to Henry VI is tentatively suggested by Fubini in Poggio, Opera Omnia, ed. Fubini, II, 499; the brief excursus on the Regnum Angliae, with which Poggio begins Book II of the De varietate Fortunae, initially conceived as the opening book, reinforces this hypothesis. For further aspects of Henry VI as a patron of Italian humanism, see Weiss 1967, 42, on the dedication of Frulovisi's Vita Henrici Quinti; on the dedication copy, apparently an autograph, now Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS. 285/1, see Bodleian Library, Duke Humphrey, 3, no. 4, with further bibliography; on Henry VI's recommendation of Pietro del Monte, Papal Collector in England, to Eugenius IV, see Weiss 1967, 28, note 3; on Antonio Luxorita's offer to the King to compose for him an encomium in Latin verse, see ibid., 191, and Weiss 1953, passim. Henry VI, it may be noted, attained his majority on 6 Dec. 1442, three months after Poggio's letter to Pietro del Monte, and it is conceivable that Poggio had this imminent fact in mind.
years before he became Pope. In 1446 Poggio dedicated to him the
dialogue De infelicitate principum, and, on his accession to the
papacy in the following year, addressed to him a fulsome oratio,
exhorting him to promote the study of literature, reminding him of
their past friendship, and, after forty indigent years in the service
of the Curia, soliciting 'the means of an honourable retirement.' So
generous was the Pope's response that Poggio was to declare himself
at last reconciled to fortune, though his remaining years in the
Curia, until being called back to Florence in 1453 to become
Chancellor, were marred by dissension and bitterness.

Because of its piecemeal composition, the De varietate
Fortunae is hard to classify in Poggio's oeuvre. Generically, it
belongs neither to his purely philosophical and moral works, nor to his
histories. In short, it is a mélange combining philosophic dialogue
with historical narrative and, in the two outer books, with
archaeological and ethnographic description. Its contents may briefly
be described. After the prooemium to Nicholas V, and the opening
description of Rome, a synopsis of which is given separately below,
Book I develops into a philosophical dialogue on the subject of Fortune
in general, its definition and dogma. Poggio's interlocutor, Antonio

12. On Tommaso Parentucelli's association with Poggio and other
Florentine humanists, when the Curia was resident in Florence from
1434, see Vesvasiano, Vite di Uomini Illustri, 24-25. Cf. Voigt
13. See the dedicatory preface, Poggio, Opera (Basel, 1538), 390-392.
14. For the Oratio, see ibid., 287-292. Cf. Shepherd 1802, 414-418;
Voigt 1893, II, 75-76.
15. Shepherd 1802, 418.
17. Poggio, Historiae de Varietate Fortunae, 1-4.
Loschi, expounds the Aristotelian view, that those circumstances are attributed to Fortune, which happen to man contrary to his intention.\(^{18}\) Poggio, on the other hand, is sceptical about the purely accidental and contingent nature of Fortune, since we speak of the good fortune of Alexander or Julius Caesar, who both laid clear plans to accomplish what they achieved.\(^{19}\) He adopts the Stoic position that Fortune was not a blind force intervening in human affairs, but a divine principle working for great men.\(^{20}\) This exchange of views — part of the wider Florentine debate on free-will versus determinism, to which Salutati, in his *De fato et fortuna* (c. 1396-1398), had seminally contributed\(^{21}\) — is interesting, if only in showing that Loschi's doctrine of Fortune, in several respects reminiscent of Salutati's, is traditionally Aristotelian, whereas Poggio's more pragmatic view is well on the way to becoming the characteristic Renaissance belief, that Fortune was capable of being manipulated by the human will.\(^{22}\)

Poggio proceeds to recount some ancient examples of the reversals of Fortune, and then requests his colleague to give some of the more striking modern instances. Loschi, in turn, adduces Tamburlaine's defeat of the Ottoman sultan Bayezid in 1402,\(^{23}\) and, in

---

22. The concept of Fortuna, however, was as inconstant as the deity herself, and in later life Poggio tended to take a more pessimistic view of her dispensations: in the preface to his *De humanae conditionis miseria* of 1455, he told Sigismondo Malatesta that 'all anxieties, all the troubles of life, all diseases of the soul are contracted from the gifts of fortune.' Poggio, *Opera* (Basel, 1538), 86; cf. Trinkaus 1970, I, 259.
the course of Book II, provides a number of other \textit{exempla} of the workings of Fortune on the lives of rulers from the death of Edward III of England in 1377 to that of Pope Martin V in 1431 (including Richard II, Charles VI, Joanna and Ladislaus of Naples, Gian Galeazzo and Filippo Maria Visconti, and Pope Urban VI),\textsuperscript{24} accompanied by a defence of modern history at the expense of the classical.\textsuperscript{25}

Book III is devoted to a straightforward narrative account of the pontificate of Eugenius IV: his accession, his flight from Rome, his dissolution of the Council of Basel, the opening of the Council of Ferrara, the rise of Vitelleschi, the transference of the Council of Florence, the attempted union of the Eastern and Western Churches, the dynastic wars of Alfonso of Aragon in Naples, the re-establishment of papal authority in Rome, and the Pope's league with Filippo Maria Visconti and Alfonso against Sforza in 1443.\textsuperscript{26}

Book IV bears only an adventitious connection to what had preceded it. In his account of the Council of Florence Poggio had mentioned the oriental delegations,\textsuperscript{27} and it is with the Orient that the final book of the \textit{De varietate Fortunae} is concerned. In the introductory preamble, Poggio makes an ingenious denial that he is about to digress:

\begin{quote}
'By no means do I believe I would be digressing if I depart slightly from the manner of writing I have adopted so far and hand this little book down to posterity in such form that it may serve for relaxation and at the same time turn the minds of the readers from the severity of fortune to a gentler fate, so to speak, and to the pleasant vicissitude of things. Yet here again one should by no means consider the power of fortune as completely insignificant, for it
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 40-82.\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 77-78.\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 85-122.\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 97-99.
brought back to Italy from the farthest limits of the earth
a man who had been tossed about on so many seas and in so
many lands for twenty-five years. 128

The man referred to is Nicolò de' Conti, a Venetian explorer, whose
extensive travels in the Orient, as far east as Java and Borneo, between
1419 and 1441 are related by Poggio in the course of this book. 29
Apart from an account of his itinerary, Poggio orally derived from Conti
various ethnographic observations (Mandevillian in character) on the
religion, customs, and ecology of India and the East Indies. 30 To
these observations are added some further information regarding the
Nestorian Christians of the East, derived by Poggio, with the help of an
Armenian interpreter, from the envoy of the Nestorian patriarch of a
Christian kingdom 'twenty days' journey from Cathay', who had been sent
to the Pope to gather information about the Christians of the West. 31
The book ends with a description of the land and peoples of Ethiopia,
derived, also with the help of an interpreter, from the Ethiopian
delegation to the Council of Florence. 32

While Book IV of the De varietate Fortunae, bears hardly any
immediate relation to the dominating themes, philosophical and
historical, of the three books that precede it, it does, in a sense,
form an antithesis to Book I. It exemplifies the virtues of the vita
activa, rather than the contemplative life reflected in Book I. It is
celebratory rather than admonitory, forward- not backward-looking. Its

28. Ibid., 126; Travelers in Disguise, 6.
29. Poggio, Historiae de Varietate Fortunae, 126-139. On the travels of
Nicolò de' Conti in the orient, see Sensburg 1906; Penrose 1967,
21-23.
30. Poggio, Historiae de Varietate Fortunae, 139-148.
31. Ibid., 148-149.
32. Ibid., 149-152. On the Ethiopians at the Council of Florence, see
Cerulli 1933.
theme is extrinsic, not intrinsic, to the culture from which Poggio sprang. In place of the lost inheritance lamented in Book I, it opens up new horizons and brings into view peoples, to whom the prospect from the Capitol was a matter of indifference.33

(b) MSS. and Printed Versions

Though it is undeniably among Poggio's most important works, to be set beside the later Historia Florentina, the De varietate Fortunae has suffered unmerited neglect. This is partly, no doubt, because it was, apart from the Description of Rome, omitted from both the Strasbourg Opera Omnia of 1513 and the Basel Opera Omnia of 1538, not being printed in its entirety till 1723,34 and partly because it has not been re-edited in more recent times. The neglect surely also stems from the misleading title Poggio gave to the work: Books II and III in particular, while admittedly containing edifying exempla of the reversals of fortune, constitute a primary source for the history of the early Quattrocento, and an evaluation of them from this point of view remains a desideratum.

That the De varietate Fortunae during its day achieved some popularity is shown by the number of surviving MSS. of the work. Valentini and Zucchetti list 23 Quattrocento MSS., of which 8 are in

the Vatican Library. 35

Books I and IV of the De varietate Fortunae have had a separate publishing history. The India recognita, as Book IV came to be called, has been printed as a separate opusculum, first in the incunabulum edited by Cristoforo da Bollate in 1492, 36 and subsequently (in an Italian translation) in Ramusio's collection of early travels in the Orient, first published in 1550 (later editions in 1554, 1563, 1588, and 1606). 37 A modern Italian translation, with annotations, had been issued by Mario Longhena. 38 An Elizabethan translation made by John Frampton, based on the Spanish translation of Rodrigo Fernandez de

35. CTR, IV, 227-229. The MSS. relating to Book IV have been separately investigated by Longhena 1925. To the MSS. listed by Valentini and Zucchetti can be added Bodleian Library, MS. RawL. C. 298, a mid-15th century codex written in England by the Paduan copyist, Milo de Carraria: Pächt and Alexander 1970, no. 883; Bodleian Library, Duke Humfrey, 13-14, no. 26; Bodleian Library, Canon. Misc. 557, written in a 15th century humanistic script, with fine border and historiated initials: Pächt and Alexander 1970, no. 866 and pl. LXXVII; and also Bodleian Library, MS. 17391, a 15th Italian miscellany, containing (ff. 46-54): 'Pogii Florentini ... libellus sive dyalogus de edificiis urbis Rome veteribus et novis.' In view of the rather perfunctory discussion by Weiss 1967, 13ff (essentially a digest of Walser 1914), a study of the inception of the De varietate Fortunae, in the light of Poggio's correspondence with English humanists, and of the earliest MSS., remains a desideratum.


Santaëlla (Seville, 1503), appeared in 1579. And a modern English translation of the *India recognita* by John Winter Jones was published by the Hakluyt Society in 1857 (and reprinted in 1963).

The Description of Rome from Book I of the *De varietae Fortunae* has similarly been printed as a separate *opusculum*, with the title *Ruinarum Urbis Romae Descriptio*, in both the Strasbourg *Opera Omnia*, edited by T. Aucuparius, of 1513, and the Basel *Opera Omnia* of 1538. Neither text is complete, since both terminate with the tomb of Antonius Lupus on the Via Ostiensis, omitting altogether the ensuing sections on the obelisks, statues, and hills of Rome, and on the Aurelian walls. The same truncated text of the *Ruinarum Urbis Romae Descriptio* is reproduced in the 18th century *compendia* of Sallengre and Clausingius. The full text of the *Descriptio* from Book I of the *De varietae Fortunae* has, however, been restored by Valentini and Zucchetti in their edition of 1953, and it is this text, with one or two minor emendations prompted by the edition of Georgio, which serves for the synopsis and discussion below.

---

2. The Ruinarum Urbis Romae Descriptio

(a) Synopsis

Since Gibbon's free paraphrase of the Ruinarum Urbis Romae Descriptio is marred by omissions and inaccuracies, a more detailed survey of its contents will now be attempted.

One day (so the book opens) when they were freed from curial responsibilities, their pontiff, Martin V, shortly before his death, having left Rome to recuperate in the Campagna, Poggio and Antonio Loschi together explored the wilderesses of the city, contemplating, on the one hand, the grandeur of the ruined buildings of antiquity, and, on the other, the downfall of so vast an empire and the deplorable inconstancy of fortune. Tired of these exertions, having ascended the Capitoline Hill, they dismounted and rested amid the ruins over the Tarpeian rock. From there they could look out over the panorama of Rome:

'\textit{Nuper cum pontifex Martinus, paulo ante quam diem suum obiret, ab urbe in agrum Tusculanum secessisset valetudinis gratia, nos autem essemus negotiis curisque publicis vacui, visebamus saepius deserta urbis, Antonius Luscus vir clarissimus, egoque, admirantes animo, tum ob veterem collapsorum aedificiorum magnitudinem et vastas urbis antiquae ruinas, tum ob tanti imperii ingentem stragem, stupendam profecto ac deplorandam fortunae varietatem. Quam autem conscendissemus aliquando Capitolinum collem, Antonius obequitando paulum fessus, cum quietem appeteret, descendentes ex equis, consedimus in ipsis Tarpeiae arcis ruinis, pone ingens portae cuiusdam, ut puto, templi marmoreum limen, plurimasque passim confractas columnas, unde magna ex parte prospectus urbis patet}.'\textsuperscript{46}

After gazing at the desolate scene, Loschi disconsolately remarks on how

\textsuperscript{46} CTR, IV, 230.
different was the Capitol from that sung by Virgil: 'Golden now, once
wild with woods and briers.' The situation had now been reversed:
what once was golden was now choked with thorns and briers:

'Hic Antonius, cum aliquantum hac illuc oculos circumulisset, 
suspirans stupentique similis: O quantum, inquit, Poggi, 
haec Capitolia ab illis distant, quae noster Maro cecinit, 
"Aurea nunc, olim silvestribus horrida dumis."
Ut quidem is versus merito possit converti: 
Aurea quondam, nunc squalida, spinetis vepribusque referta.'

As an analogy to their own situation, Loschi calls to mind Marius, who,
banished from Rome, moped amid the ruins of Carthage, unable to make up 
his mind whether he himself or the scene of his exile offered a more 
striking illustration of the reversals of fortune. But, for Loschi, 
the devastation of Rome far outstripped this; it exceeded in 
magnitude, indeed, every misfortune recorded in the annals of history:

'Venit in mentem Marii illius, per quem olim urbis imperium 
stetit, quem pulsum patria, profugum atque egentem, quam in 
Africanam appulisset, supra Carthaginis ruinas insedisse 
ferunt, admirantem suam et Carthaginis vicem, similique 
fortunam utriusque conferentem, addubitatemque utrius 
fortunae maius spectaculum extitisset. Ego vero immensam 
huius urbis stragem nulli alteri possum conferre, ita 
ceterarum omnium, vel quas natura tulit rerum, vel quas 
manus hominum conflavit, haec una exsuperat calamitatem, 
Evolvas licet historias omnes, omnia scriptorum monumenta 
pertractes, omnes gestarum rerum annales scruteres, nulla 
unquam exempla mutationis suae maiora fortuna protulit, 
quam urbem Romam, pulcherrimam olim ac magnificentissimam 
omnium...'

Loschi is appalled that the world's greatest city, by the iniquity of 
fortune, should not only be stripped of its imperial majesty, but 
delivered into the most wretched servitude, and become so deformed and 
abject that the only traces of her former dignity and grandeur were 
exhibited by her ruins:

47. Virgil, Aeneid, VIII. 348.
48. CTR, IV, 230.
49. CTR, IV, 230-231.
'... nunc per fortunae omnia vertentis iniquitatem, non solum imperio maiestateque sua spoliatam, sed addicatam vilissimae servituti, deiformem, abiectam, sola ruina praeteritam dignitatem ac magnitudinem ostentantem.'

Stupendous, indeed, was the force and vicissitude of fortune which could reduce such massive buildings almost to nothing. For what greater had the world ever seen that that which destroyed so many buildings of the city, temples, porticoes, baths, aqueducts, harbours and palaces?:

'Stupenda quippe vis est ac varietas fortunae, quae etiam ipsas aedificiorum moles, quas extra fatum illarum conditores existimabant, funditus demolita, nihil fere ex tantis rebus reliqui fecit. Quid enim maius orbis vidit unquam, quam tot aedificia urbis, templi, porticus, thermas, theatra, aquaeductus, portus manufactos, palatia fato suo absumpta, et ex tanta rerum magnificarum copia nihil aut parum ferme superesse?'

Poggio, in response to this rhetorical outburst, can only agree with his colleague's estimation of the injury of fortune, remarking how few were the vestiges of the ancient city, and even what remained, whether of public or private works, appeared damaged and half-destroyed:

'Tum ego: Merito, inquam, admiraris, Antoni, fortunae iniuriam in hac urbis parente tam foede vexanda excitatam, quam ipse quotidie inspiciendi causa perlustrans, non mirari solum, sed etiam queri cogor, nihil fere integrum, paucas admodum reliquias ex prisa illa urbe, et eas semesas ac corruptas apparere. Nam ex omnibus aut publicis aut privatis operibus liberae quondam civitatis, interrupta quaedam et ea parva vestigia visuntur.'

These preliminary philosophical remarks prompt Poggio to describe the scanty and scattered remains of the city's antiquities. His description can be divided into twelve principal sections, and, for the sake of clarity, these are separated and enumerated below.

50. CTR, IV, 231.
51. CTR, IV, 231-232.
52. CTR, IV, 232.
Poggio begins his survey, appropriately enough, on the Capitol itself, mentioning two Republican inscriptions, which he had previously transcribed into his *sylloge*, the first of them recording the construction of the Tabularium,\(^{53}\) and the second being the funerary inscription of Gaius Publicius Bibulus.\(^{54}\) Descending from the Capitol to the river, Poggio mentions the bridge leading to the Isola Tiberina (the ancient Pons Fabricius),\(^{55}\) noting the inscription recording its erection in 62 B.C.\(^{56}\) The other inscription on the bridge, that of Q. Lepidus and M. Lollius, Poggio interprets as a consular authorization; it probably *commemorates* a restoration in 21 B.C.\(^{57}\)

A further inscription to be seen in Poggio's day in the vicinity of the Isola Tiberina was that on the so-called arch of Lentulus and Crispinus; he correctly locates it between the Aventine and the bank of the Tiber.\(^{58}\) Poggio now turns to the Esquiline, to the so-called Temple of Marius, *'quae hodie Cimbron appellant'*, but his account perpetuates the confusion of the *Mirabilia*,\(^{59}\) which associated the monument with Marius' conquest of the Cimbri; Poggio explains that the temple was built from the spoils

---


57. C.I.L., VI, 1305 d. The inscription, not extant in the *Sylloge Poggiana*, is transmitted by the *Sylloge Barberiniana*, no. 28, C.I.L., VI, Pars 1, XXI. Cf. *Nash*, II, 189. Poggio's *L* Lepidus is an error in transcription.


of the Cimbri, and that the *trophaea* of Marius were still to be seen there:

'Sunt et monimenta quaedam prisca quae hodie Cimbron appellant; templum ex marabiis Cimbricis a C. Mario factum, in quo adhuc eius trophaea conspicuiuntur.'

The next monument treated by Poggio is the pyramidal tomb by the Porta Ostiensis, which, on the basis of its inscription, he correctly associates with C. Cestius. He notes with amazement that, although this inscription was intact, the learned Petrarch, in one of his letters, identified the monument as the Tomb of Remus, presumably because, in following the popular opinion, he did not consider it important to search out the inscription, which was overgrown with shrubbery, and which his more diligent but less learned successors managed to read:

'Quo magis miror, integro adhuc epigrammate, doctissimum virum Franciscum Petrarcham in quadam sua epistola scribere, id esse sepulum Remi; credo, secatum vulgi opinionem, non magni fecisse epigramma perquirere, fruticetis contectum, in quo legendo, qui postmodum seuti sunt, minore cum doctrina maiorem diligentiam praebuerunt.'

This rebuke to Petrarch's shortcomings as an epigraphist induces Loschi

---

60. CTR, IV, 232. The structure was not a temple at all, but the Nymphaeum of the Aqua Julia, the remains of which are extant in the Piazza Vittorio Emanuele II: Platner-Ashby, 363-364; Nash, II, 125-126. The *trophaea* from this nymphaeum were removed in 1590 by Sixtus V and set up on the balustrade of the Piazza del Campidoglio: Helbig, II, 1165. Cf. Biondo, R.I., II, 23. The actual *trophaea* of Marius, as recorded, for example, by Suetonius, *Julius*, 11, have disappeared without trace.


62. CTR, IV, 6 and note 4.

63. The difficulty of reading the inscription on the Pyramid of Cestius, because it was covered over by shrubbery, had already been mentioned by Pier Paolo Vergerio: CTR, IV, 98.

64. CTR, IV, 233.
to interrupt the discourse, in order to commend Poggio's zeal and care in this field, since he had handed down for the perusal of literary students the inscriptions both of public and private buildings, searched out within Rome and, in many places, outside it, and had gathered them together into a small volume - a specific allusion to the Sylloge Poggiana (which, in the surviving version, contains transcripts of five of the six inscriptions Poggio has mentioned above): 65

"In hoc laudo, inquit Antonius, curam et diligentiam tuam, Poggi, qui ista tum publicorum, tum privatorum operum epigrammata intra urbem et foris quoque multe in locis conquisita atque in parvum volumen coacta, literarum studiosis legenda tradidisti."

Poggio, in reply, concedes his diligence in this matter, boastfully declaring that he had dug many things out of the darkness, or hidden amongst bushes and thickets, so that they might be exposed to all. He had, moreover, published them entire, so that if the Romans destroyed them, 'as we have often seen them to do', at least the memory of the inscriptions might survive. These were, Poggio adds, the only ornaments which had survived to his own day from so many of the city before it was reduced, by the injury of fortune, to servitude:

"Utcumque id ceteri accipiant, inquam, ad utilitatem certe communem diligenter omnia, nonnulla vero inter virgulta et rubos latentia ex tenebris eruens, ut aliiis paterent, ad verbum integra expressi: ut si, quod persaepe vidimus, ea Romani everterint, saltem titolorum extet memoria. Haec sola igitur, ex tam multis nondum servitute oppressae civitatis ornamentis, fortunae iniuria, ad nostram aetatem usque perdurant."

65. On these and other references in the Ruinarum Urbis Romae Descriptio to inscriptions contained in the Sylloge Poggiana, see infra, Appendix D.
66. CTR, IV, 233.
67. Ibid.
(ii) **Augustan Rome.** After stressing the importance of inscriptions as an antidote to oblivion, Poggio turns to the various emperors and princes commemorated in them. Pre-eminent among them was Augustus, who boasted he had found Rome brick and left it marble, and who persuaded his friends to adorn the city with their own works. Among them was the Pantheon, erected by Agrippa, son-in-law of Augustus, as the inscription on the architrave showed. Also among the residual Augustan ornaments of the city was the travertine arch of Augustus in front of the Pons Aemilius 'in quo Divi Augusti nomen est sculptum'. But the other works of the Augustan city had been destroyed by the 'saevitia fortunae'.

(iii) **Temples.** Poggio now turns his attention to the scanty remains of the ancient temples of Rome. Conspicuous among them was the Vespasianic Temple of Peace, which Poggio, in common with other Renaissance antiquaries, mistakenly identified with the secular Basilica of Maxentius; he mentions the single marble column inside the basilica (one of eight monolithic columns at the corners of the nave), which was removed by Paul V in 1613 to the Piazza di S. Maria Maggiore, where it now stands. Poggio proceeds to identify the other temples on the Forum Romanum: the Temple of Romulus, which he identified in SS. Cosma e Damiano, the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina, 'nunc beato Laurentio

---

69. Ibid., 29.
72. *CTR*, IV, 234.
73. *CTR*, IV, 234. On the marble column, see Platner-Ashby, 77.
74. *CTR*, IV, 234. On the relationship of SS. Cosma e Damiano to the Temple of Penates and the Temple of Romulus, see Platner-Ashby, 386-389; Nash, II, 268; *CTR*, II, 124, note 2, with bibliography.
dicatum, cuius porticus plurimae marmoreae columnae ruinam effugerunt', 75 and the Temple of Castor and Pollux, which Poggio wrongly identified with the double Temple of Venus and Rome, the imposing ruins of which, next to S. Maria Nova, excited his wonder: 76

'Castoris insuper et Pollucis aedes contiguae, loco edito in via sacra, altera occidentem, altera orientem versus (hodie Mariam Novam appellant), inclytus quondam cogendi Senatus locus, maiori ex parte collapsae parvis vestigiis haerent, in quas me saepissime confero, revocans, stupore quodam oppressus, animum ad ea tempora, quum ibi senatoriae sententiae dicerentur, et aut L. Crassum mihi, aut Hortensium, aut Ciceronem orantem proponens.' 77

Temples in other parts of the city are dealt with next. The so-called Temple of Vesta 'iuxta Tiberis ripam ad initium montis Aventini' Poggio, as later Biondo, 78 mistakenly identified with the presumed Portunium, the circular temple occupied by S. Stefano, now S. Maria del Sole, in the Piazza Bocca della Verità. 79 Poggio's location of the Temple of Minerva is also suspect; the Temple of Minerva Chalcidica is situated by the Regionaries in Regio IX between the Iseum and the Pantheon, 80 but since little of it can have remained to be seen by the 15th century (most of it being hidden by S. Maria sopra Minerva), 81 Poggio is probably referring instead to the Thermae of Agrippa in the same region; 82

76. Platner-Ashby, 552-554; Nash, II, 496-499. Poggio correctly states that the actual Temple of Castor, at the south-east corner of the Forum Romanum, was used as a meeting-place of the Senate: Platner-Ashby, 101.
77. CTR, IV, 234.
81. Jordan, I. 3, 573-574; Platner-Ashby, 344; Nash, II, 66-68.
82. Platner-Ashby, 518-519; Nash, II, 429-443. Cf. Biondo, R.I., III. 80, who also mentions the huge ruins extant near S. Maria sopra Minerva.
the adjacent collapsed porticus which he mentions that he had recently seen being demolished for lime can then be identified with the Agrippan Porticus Argonautarum:

'Aedis Minervae portio conspicitur, ubi nunc domus est Praecedatorum, unde et loco Minervae est inditum nomen, iuxtaque eam porticus ingens ruderibus oppressa, quem nuper ad saza in usum calcis perquirenda, effossa humo, multis prostratis ad terram columnis conspexi.'

Near this porticus a statue of a reclining figure, with head intact, had been found while someone was digging ditches to plant trees; it was so huge, Poggio reports, as to exceed in size all the statues of the city, and attracted so many visitors that the owner of the garden eventually got so tired of the disturbance they made that he had the statue covered with earth again:

'Prope porticum Minervae, statua est recubantis, cuius caput integra effigie, tantaeque magnitudinis, ut signa omnia urbis excedat; quidam, ad plantandas arbores scrobes faciens, detexit. Ad hoc visendum cum plures in dies magis concurrerent, strepitum adeuntium, fastidiumque pertusa, horti patronus congesta humo textit.'

Returning to the Capitol, Poggio now mentions a temple to which he gives the name Concordia. The marble portico alone remained. Poggio ruefully points out that when he first arrived in Rome (in 1402), he had seen this portico almost intact, but that later the Romans demolished

---

83. Jordan, L 3, 574; Platner-Ashby, 420; Nash, II, 291-292. There is documentary evidence of lime-burning and excavation of columns on the presumed site of the Iseum et Serapeum dating to Dec. 1451-June 1452, and, in publishing this evidence, Lanciani 1902-12, I, 54, suggested that Poggio was referring to the same site. But Poggio's comments seem more applicable to the Agrippan complex, which was itself being quarried for columns for St. Peter's under Nicholas V: see Michaelis 1888, 263 and note 20; CTR, IV, 361-362; Magnuson 1958, 191-192.

84. CTR, IV, 234-235.

85. On the discovery of this statue, see supra, chap. IV. 1.

86. CTR, IV, 235.
the whole temple, including part of the portico, in order to obtain lime. But on the portico still remained the letters S. P. Q. R., recording a restoration after the temple had been destroyed by fire; from this inscription it is clear that Poggio is, in fact, referring to the Temple of Saturn at the foot of the Capitoline Hill: 87

'Capitolio contigua, forum versus, superest porticus aedis Concordiae, quam, cum primum ad urbem accessi, vidi ferme integram, opere marmoreo admodum speciosam, Romani postmodum, ad calcem, aedem totam et porticus partem, disiectis columnis, sunt demoliti. In porticu adhuc literae sunt S. P. Q. R. incendio consumptam restituisse.' 88

After noting that of the aedes Telluris nothing remained, 89 Poggio proceeds to identify the Temple of Saturn with S. Adriano, the ancient Senate building, or Curia Julia; 90 though the identification is mistaken, Poggio is correct to associate the Temple of Saturn with the aerarium. 91 The ensuing portico of the Temple of Mercury is also misplaced; no such temple is known to have existed in the Forum Piscarium, where he locates it, and the church of S. Angelo, into which he claims that the temple had been converted, was rather constructed within the porticus of Octavia. 92 The Temple of Apollo 'in Vaticano iuxta basilicam Beati Petri' had also, according to Poggio, been turned

---

88. CTR, IV, 235.
89. Ibid. On the Temple of Tellus on the Esquiline, see Platner-Ashby, 511; CTR, II, 226, note 1. Poggio associates it with S. Salvatoris in Tellure; on this apparently apocryphal church, see Huelsen 1927, 522-523, no. 71; it is possibly a confusion with S. Salvatoris de Ludo on the Palatine, on which see ibid., 444-445, no. 23.
90. CTR, IV, 235. On the Curia Julia, see Platner-Ashby, 143-146; Nash, I, 301-303.
91. Platner-Ashby, 464; Nash, II, 294.
to Christian usage, but this temple is apparently apocryphal, and
Poggio evidently follows the *Mirabilia* in confusing it with the chapel
of S. Petronilla, originally a circular mausoleum built in the 5th
century A.D. for the imperial family. The Temple of Jupiter
Stator Poggio says that though some identified it with the 'aedes
vetustissima unica testudine ex lapide Tiburtino, quam nostri Sanctum
Nicolaum in Statera appellant', he contested this, on the grounds
that Livy had located the temple 'in radicibus Palatini montis'.
Concluding the section on temples is the Temple of Juno Lucina, but of
this only the name was left, being incorporated in that of S. Lorenzo
in Lucina.

(iv) Baths. Of the public baths of the city Poggio enumerates seven,
all of them devoid of ornament. Of these the Baths of Diocletian

---

Neronianum est templum Apollinis, quod dicitur Sancta Petronilla...'

94. CTR, IV, 236. S. Nicola is a mistake; the church in question is
S. Salvatore de Statera: Huelse 1927, 519, no. 61, 453, no. 39;

95. Livy, *ab urbe condita*, I, 12, 3. The foundations of the Temple of
Jupiter Stator have been identified on the Sacra Via, directly south­
east of the Arch of Titus: Platner-Ashby, 303-304; Nash, I, 534.

96. CTR, IV, 236. The location of this temple is contested: Platner­
Ashby, 288-289, place it on the Cispian, 'probably not far west of
S. Prassede just N.W. of the Torre Cantarelli.' In this case, Poggio
is quite wrong in associating the temple with S. Lorenzo in Lucina.
But the cult of Juno Lucina may have been transferred from the Cispian
to the Campo Marzio; *cf.* CTR, II, 124, note 3.

97. CTR, IV, 236. Poggio also gives a brief quotation from Ammianus
Marcellinus, XVI, 10, 14, on the colossal size of the baths. On
Poggio's discovery of this source at Fulda in 1417, see Sabbadini
1905-14, I, 80 and note 39, II, 192, 200-201.
and of Antoninus (i.e., Caracalla) still retained the names of their founders and were the most impressive in the size of their remains; one could not but wonder to what a common purpose such massive buildings, such a multitude of columns, and such variety of marble had been raised:

'Diocletiani et item Severi Antonini, servato ad hanc diem conditoris nomine, permaxima vestigia et ceteris incorruptiora, maiorem in modum aspicientes movent; non sine admiratione quidam qui sibi voluerit ad tam vilem usum tanta aedificiorum moles, tot tantarumque columnarum, tam vari generis marmorum apparatus.'

The Baths of Constantine on the Quirinal were not their equal. That they did belong to Constantine, however, was demonstrated by the in situ inscription recording the restoration made (in 443) by Petronius Perperna. The Baths of Alexander Severus Poggio locates close to the Pantheon, where its many and splendid remains were to be seen.

The few remains of the ensuing Baths of Domitian (which are apocryphal, since this emperor built no baths) are located by Poggio in the vicinity of S. Silvestro, his explicit source for this identification being the Liber Pontificalis:

'Domitianas, quorum perpauca rudera conspiciuntur, fuisse in iis locis, ubi nunc Sylvestri ecclesia est, scriptum in vita Pontificum adverti.'

But the church here referred to, S. Silvestro, founded by the eponymous Pope (314-335) adjacent to the Baths of Trajan on the Oppian, and enlarged by Symmachus c. 500 with the addition of a church dedicated to

98. CTR, IV, 236.
99. Ibid. Sylloge Poggiana, no. 64, C. I. L., VI, Pars 1, XXXVII = C. I. L., VI, 1754.
100. CTR, IV, 236. On these baths, the same as the Thermæ Neronianæ built by Nero near the Pantheon, of which there remained extensive ruins in the 16th century, see Platner-Ashby, 531-532; Nash, II, 460-464. Cf. Biondo, R.I., II. 7.
St. Martin, was known in Poggio's day as *S. Martino ai Monti*.\(^{102}\)
Poggio evidently interpreted the passage, as Biondo explicitly did in *R.I., II. 12*, as referring to *S. Silvestro in Capite* (now on Piazza *S. Silvestro*), and hence identified the ruins of the Baths of Domitian in those of the presumed Temple of the Sun of Aurelian.\(^{103}\) Of the other baths of the city, Poggio concludes, nothing remained. No matter how much expense and labour had been entailed in their construction, oblivion had overtaken them;\(^{104}\) the matter of labour is illustrated by Poggio with recourse to the *Life* of *S. Marcellus* from the *Acta Sanctorum*, in which the employment of Christian slave-labour on the construction of the Baths of Diocletian is mentioned:

> 'Legisse memini in Martyrum libris cum a Diocletiano fabricarentur, qui fuit fidei nostrae hostis acerrimus, centum et quadraginta Christianorum millia ad id opus pluribus annis in modum servitutis addicta.'\(^{105}\)

\(^{(v)}\) *Triumphal Arches.* How many arches there originally were Poggio does not know. Those of Septimius Severus, Titus Vespasianus, and Constantine were preserved intact, with their commemorative inscriptions.\(^{106}\) Partly preserved was the arch *'iuxta Comitium, in qua sculptae litterae Traiani arcum fuisset dicunt'*.\(^{107}\) There were,

---

103. Cf. CTR, IV, 292 and note 1; Robathan 1970, 206. On the contested location of Aurelian's Temple of the Sun, see Platner-Ashby, 491-493. But it is now generally located by *S. Silvestro in Capite*.
104. CTR, IV, 236-237.
107. CTR, IV, 237. It seems doubtful that this arch can be identified with the Arch of Trajan in the Forum of Trajan, of which only the foundations, and a few fragments, first revealed by 16th century excavations, remain: Jordan, L 2, 456-457; Platner-Ashby, 239. No Trajanic inscription, associated with this arch, has been recorded, and it is, accordingly, possible that Poggio is here alluding, in a garbled way, to the Arco Noe and C.I.L., VI, 953.
in addition, two triumphal arches on the Via Flaminia: the first, shorn of its inscription, was situated next to S. Lorenzo in Lucina, and was popularly called Tripolis;\(^{108}\) the second, with a fragmentary inscription, the remaining letters of which, to Poggio's amazement, had managed to escape demolition, had lost its name:\(^{109}\)

> 'Duo sunt insuper via Flaminia,titulo in altero penitus deleto, in altero corrupto, quorum eum, qui est prope Laurentium in Lucina, ubi plura signa marmorea insunt, vulgo ob victorian trium Civitatum, prout antiquum epigramma seniores se legisse referebant, Tripolim hodie quoque arcum appellant: alterius nomen (perpaucæ enim litteræ superextant, et antiquæ cælature tabulæ quaedam e marmore, quas sape mēror insaniam demolientium effugisse) penitus obsolevit.'\(^{110}\)

Another triumphal arch, dedicated, as its inscription showed, to the Emperor Gallienus, was situated on the Via Numentana,\(^{111}\) and, finally, Poggio records that he had read the surviving inscription of the arch dedicated to Titus, after his victory over Judaea, in the Circus Maximus, where there were now gardens:\(^{112}\)

---

108. This is the Arco di Portogallo, an arch over the Via Lata, demolished in 1662 by Alexander VII in order that the Corso might be widened. Jordan, I, 3, 466; Platner-Ashby, 33; Nash, I, 83-87.

109. Gregorovius, VI, 723-724, and Valentini and Zuccheti in CTR, IV, 237, note 4, identify this arch with the Arch of Claudius on Piazza Sciarra, but a more likely explanation is that Poggio is referring to the Arch of Diocletian, the so-called Arcus Novus, as Huelen in Jordan I, 3, 469-470 and note 60, concluded; this marble arch spanned the Via Lata, close to the N.E. corner of S. Maria in Via Lata: Nash, I, 120-125. On its destruction by Innocent VIII in 1491, see Infessura, Diario, 266; Lanciani 1902-12, I, 88. The last remains of the Arcus Novus were demolished in 1523: ibid., I, 217-219. On this identification see also Jones 1902, 270-271. On the inscription, which Poggio alludes to - C.I.L., VI, 31383 - see Platner-Ashby, 42.

110. CTR, IV, 237.

111. Ibid. Sylloge Poggiana, no. 67, C.I.L., VI, Pars I, XXXVIII = C.I.L., VI, 1106.

112. Of this arch, erected in 80-81 A.D. by the senate in honour of Titus, to commemorate the capture of Jerusalem, nothing is known, except what is contained in the inscription, preserved in the Sylloge Einsidlenensis, from which Poggio derived his information: Sylloge Poggiana, no. 18, C.I.L., VI, Pars I, XXXI = C.I.L., VI, 944. Cf. Platner-Ashby, 45; Nash, I, 236.
Aqueducts. Poggio begins by listing the ancient aqueducts of Rome after Julius Frontinus, curator aquarum under the Emperor Nerva, a codex of whose De Aquaeductibus he himself, as he explains, had recently found hidden in the monastic library of Monte Cassino:

'Ductus aquarum novem fuisse refert Iulius Frontinus (quem libellum ipse paulo ante repperi absconsum abditumque in Monasterio Cassinensi) Appiam, Anienem veterem, Martiam, Tepulam, Virginem, Alsietinam, Claudiam, Anienem novam, aedc sumptuoso opere et structura mirabilis, ut idem Iulius, qui a divo Nerva curatorem aquarum se factum scribit, Aegypti Pyramidibus censeat aequandos.'

Poggio goes on to quote from Frontinus some of the capacities of the Anio novus, Claudia and Martia. He then points out that the Aqua...
Virgo was the only aqueduct still functioning in his own day; the rest were broken and collapsed: 'Sola ex his Virgo hodie in urbem fluit, quae a milliario octavo conspicitur; ceterae intermissae, collapsaeque sunt.' Apropos of the magnificent remains of the Aqua Claudia, Poggio refers to the in situ inscription, recording a Severan restoration, to be seen on the Caelian:

'Videntur reliquiae omnium magnificentissimi aquaeductus, qui a Divo Claudio in urbem ad Caelium usque montem perductus est, unde et Caelimontanum nominabant, et a L Septimio Severo, et a M Aurelio Antonino Pio, cum vetustate collapsus et corruptus plurifariam esset, a solo, ut referit sculptum in marmorea tabula epigramma, restitutas.'

(vii). Theatres, Amphitheatres and Circuses. Poggio begins with the largest and most beautiful of the amphitheatres, the Colosseum, built out of travertine, which the Romans, in their folly, had in great part

117. Cf. Platner-Ashby, 28-29; Nash, I, 55-56. Completed by Agrippa in 19 B.C., the Aqua Virgo began at the 8th mile of the Via Collatina, and ran almost entirely underground (hence its survival), until it reached the Horti Luculliani on the Pincian. It then ran southwards, partly on arches, crossing the Via Lata by the Arcus Claudii, and terminating near the N.W. angle of S. Ignazio. The Aqua Virgo had made a crucial contribution to the water-supply of medieval Rome. In 1453 it was restored by Nicholas V, who, with the help of Alberti, had it extended as far as its present outlet at the Fontana di Trevi; on this restoration, see Infessura, Diario, 50; Magnuson 1958, 18-19 and fig. 4, showing the aspect of Nicholas's fountain (after Tempesta); the monumental inscription is given by Müntz 1878-82, I, 156, note 2; on Alberti's direction of the project, see Gadol 1969, 94.

118. CTR, IV, 238.
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destroyed to make lime.\textsuperscript{121}

'Ingens pulcherrimimque omnium suisse dicunt, quod est media fere urbe, ex lapide Tiburtino, opus Divi Vespasiani, Colisium vulgo appellatum, atque ob stultitiam Romanorum, maiori ex parte ad calcem deletum.'\textsuperscript{122}

Another amphitheatre, that of Marcellus, situated 'inter Tarpeium collem Tiberimque', served in Poggio's day as a meat-market.\textsuperscript{123} Facing it were visible numerous marble columns, which Poggio thought belonged to the portico of a temple of Jupiter, but which in reality belonged to the Porticus Octaviae.\textsuperscript{124} The third of the amphitheatres (to which Poggio does not give the name Castrense, as it is called in the Regionaries),\textsuperscript{125} built of brick, and situated close to S. Croce in Gerusalemme, had been incorporated into the new walls of the city, forming part of their circuit:\textsuperscript{126}

'Tertium ex latere cocto iuxta ecclesiam, quam Hierusalem appellant, his novis insitum moeniis partem efficit ambitus murorum urbis.'\textsuperscript{127}

From amphitheatres, Poggio turns to circuses. That known in his own day as the Agon (i.e. the Stadium of Domitian, now Piazza Navona) was used, he says, for the annually held ancient Roman games, as well as for

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[121.] The destruction of the Colosseum, for commercial or military reasons, continued sporadically through the Trecento; see Gregorovius, VI, 720-722, and, on Petrarch's representations to Paolo Annibaldi on the subject, \textit{supra}, chap. II, note 74. The depredations continued into the following century, to such a degree that Eugenius IV felt obliged to issue a brief for the preservation of the Colosseum: Lanciani 1899, 207; \textit{ibid.} 1902-12, I, 50-51.
\item[123.] CTR, IV, 238. On the allocation of the Theatre of Marcellus to butchers, as described in Martin V's bull 'Et si in cunctarum' of March 1425, see Lanciani 1902-12, I, 47; \textit{ibid.} 1906, 10-11.
\item[124.] CTR, IV, 238. Cf. Platner-Ashby, 427; Nash, II, 254-258.
\item[125.] Regio V. Jordan, II, 548.
\item[126.] Platner-Ashby, 5-6; Nash, I, 13-16. When the Aurelian walls were built, the brick Amphitheatrum Castrense was utilized as a part of the line of fortification, when its open arcades were walled up.
\item[127.] CTR, IV, 238-239.
\end{enumerate}
\end{flushleft}
those inelegantly presented in his own day. Of the Circus Maximus, where once was situated the triumphal arch of T. Vespasian and a colossal obelisk, little remained to be seen, the site having been turned into gardens:

'Est et locus ingens, plebis receptaculum (hodie Agonem appellant) ad venationes et spectacula editus, in quo et hodie quoque Romani quotannis ludos, licet insulse, quosdem exercent. Circi maximi, celeberrimi quondam spectaculi, nunc hortis deputatus locus, in quo et obeliscum ingentem, et arcum triumphalem T. Vespasiani fuisse legitimus, parum quid visu reliquit vetustas.'

More controversial was the location of the Theatre of Pompey. Poggio correctly recognised it in the theatre, then occupied by private houses, in the Campo dei Fiori. Moreover, he found confirmation of this view in two inscriptions incised on recently excavated marble slabs, which had been found interspersed with the columns of the theatre's collapsed portico. One of them, in a fragmentary state, recorded that the genius of the theatre had been renewed by a certain prefect of the city; the other that it had been dedicated by Symmachus, prefect of

---

128. Strictly, the Stadium of Domitian was not a circus, having no central spina, nor does Poggio so designate it. It was chiefly used for athletics: Platner-Ashby, 495-496; Nash, II, 387-390. On the medieval carnival games celebrated in the Piazza Navona, see Georgio in Poggio, Historiae de Varietate Fortunae, 18, note (b); Gregorovius, VI, 709. On the Campus Agonis and medieval nomenclature, see Huelsen in Jordan, I. 3, 593 and note 94.

129. The presence of two obelisks in the Circus Maximus (those of Augustus and of Constantine) had been asserted by the Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis (CTR, IV, 129, 131); Poggio presumably refers to that of Constantine, re-erected in 1587 at the Lateran: Platner-Ashby, 367-368; Nash, II, 142-143. On the arch of Titus, see note 112 supra.

130. CTR, IV, 239.


132. Biondo, R.I., II. 109, tells us that this inscription, in honour of the 'Genium Theatri Pompeiani', had recently been found, amongst ancient foundations, by Angelo Pantano, in the process of excavating a place for a wine-cellar. On the location of Pantano's house, see CTR, IV, 239, note 3. The fact that both Poggio and Biondo record this inscription casts doubt on Henzen's inclusion of it among his falsae: C.I.L., VI, Pars 5, 55; though the formula 'genium theatri'
the city, to Honorius Augustus. In any case, Poggio concludes, the building was at one time commonly called the Theatre of Pompey, until the ignorance of the Romans, 'who maintain falsehoods as truths', removed all reliability from the statement:

'Pars theatri Pompeii haud procul ab eo, quem Campum Florum appellant, superextat, etiam ipsa privatis aedificiis occupata. Id ut credam, litterae quaedam adducunt, effossis nuper marmoribus, quae in eius collapsa porticu columnis inmixta reperta sunt, incisae. Alterae, epigrammate effracto, genium theatris a quodam praefecto urbis instauratum ferunt, alterae a Symmacho urbis praefecto Honorio Augusto dicatum; vulgo antea theatrum Pompeii dicebatur: sed Romanorum incititia, falsa pro veris affirmantium, detrahebat verbis fidem.'

(viii). Mausolea. The Mausoleum of Augustus was situated between the Via Flaminia and the bank of the Tiber, and was decorated with two obelisks; in Poggio's day it was occupied by vineyards. The is certainly spurious, it seems more probably that this represents a misreading, rather than a deliberate fabrication. On this assumption, Huelsen 1899B, 251ff, attempted a reconstruction, arguing that 'genium' was a corruption of 'proscenium', and recognising the inscription in C.I.L., VI, 1191, recording a 5th century restoration of the Theatre of Pompey under Arcadius and Honorius. The location of the proscenium of the Theatre of Pompey is not inconsistent with that of Ponto's house on the Strada dei Chiavari. Georgio, in his edition of the De varietate Fortunae, 18, note (f), was astute enough to anticipate Huelsen's learned identification by almost two centuries, pointing to Labillon's edition of the Itinerarium Einsidlensis, in which C.I.L., VI, 1191 occurs: cf. C.I.L., VI, Pars 1, XIII, no. 50. See also Huelsen in Jordan, I, 3, 528, note 57.

133. C.I.L., VI, 1193, transcribed only in Ciriaco d'Ancona, Cod. Parm., f. 98: 'in porticu theatri Pompeiani'.
134. CTR, IV, 239.
135. On these two obelisks, mentioned in Ammianus Marcellinus, XVII. 4, 16, see CTR, I, 149, note 1; Platner-Ashby, 370; Nash, II, 155-156. It is questionable whether Poggio actually saw them (in any case he omits them from his section on the obelisks of the city) (see below), since they were only discovered by excavations in the early 16th century behind the church of S. Rocco; one was re-erected in the Piazza dell'Esquilino in 1587, the other in the Piazza del Quirinale in 1782.
136. On the desolation of the Mausoleum of Augustus in the Quattrocento, cf. Biondo, R.I., II. 74. In a document dated 30 Jan. 1427 Martin V conceded the site to the brothers Gallo and Pasquino Gallo of Castel del Monte; see Lanciani 1902-12, I, 234: 'conceditur ad XX annos

Continued
Mausoleum of Hadrian and his wife, Sabina, or the Castel S. Angelo, as it is commonly called, situated next to the Pons Hadrianus, had been to a great extent destroyed by the injury of the Romans, though the inscription still remained undamaged over the entrance. 137 If the rest of the mausoleum had been accessible, Poggio claims, the Romans would have certainly demolished it completely, since a state decree to that effect had been promulgated: 138

'... et Divi Hadriani ac Divae Sabinae molem in primis conspicuum iuxta pontem, quem suo quoque nominé dicavit; alterum disiectum vineis occupatur, licet locis in morem collis editus, conditoris (Augusta enim appellatur) nomen servet: alterum, quod Castrum Angeli vulgo dicunt magna ex parte Romorum iniuria, licet adhuc titulus supra portam extet integer, disturbavit, quod certe funditus evertisset, id enim publice decreverant, si eorum manibus pervia, absuntis grandibus saxis, reliqua moles extitissent.' 139 among the mausolea of Rome Poggio, in the medieval tradition, numbered the two triumphal columns; the first he attributed, on the basis of its dedicatory inscription, to Trajan; 140 the second, which had lost its inscription, he erroneously attributed to Antoninus Pius: 141

---

137. SyIloge Poggiana, no. 48, C. I. L., VI, Pars 1, XXX = C. I. L., VI, 984.
138. A specific allusion to the events of April 1379, when, as part of Urban VI's offensive against the strongholds held by the anti-pope, Clement VII, the Romans attempted to level the Castel S. Angelo to the ground; the square enclosing wall was demolished, leaving the central drum exposed. See Gregorovius, VI, 515-517, with sources; Sauerland 1887, passim; Paschini 1940, 30.
139. CTR, IV, 239-240.
140. SyIloge Poggiana, no. 86, C. I. L., VI, Pars 1, XL = C. I. L., VI, 960.
141. Biondo, R. I., II, 76, also attributed the Column of Marcus Aurelius to Antoninus Pius. The error may have originated in a misinterpretation of the Regionaries, where, in Regio IX, the column is listed in collocation with a temple of Antoninus, Jordan, II, 556: 'templum Antonini et columnam cocidem altam pedes CLXXV s. gradus intus habet CCIII fenestras LVI.' Cf. Jordan, I, 3, 605; CTR, I, 125.
Next to the Appian Way, at the second milestone, was the mausoleum of Caecilia Metella, a distinguished work, which Poggio had first seen intact and subsequently to a large extent demolished for lime.  

'Iuxta viam Appiam, ad secundum lapidem, integrum vidi sepulcrum Q. Caeciliae Metellae, opus egregium, et id ipsum tot saeculis intactum, ad calcem postea maiori ex parte exterminatum.'

A further tomb outside the walls of the city was the tall and imposing mausoleum of M. Antonius Lupus on the Via Ostiensis close to the Tiber, with a fine inscription (which Poggio had already transcribed into his sylloge):

'Illud quoque via Ostiensi, a secundo milliario, iuxta Tiberim adhuc integrum manet M. Antonii Antii Lupi cum inscriptione egregia rerum a se gestarum, quod tribus tantum praegrandibus saxis, altero super alterum positis, constat.'

---

142. CTR, IV, 240.
143. Cf. Gregorovius, VI, 724; CTR, IV, 240, note 2. In the second half of the 13th century the Mausoleum of Caecilia Metella had been incorporated into a fortress, which, towards the end of the century, came into the hands of the Caetani. Poggio surely exaggerates the damage caused by lime-burners in his own day. Enough survived to arouse the iconoclastic zeal of Sixtus V, who declared that 'he wished to remove the unsightly ruins in order to repair those that required it.' Fortunately, so great was the public protest that Sixtus was obliged to yield to a municipal order cancelling the planned demolition of the tomb. See Lanciani 1899, 235-237.
144. CTR, IV, 240.
145. Sylloge Poggiana, no. 65, C.I.L., VI, Pars I, XXXVII = C.I.L., VI, 1343. The tomb of Antonius Lupus had been demolished by 1589; see Lanciani 1899, 236-237.
146. CTR, IV, 240. At this point, the text of the Ruinarum Urbis Romae Descriptio in both the Strasbourg Opera of 1513 and the Basel Opera of 1538 terminates.
Finally, Poggio mentions the pyramidal tomb in the Vatican Borgo, but refrains from giving it its popular attribution to Romulus.\(^{147}\)

(ix) Obelisks. The Egyptian source for the obelisks of Rome was vouched for by Pliny.\(^{148}\) Only one complete one was left standing: that in the Vatican, which, as Poggio correctly states, was erected by Caligula.\(^{149}\) Another obelisk Poggio had seen lying recumbent, broken into four pieces, in the hippodrome on the Via Appia (i.e. the Circus of Maxentius);\(^{150}\) it was carved with various animals, birds and figures, which, as Poggio explains, served as letters to the Egyptians:\(^{151}\)

---

147. CTR, IV, 240. This is the 'sepulchrum Romuli, quod vocatur Keta' of the Mirabilia (CTR, III, 45), and the 'piramis Romuli' of Magister Gregorius (CTR, III, 163). Poggio says that it was shorn of ornament, and indeed some of its marble facing was stripped to pave the Paradiso of St. Peter's and the steps of the basilica in the 10th century: Platner-Ashby, 340. What remained of the pyramidal tomb was partly removed by Alexander VI in 1499 during construction of the Borgo Nuovo, and the rest disappeared during the course of the first quarter of the 16th century: Lanciani 1902-12, I, 126, 161, 186-189.


149. CTR, IV, 240. Sylloghe Poggiana, no. 53, C. I. L., VI, Pars 1, XXXV = C. I. L., VI, 882. On this obelisk, erected by Caligula on the spina of the Circus Gai et Neronis, and now standing in front of St. Peter's, see Platner-Ashby, 370-371; Nash, II, 161-162; CTR, I, 148, note 5. Poggio studiously ignores the medieval view that the gilt ball on top contained the ashes of Caesar.

150. Platner-Ashby, 284, 369; Nash, II, 159-160; CTR, I, 280, note 6. This obelisk was brought from Egypt by order of Domitian and erected in the precinct of the Iseum. It was subsequently removed to decorate the spina of the Circus of Maxentius on the Via Appia, where its recumbent fragments were seen by Poggio; the fragments are clearly visible marking the spina of the circus in the engraving in Graevius, Thesaurus Antiquitatum Romanorum (1696), III, facing p. 732. In 1651 they were recovered by order of Innocent X, reconstituted, and the obelisk was then re-erected in its present position surmounting Bernini's fountain of river-gods in the Piazza Navona.

151. Cf. Ammianus Marcellinus, XVII. 4, 8-11, giving a brief explanation of the principles of Egyptian hieroglyphics.
Vidi alterum paulo minorem veris animalium aviumque
figuris, quibus prisci Aegyptii pro litteris uterantur,
iacentem in hippodromo, via Appia, quatuor frustis
contractum.

Of the remaining obelisks of the city, two damaged fragments still stood
erect, one on the Capitol, and the other in the region called Pinea
(i.e. S. Bustachio), but nothing was known about them.

(x) Statues. Poggio begins by declaring that, unimportant though the
matter may seem, he was especially concerned with the fact that of the
innumerable colossal statues of antiquity, both of marble and bronze,
set up for famous men, because of their virtue, not to mention various
statues erected for public exhibition in the interests of pleasure and
art, only five marble ones remained in situ (Poggio is not surprised
that the silver and gold ones had been melted down); four of them
were in the Baths of Constantine, namely the Dioscuri, which he

152. CTR, IV, 240.
153. This obelisk, re-erected on the Capitol in the 13th century (see
supra, chap. I. 3 (c)), stood in front of the Ara Coeli till 1542,
when it was knocked down. In 1582 the Senate presented it to the
antique-collector, Ciriaco Mattei, who set it up in the garden of
his villa on the Caelian, where it still remains. Cf. Platner-
Ashby, 367; Nash, II, 139-141; Noehles 1966, 18-19.
154. One of the obelisks belonging to the Temple of Isis in the Campus
Martius, it now stands above the fountain in front of the Pantheon.
Platner-Ashby, 369; Nash, II, 150-151; CTR, IV, 130, note 5.
155. CTR, IV, 240.
156. Poggio's list is explicitly devoted to colossi, and should not be
taken as his opinion of the total number of all antique statuary
in the city; the point is stressed, since Krautheimer 1956, 277
and note 2, discussing the number of extant statues in Rome
during the early Quattrocento, takes it that Poggio meant to
include all statues still in situ; he comments on the omission of
the statues of Constantine and his three sons on the Quirinal, but
these were not colossi. Cf. McCarthy 1972, 43, who perpetuates
the misunderstanding.
conventionally attributes to Phidias and Praxiteles, 157 and the recumbent twin River-Gods; 158 a fifth was located in the Forum of Mars, the so-called Marforio. 159 Only one gilded bronze equestrian statue had survived, that at the Lateran, which Poggio identifies with Septimius Severus: 160

'Hoc videbitur levius fortasse, sed me maxime movet, quod his subiiciam, ex innumeris ferme Colossis, statuisque tum marmoreis, tum aeneis (nam argentae atque aureae minime miror fuisse conflatas) viris illustribus ob virtutem positis, ut omittam varia signa voluptatis atque artis causa publice ad spectaculum collocata, marmoreas quinque tantum, quattuor in Constantini thermis; duas stantes pone equos, Phidiae et Praxiteles opus; duas recubantes; quintam in foro Martis statuam quae hodie Martis fori nomen tenet; atque aeneam solam equestrem deauratam, quae est ad basilicam Lateranensem Septimio Severo dictatam, tantum videmus superesse, ut partem maximam stragis urbis, si quis numerum advertat, hoc solum fuisse fateatur.' 161

(xi) Capitol, Palatine and Forum. The destruction of the ornaments of the city prompts Poggio to dwell, in rhetorical terms, on the melancholic process of fortune which had turned its centre into a wilderness: the Capitol, formerly head of the Roman Empire, citadel of the earth, before which monarchs had trembled, and up to which so

---

157. On the spurious inscriptions on the bases of the Dioscuri, on which this attribution rested, see Michaelis 1898, 249-250, 260, 274. 158. Helbig, II, 1162. 159. Helbig, II, 1193. 160. I.e. the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius now on the Capitol: Helbig, II, 1161. Poggio's attribution to Septimius Severus may have been suggested by his knowledge of the Severan barracks of the equites singulares on the Piazza del Laterano. Cf. Platner-Ashby, 105; Nash, I, 391-392. In the Mirabilia, as in other medieval sources, the statue is described as the 'caballus aereus qui dicitur Constantini': CTR, III, 32; cf. Jordan, II, 370-371. In the inscription dated 1465 to his bronze statuette of the Marcus Aurelius in Dresden, Filarete records that it was popularly thought to represent Commodus. Biondo passes over the statue in silence. 161. CTR, IV, 240-241.
many triumphant emperors had ascended, enriched with the spoils and
tributes of countless nations, this spectacle of the world was now
desolate and ruined; the benches of the Senators had been turned
into a dunghill for the cultivation of vines:

'Id vero gravissimum et haud parva cum admiratione
recensendum, hunc Capitolii collem, caput quondam
Romani Imperii, atque orbis terrarum arcem, quem omnes
reges ac principes tremeabant, in quern triumphantes tot
imperatores ascenderunt, domis ac spoliis tot tantarumque
genium ornamentum, florentemque, ac universo orbi
spectandum, aedificium atque eversum, et a priori
illo aureo immutatum, ut vineae in Senatorum subsellia
successerint, stercorum ac purgamentorum receptacula
factum.'162

The Palatine was equally desolate. Of the palace built by Nero after
the fire, to which he conveyed spoil from all over the world, nothing
had survived save the debris.163 The other hills of the city told
the same story: wildernesses devoid of buildings, filled only with
ruins and vineyards.164 As for the Forum and the nearby Comitium,
both were deserted through the malignity of fortune; the one had been
given over to pigs and cattle, while the other served for the cultivation
of pot-herbs, though it retained, Poggio adds, part of a wall with a
marble sculpture of two men dressed in togas: 165

'Forum iure dicundo, ferendis legibus, plebe ad concionem
advocanda, celeberrimum urbis locum, et iuxta Comitium
creandis magistratibus insignem, deserta squalent
malignitate fortunae, alterum porcorum bubalorumque
diversorium, alterum serendis oleribus cultum. Extat
tamen Comitii portio quaedam aureorurn insigni structura, in
quibus adiunct duo signa marmorea togata in summo collocata

162. CTR, IV, 214.
164. Cf. supra, chap. IV. 1.
165. The reference is too vague for such a sculpture to be positively
identified; the use of the word signa suggests that Poggio is
referring to an ancient relief.
Not far from Trajan's column, where was now the church of S. Basilio, was situated another distinguished building, which Poggio, on the basis of Ammianus Marcellinus, a source he had discovered at Fulda, identifies with the Forum of Trajan, though it was, in fact, the Temple of Mars Ultor. Poggio goes on to mention the bridge which, according to Suetonius, Caligula built between the Capitoline and Palatine Hills, erroneously associating with it six marble columns 'tres ad Capitolii, et item tres ad Palatii radices'. Poggio concludes the section with a note on the Senate. That the ancient Secretarium Senatum was situated in the time of Theodosius where is now the church of S. Martina was indicated by an inscription preserved, with other ancient inscribed tablets, on the walls of the church:

166. CTR, IV, 241-242.
168. CTR, IV, 242. The church of S. Basilio was founded on the ruins of the Temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus; it was described as 'iuxta palatium Traiani imperatoris' in the Descriptio Lateranensis Ecclesiae (CTR, III, 362) and by Petrus Mallus (CTR, III, 439). Cf. Huelser 1927, 208, no. 12.
170. CTR, IV, 242. On these columns, see Georgio's edition of the De varietate Fortunae, 22, note c.
172. Syll. Pogg. no. 63, C.L.L., VI, Pars 1, XXXVII = C.L.L., VI, 1718. The inscription commemorates a restoration of the Secretarium Senatus in 412 A.D. by the then Prefect of the City, Epifanius. Cf. Platner-Ashby, 145-146. The church of S. Martina must, in the Quattrocento, have been practically a museum of antiquities, since it also contained the three reliefs from a triumphal arch of Marcus Aurelius now in the Conservatori: Heltig, II, 1444; on these reliefs, see Biondi, R.I., III. 55.
Walls and Gates. Poggio ends his description of Rome with a substantial account of its walls. Here again, appearances to the contrary, was cause for lamentation, since of the ancient walls of the city, battered by so many disasters, and demolished to their foundations, nothing remained, not even their location; all recollection of them had been lost. Poggio proceeds to explain, with recourse to the Liber Pontificalis, that the brick walls visible in his day were new; 800 years after the earlier walls, which had been destroyed, they had been begun by Pope Hadrian I, after a hundred pounds of gold had been collected from the peoples of Etruria, and completed by the two Popes Gregory; it was consequently the work of diverse popes that gave the appearance of the walls a varied one:

'Quid iam querar, quod etiam stuporem recensenti mihi affert, urbis moenia ita multiplici clade afficta, ita a fundamentis eruta, ut ne dum locus eorum pristinus, sed ne vestigium quidem illum aspiciatur omni veterum murorum sublata memoria? Nam ea quae cernis lateri tia, nova sunt et post octingentesimum annum, deletis prioribus, primum ab Hadriano inchoata, collatis ab Etruriae populis centum somo pondo, tum a Gregorio uno, et item altero, pontificibus perfecta, unde et diversarum pontificum opus variam reddidit murorum formam.'

175. Poggio's papal chronology is confused. The popes in question must be Gregory II (715-731) and Gregory III (731-741), who both precede Hadrian I. On their respective restorations to the walls of Rome, as recorded in the Liber Pontificalis (presumably Poggio's source), see CTR, II, 261-262, 266.
The completion of the ancient stone walls of Rome had been recorded by Livy: 177 'Antiqua moenia ex quadrato lapide, post incensam a Gallis urbem, consummata Livius tradit.' 178 As to their circuit, Dionysius Halicarnassus, according to Poggio, had estimated it to be 16,000 paces, but had remarked on the difficulty of measuring it, because of the buildings that stood in the way; the abutment of private buildings onto the walls (in default of the Etruscan *pomerium*) was corroborated by Livy. 179 Poggio, for his part, computed the circuit of the existing walls, excluding the Leonine walls of the Vatican, to be 'not beyond 10,000 paces'. 180 He also claims to have taken great care to count the number of towers along the perimeter of the walls, arriving at a figure of 379. 181 As for the gates into the city, of the 37 mentioned by Pliny 182 only 13 remained still in use. 183 The Transtiberine region possessed three gates: Portuensis, Aurelia, and Cassia. 184 In addition, three gates were no longer in use, having been blocked up; two of them were of ancient structure, an inscription on one

177. Livy, *ab urbe condita*, VI. 32. 1; VII. 20. 9.
178. CTR, IV, 24.3.
179. Livy, *ab urbe condita*, I. 44. 4; Dionysius Halicarnassus, IV. 13. 5 — Dionysius actually does not give a figure for the size of the wall, but comments: 'if one should wish to measure Rome by the wall, which, though hard to be discovered by reason of the buildings that surround it in many places, yet preserves in several parts of it some traces of its ancient structure, and to compare it with the circuit of the city of Athens, the circuit of Rome would not seem to him very much larger than the other.' (Loeb ed., translated by E. Cary, vol. II, 311); Poggio doubtless derived the figure of 16,000 paces from a scholiast.
181. CTR, IV, 24.3. Poggio's count of 379 towers differs only marginally from medieval figures: Richmond 1930, 50-52; CTR, III, 17, note 1; Jordan, II, 159, for this reason, was disinclined to accept Poggio's claim that he had counted the towers himself.
183. CTR, IV, 24.3.
184. Ibid.
of which, between the Porta Ostiensis and Appia, proved to Poggio, as
did the inscription on the Porta Ostiensis itself, that Arcadius and
Honorius had restored the walls, gates, and towers of the city; the
other, between Porta Latina and Asinaria, had no inscription; the
third was between Porta Tiburtina and Nomentana. To these three
walled-up gates Poggio adds a fourth, which he locates not far from the
Porta Clausa, facing the Nomentana, 'adjoining the walls on the outside,
from which there extends a wall of greater circuit for 500 paces', the
circuit of the walls being, Poggio suspected, diminished after the
destruction of the earlier walls:

'Adiicitur his quarta etiam haud procul ab ea, Nomentanam
versus, exterius moenibus contigua, a qua ducitur murus
amplioris ambitus per quingentos passus: ut plane suspicer
etiam post priscorum murorum ruinam, eorum ambitum aliquando
ab ea parte immunitum.'

185. OTR, IV, 244. I.e. the Porta Arde~ina, which was blocked at an
early but unknown date in its history; cf. Richmond 1930, 217-219.
The existence of any Honorian inscription on this posterula has been
denied by Huelen 1894, 326. In any case, it is not included in the
Sylloge Poggiana. Moreover, Richmond, discussing the same
passage from the De varietate Fortunae, concluded that 'quite
certainly there never was any inscription of Honorius on Porta
Ostiensi' either. Possibly, Poggio mistook Ostiensis for
Portuensis, with its Honorian inscription: C.I.L. VI, 1188. Cf.
Platner-Ashby, 405; Nash, II, 222.

186. OTR, IV, 244. I.e. the Porta Metrovia: Platner-Ashby, 409;
Nash, II, 214.

187. OTR, IV, 244. I.e. the Porta Clausa (or Chiusa), a postern in the
Aurelian wall immediately to the south of the Castra Praetoria:
Platner-Ashby, 406; Nash, II, 206-209.

188. Though obscure, Poggio is probably here referring to the Porta
Praetoria on the western side of the Castra Praetoria, which was
incorporated by Aurelian in his line of fortification. Cf. Jordan,
I. 3, 387-388; Platner-Ashby, 106-108; Richmond 1930, 230-231;
OTR, IV, 244, note 5; Nash, I, 221-224.

189. OTR, IV, 244.
of the ancient gates built on this side of the Tiber, Poggio finds that only three were still in use: the Praenestina, Tiburtina, and the Nomentana; the rest were of more recent construction.\textsuperscript{190} Poggio refers to the three inscriptions on the Porta Tiburtina, which he had already transcribed into his \textit{sylloge},\textsuperscript{191} and to the three inscriptions on the attic of the Porta Praenestina, also included in the \textit{Sylloge Poggiana}.\textsuperscript{192}

He now reverts to the walls of the city, as they existed in his own day, their heterogeneous construction, and the implications this, in turn, had for their dating. He notes that the stretch of wall called \textit{Pinciana} (i.e. the Miro Torto) was devoid of towers.\textsuperscript{193} That the existing walls were not the same as the ancient ones was, he says, demonstrated by many proofs. Firstly, he notes that in many places both public and private buildings, and shrines too, were embedded in the walls, and that from time to time its foundations rested upon ancient ruins. Secondly, from the Porta Praenestina for a long distance the aqueduct of Claudius was used as a wall.\textsuperscript{194} Thirdly, between the Porta Tiburtina and Nomentana, for more than a mile, the wall was taken round beyond a rectangular public building (called \textit{Piscina}), on three sides of which appeared most lovely plastered walls,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{190} \textit{Ibid.}
\item \textsuperscript{191} \textit{Ibid.} \textit{Sylloge Poggiana}, no. 35, C.I.L., VI, Pars 1, XXXIII = C.I.L., VI, 1244; \textit{Sylloge Poggiana}, no. 36, C.I.L., VI, Pars 1, XXXIII = C.I.L., VI, 1245; \textit{Sylloge Poggiana}, no. 37, C.I.L., VI, Pars 1, XXXIII = C.I.L., VI, 1246. On Poggio's revelation of the inscriptions over the Porta Tiburtina, and his report to Niccoli on the subject, see \textit{supra}, chap. IV. 3.
\item \textsuperscript{192} \textit{GFR}, IV, 244. \textit{Sylloge Poggiana}, no. 39, C.I.L., VI, Pars 1, XXXIV = C.I.L., VI, 1256; \textit{Sylloge Poggiana}, no. 40, C.I.L., VI, Pars 1, XXXIV = C.I.L., VI, 1257; \textit{Sylloge Poggiana}, no. 41, C.I.L., VI, Pars 1, XXXIV = C.I.L., VI, 1258.
\item \textsuperscript{193} Cf. Procopius, \textit{De bello Goth}, I. 23; Richmond 1930, 13.
\item \textsuperscript{194} L.e. the \textit{Aqua Marcia}, Tepula and Julia between the Porta Praenestina and Tiburtina.
\end{itemize}
Fourthly, between the Porta Flaminia and the Tiber a shrine was contained in the wall, and in many places could be seen blocked windows and the doors of private houses, which served as the wall. Fifthly, there were, Poggio explains, some rotten and crumbling stretches of wall, which fell without being touched, their substance consisting of a mass of varied smashed pieces of marble and sherds of tile. Poggio himself had seen a collapsed part of the wall, where the building material was taken from miscellaneous collected stone and fragments of marble, while the outer and inner facings were adorned with bricks polished like tiles. The construction of the ancient walls, on the contrary, was so compact that it could not be removed without great effort. Since there was no uniform method of building, and since the walls differed in many places, they had evidently been built neither all at the same time nor by a single architect. This, Poggio concludes, is his theory about the walls of the city, although they were considered older by many:

"Muros, qui nunc sunt, non esse antiquos multis argumentis monstratur; nam pluribus in locis publica privatae aedificia, sacella quoque complectuntur, et fundamenta quandoque veteribus ruinis superaedificata sunt. A porta quidem Praenestina longo spatio aquaeductus Divi Claudii"

195. Valentini and Zucchetti in CTR, IV, 245, note 2, identify this structure as the Castra Praetoria; cf. Platner-Ashby, 106-108; Nash, I, 221-224. But the name Piscina seems to occur only in Poggio; the common medieval and Renaissance name for the Castra Praetoria was Vivarium or Vivariolium: Jordan, I, 3, 392, note 48; Richmond 1930, 53, note 4, in his translation of the passage, disposes of the problem by substituting Vivaiolo for Piscina. Cf. Biondo, R.I, IL 89.

196. See CTR, IV, 245, note 3, with further literature on the stretch of wall between the Porta Flaminia and the Tiber; Richmond 1930, 11-12. Poggio may refer here to the tomb incorporated in the wall at the third tower west of the Porta Flaminia: Richmond 1930, 12, note 4.
Finally, at the end of his description of Rome, Poggio mentions a 'porticus inter M. Agrippae templum et collem Quirinalem, cuius auctor et nomen incertum est.'

(b) Discussion

The priority of epigraphy in Poggio's antiquarian pursuits has already been stressed, with regard to his correspondence with Niccoli and the compilation of his sylloge. This priority also

197. CTR, IV, 244-245.
198. CTR, IV, 245. Possibly, Poggio is here referring to the ruins of either of the twin porticus associated with the Saepta Julia in the Campus Martius: Platner-Ashby, 460-461; Nash II, 291. The suggestion by Huelsen in Jordan, I 3, 560, note 7, that the ruins mentioned by Biondo, R L, III 78 at S. Marco also belonged to the Saepta can now be discounted, since subsequent research has convincingly located the complex between the Pantheon and the Temple of Isis.
199. See supra, chap. IV. 3 and chap. VI. 2.
makes itself felt in the *Ruinum Urbis Romae Descriptio*, which 
contains references to no less than 34 *in situ* inscriptions (of which 
24 are fully transcribed in the *Sylloge Poggiana*).\(^{200}\) It contains, 
moreover, Loschi's flattering commendation of the *sylloge*, and Poggio's 
own boastful justification of epigraphy as an antidote to oblivion.\(^{201}\)

The *Ruinum Urbis Romae Descriptio* not only reflects the 
same preoccupation that had inspired the *Sylloge Poggiana*, but the 
episode on which it purports to be based is dated by Poggio to shortly 
before the death of Pope Martin V—precisely the time during which 
the *sylloge* must have been substantially compiled.

This epigraphic approach, unique to Poggio, contrasts, on the 
one hand, with the various descriptions of Rome in the tradition of the 
*Mirabilia*, and, on the other, with Flavio Biondo's *Roma instaurata*, 
which, though it does contain one or two references to ancient 
iscriptions, is overwhelmingly based on classical literary sources. 
It has, nevertheless, been contended that, since the *De varietate 
Fortunae* was not issued till 1448, two years after the dedication of the 
*Roma instaurata* to Eugenius IV, Poggio profited from Biondo's more 
substantial work, and derived information from it, which he incorporated 
into the *Ruinum Urbis Romae Descriptio*.\(^{202}\) Fubini argues, in 
particular, that Poggio's account of the location of the Baths of 
Alexander Severus derives from the *Roma instaurata*, II. 7-8, of the 
Baths of Domitian from *ibid.*., II. 12, and that his passage on the 
aqueducts appears to be a reduction of *ibid.*., II. 94-97.\(^{203}\)

\(^{200}\) See supra, notes 53-192 *passim*, and *infra*, Appendix D.
\(^{201}\) *CTR*, IV, 233.
\(^{203}\) Fubini 1966, 547.
The thesis is too slight to be convincing. A distinction should be drawn between what constitutes dependence and common knowledge. The Liber Pontificalis source for the location of the Baths of Domitian surely constitutes the latter, and, as far as the section on the aqueducts is concerned, it was, after all, Poggio, and not Biondo, who retrieved the classical source on which it is explicitly based, the De Aquaeductibus of Frontinus. Equally, the Notitia or Curiosum source which seems to be implicit in Poggio's remarks on the Baths of Alexander Severus need not derive from Biondo, who alleged to have discovered such a source at Monte Cassino, since MSS. of the Regionaries must have been available in Rome some years beforehand; texts of the Regionaries, we recall, were included in both the Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis and in Signorili's Descriptio Urbis Romae.

The emphasis given to inscriptions by Poggio is symptomatic of the generally empirical approach of the Ruinarum Urbis Romae Descriptio. In comparison with Biondo, indeed, his use of classical literary sources, including those he had himself discovered, is rather perfunctory. Far more valuable are his observations about the state of the monuments in his own day. He was vigilant enough in the field to note, and decry, the fact that both the Temple of Mercury (i.e. Concordia) and the Mausoleum of Caecilia Metella, which he had first seen intact, had

204. In any case, it is easy enough to suppose that both Poggio and Biondo independently interpreted the Vita of Silvester in the Liber Pontificalis as referring to S. Silvestro in Capite.

205. See supra, note 114.

206. See infra, chap. VIII. 5 (a) on Biondo's use of a text of the Regionaries in the Roma instaurata.

207. See supra, chap. III. 2 and chap. V. 4; CTR, IV, 124, 169.
subsequently undergone demolition for lime. Particularly perceptive, from the observational point of view, is his discussion of the composition, and the chronology, of the walls of the city, a discussion which, as Richmond concluded, 'shows that Poggio, whatever his other faults, could read palimpsests in mortar and brick as well as ink.' To be sure, Poggio's discrimination between authentically antique and degenerate medieval structure, however acute, was reinforced, if not actually prompted, by false assumptions about the nature and duration of the ancient walls, in particular the failure altogether to specify the walls built by Aurelian, as well as by some misleading information on the medieval fortifications of Rome taken uncritically from the Liber Pontificalis. The ancient city, Poggio assumed, possessed, in its history, one set of walls, which corresponded, from the point of view of the sources adduced, to the murus Servii Tullii, not to the Aurelian circuit. These ancient walls, in Poggio's view, had, in any case, been destroyed long before Pope Hadrian I, in the 8th century, began construction of the new ones. That they had been destroyed already in antiquity he attempted to show by noting ostensibly later alterations to its course and fabric; thus, he seems to adduce the use of an aqueduct as a stretch of wall between the Porta Praenestina and Tiburtina as a terminus post instead of a terminus ante quem to the construction of the ancient walls, and his other adductions

208. CTR, IV, 234-235, 240.
209. Richmond 1930, 54.
210. The brief and scantly classical literary sources for the construction of the walls under Aurelian are gathered together by Richmond 1930, 27-30.
211. The conflation of republican and imperial walls of Rome was, in the following decade, even more explicitly made by Flavio Biondo, R.I., I. 3-20.
212. CTR, IV, 245.
evidently attempt to sustain the same hypothesis. Nevertheless, this hypothesis, that the 'muros, qui nunc sunt, non esse antiques', resting as it does on a close structural analysis of the texture of the existing (i.e. Aurelian) walls along their twelve mile circuit, does occasion some valuable perceptions. It would not be too extravagant to say that Poggio's excursus on the walls of Rome constitutes the first sustained attempt at archaeological deduction in its proper sense (based exclusively, that is, on in situ remains) in the history of archaeology.

Other instances of Poggio's first-hand observation of the ancient monuments of Rome in the field, and the archaeological deductions he drew from them, are afforded by his account of the Pyramid of Cestius, the Baths of Constantine, the Theatre of Pompey, the obelisk in the Circus of Maxentius, and the Secretarium Senatum; the primary, or exclusive, rôle played by inscriptions in these deductions need hardly be stressed.

Other aspects of the Ruinarum Urbis Romae Descriptio, notably the section on temples, which is shot through with much the same kind of misconceptions as the Periegesis of the Mirabilia, are rather less progressive in spirit. More fundamentally, the work's philosophic structure, though formally in the mode of Quattrocento humanist dialogue, belongs in spirit to the long tradition of lament over the destruction of Rome's antiquities, which we have traced through the Middle Ages to Petrarch and the humanists of the Schism. When describing Poggio's

213. CTR, IV, 244-245.
214. See supra, chap II. 2 (a).
discourse with Loschi on the Capitol, one cannot but recall Petrarch's with Giovanni Colonna on the roof of the Terme. Both take the panorama of Rome as the pretext for a survey of history and destiny. But while to Petrarch the monuments of the city were pregnant with moralistic and political implications - stage-sets on which had been enacted the exemplary history of the Roman Republic - to Poggio they were magnificent, if poignant, instances of the vicissitudes of fortune. Where Petrarch's survey of Rome is instinct with hopes for the future, Poggio's had already attained a level of philosophic resignation, which, perhaps, verges on the sentimentality of later generations of antiquaries, for whom the ruins of antiquity were objects not of admonition, but of the picturesque.

CHAPTER VIII

THE ROMA INSTAURATA OF FLAVIO BIONDO

1. Introduction

The death of Pope Martin V on 20 February 1431 brought an end to Poggio's investigation of the antiquities of Rome. We enter upon a new phase in the rediscovery of the ancient city, but one postponed for over a decade by the events which so convulsively separated the composition of Poggio's Descriptio and Flavio Biondo's Roma instaurata.

Pope Eugenius IV's initial vendetta against the family of his predecessor soon escalated into wider hostilities, which, by May 1431, had driven the Colonna into an alliance with Filippo Maria Visconti, and had engulfed the whole of Latium in war. In August 1433, after a rapid campaign, Fortebraccio, Visconti's condottiere, appeared before Rome. Simultaneously, Francesco Sforza, another Visconti hireling, advanced without serious impediment through the Marches, Umbria, and Roman Tuscany. It was under the threat of this dual offensive that Eugenius was obliged, in December 1433, to make his humiliating submission to the Council of Basel. Though Sforza was shortly afterwards induced to change sides, the Pope's position remained precarious. It was entirely undermined, when, on 29 May 1434, a popular uprising, fomented, it seems, by Colonna and Visconti agents,

---

1. On the participation of Flavio Biondo, a papal envoy, in the negotiations which led to this reversal, see Decades, III. 5-6; cf. Masius 1879, 15; Nogara 1927, LXIII-LXIV, and notes 88-89.
launched an attack on the Capitol, and a Republic was duly proclaimed.

Five days later, 'come fraticello dell'ordine de sancto Pavolo', Eugenius rode on a mule out of Trastevere to the Ripa Grande, where a small boat awaited. As he embarked, he was recognised by bystanders, who pelted him with stones, spears and other projectiles from the shore. The boat was pursued downstream as far as Ostia, where a galley lay to speed the Pope to Civitavecchia and safety.

While Eugenius spent his exile in Florence, civil war raged in the Campagna. Rome itself was bombarded from without, and pillaged from within: both the Vatican and the papal palace in Trastevere were looted. On 25 October 1434 the papal forces under Giovanni Vitelleschi re-entered the city; an assault on the Capitol swept the tottering Roman Republic away. With papal government restored in Rome, Vitelleschi set about recovering the lands of the Papal State. 'Seldom,' thought Poggio - himself a victim of the struggle - 'has the rule of any other Pope produced equal devastation in the provinces of the Roman church.' Palestrina, a

3. Biondo's vivid narrative of the flight of Eugenius IV from Rome in Decades, III, 6 (Opera, 482-483; cf. II, 4, Opera, II, 236) is digested by Gregorovius, VII, 45-46; that Biondo was not an actual eye-witness is, however, pointed out by Nogara 1927, LXVII, note 92. Among other sources: Poggio Bracciolini, De varietate Fortunae, III, ed. Georgio, 91-92; Paolo dello Mastro, Memoriale, 84; Vespasiano da Bisticci, Vite di Uomini Illustri, 9.
4. On the papal palace at S. Maria in Trastevere, used temporarily as a residence by Eugenius IV, see Magnuson 1958, 223; Nogara 1927, LXII and note 87.
5. Poggio added his detention by the troops of Piccinino to the illustrations of the vicissitudes of fortune: De varietate Fortunae, III, ed. Georgio, 92. Ambrogio Traversari used his influence 'to induce Piccinino to restore so learned and liberally minded a man as Poggio to liberty' (Traversari, Epist., V. 10), but to no avail: Poggio was obliged to buy his own way to freedom. Cf. Shepherd 1802, 230-232.
Colonna stronghold, was systematically razed to the ground. Finally, on 28 September 1443, bolstered by new alliances with Alfonso of Naples and Filippo Maria Visconti, Eugenius triumphantly re-entered the city he had so ignominiously fled from almost a decade before. Rome, in his absence, had become, according to Vespasiano da Bisticci, 'a mere cow pasture'.

In the Pope's entourage was his loyal servant, Flavio Biondo, whose Roma instaurata both coincides with and reflects a new phase in the history of Rome and of its renascence.

2. Date and Composition of the Roma instaurata

The life of the humanist and historiographer, Flavio Biondo, who had entered the service of the Pope in 1433, and been appointed secretarius in the following year, is by now sufficiently well-known to be passed over quickly. It may be said to cover four main periods: his childhood and education at Forli and Cremona (1392-1423); his Wanderjahre as diplomat and administrator, after his expulsion from Forli, at Venice, Vicenza, Bergamo, Brescia, and in the March of Ancona (1423-1433); his years in the Roman Curia under Eugenius IV until his fall from favour under Nicholas V (1433-1449); and his retirement, in

8. Vespasiano da Bisticci, Vite di Uomini Illustri, 20: 'Era tornata Roma, per l'assenza del papa, come una terra di vaccai: perchè si tenevano le pecore e le vacche in sino dove sono oggi i banchi de' mercatanti.'
9. The biography of Masius 1879 has generally been supplanted by that of Nogara 1927, XIX-CLXXXIII, which remains the most substantial account of Biondo's life and works. Cf. the remarks of Hay 1959, 99-101; and cumulative bibliography in Fubini 1966, 557-559.
old age, from the most arduous of his public duties (1450-1463).

Biondo's literary reputation rests on four substantial works: the Decades (1439-c. 1444); the Roma instaurata (1444-1446); the Italia illustrata (1448-1453); and the Roma triumphans (1457-1459). Our concern is with the second of these. We first hear of the work in a letter of February 1446 to the Marchese Leonello d'Este, in the course of which Biondo describes a banquet given by Cardinal Prospero Colonna in honour of Sigismondo Malatesta, lord of Rimini, to which Biondo had been invited; when the conversation turned to the subject of numismatics, Biondo grasped the opportunity to draw attention to the passage in the Roma instaurata dealing with the invention of money (II. 83-85):

'Erat forte mihi tunc in manibus pars illa Romae a me instauratae, in qua primi aeris cusi primorum nummorum initia ostenduntur. Quam cum a Columnensi nostro iussus ad te mittere destinassem, constitui hortorum etiam Maecenatianorum descriptionem mittere, ut simul tui facti originem et locum, quem alter inhabitat Maecenas, a me noscas. Sociavi autem originis suae descriptioni nummos ipsos iam bigatos quadrigatosque, ut sculpturam videns, licet vetustate obliterateam, quid velint Ovidii et Plinii verba, melius intelligas.'

Though the letter is proof only of the existence of Books I and II at this date, confirmation that all three books of the Roma instaurata were complete by September of the same year is found in a letter of 13 September 1446 to an anonymous prelate, in which Biondo mentions that he had shown the work to him; he had written it after the completion of the first eleven books of the Decades (which were already circulating in manuscript by 1443): 12

---

10. For the dates of composition and publication of Biondo's principal writings, see Hay 1959, Appendix I.
11. Nogara 1927, 160; cf. ibid., XCVII.
That the *Roma instaurata* was complete by 1446 is further suggested by a passage in the *Italia illustrata* at the beginning of the description of the *Regio Latina*, in which Biondo explains that, since four years earlier he had already written a work in three books on Rome under the title of *Roma instaurata*, he proposes to exempt the city from his description of that region:

"Finis Etruriae ad Tyberim nos perducens Romam ordine describendam offerebat. Sed quum id anno ante quarto tribus libris IIII Eugenio Romano pontifici celeberrimo inscriptis sub *Romae instauratae* titulo effecerimus, urbem ipsam reliquentes, regionem in qua est Latinam novo volumine describemus." 14

It should also be pointed out — a fact previously overlooked — that the *Roma instaurata* itself contains some internal evidence as to its date of composition; the relevant passages are assembled in an appendix below. 15

A comparative evaluation of the epistolary and internal evidence for the date of the work indicates that it was begun in 1444, a few months after Biondo's return to Rome with Eugenius IV in September 1443, and completed by 1446, towards the end of which year it was dedicated to the Pope.

13. Nogara 1927, 162; cf. *ibid.*, CIV.
15. Appendix E.
3. MSS. and Printed Versions

A catalogue of the surviving MSS. of the Roma instaurata, as indeed of all Biondo's works, has still to be attempted. A useful starting-point for such a venture is afforded by Nogara's appendix listing the Biondo MSS. preserved in the Vatican Library. Among them are no less than ten codices of the Roma instaurata. Unfortunately, these do not include the dedication copy to Eugenius IV, which appears to be lost. The finest of the Vatican MSS., Ottob. lat. 1096, a mid-Quattrocento codex with period binding, and a title-page decorated with floriated margins, portrait medallions, an illuminated initial containing a miniature of Rome, and the device of its owner, Petrus Ursuleus, is textually unsound, being marred by many lacunae.

There are, furthermore, numerous 15th century MSS. of the Roma instaurata in libraries elsewhere in Italy, and a few even further afield.

---

16. Nogara 1927, CLXXXV-CXCI.
17. Biblioteca Vaticana: Vat. lat. 1941, 1942, 1943 (Poggio's copy), 1944, 7310; Urb. lat. 454; Reg. lat. 827; Ottob. lat. 1096, 1279, 1375. To these MSS. listed by Nogara can be added Vat. lat. 6311, which Jordan, II, 399, referred to as the 'Anonymus de antiquitatibus urbis ad Eugenium IV', but which Hulsen 1907B, 23, identified as a MS. of the Roma instaurata; one may also add the 16th century MS. of Book I in Vat. lat. 10803. XII (ff. 181-193).
18. Nogara 1927, CLXXXIX. For a convenient illustration of the title-page (f. 3r), see Garin 1966, 176. The many lacunae in this MS., and other textual corruptions, have been brought to my attention in a kind communication from Dorothy Robathan, who is currently preparing an edition of the Roma instaurata from MS. sources.
19. MSS. of the Roma instaurata in other Italian libraries include: Arezzo, Biblioteca della Fraternità di S. Maria, no. 233 (Mazzatinti, VI, 218); Ferrara, Biblioteca Comunale Ariostea, Classe IIa, Manoscritti Esteri, 180 (Kristeller 1963-, I, 54); Florence, Mediceo Laurenziana, plut. 54 cod. 4 (CTR, IV, 252); ibid., plut. 76 cod. 50 (CTR, IV, 252); ibid., Fondo Ashburnham

Continued
Of the several printed editions of the *Roma instaurata*, the *editio princeps* is represented by the rare incunable without colophon or signature edited by Gaspare Biondo, Flavio's son, and published in Rome probably in 1470; this consists of 66 leaves, ff. 1, 2, 65, 66 blank, 36 lines to a page, and contains, besides the *Roma instaurata* (ff. 3r - 56v), also a text of Biondo's *De verbis Romanae locutionis* (ff. 57v).

---

214 (291-223) (Kristeller 1963-, I, 84); Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Fondo Conventi Soppressi J I 45 (S. Marco 579) (Kristeller 1963-, I, 150); Foligno, Biblioteca Jacobilli, 37 (A II. 10) (Mazzatinti, XLI, 16); Forli, Biblioteca Comunale, Piancastelli cod. 373, now I 41 (Kristeller 1963-, I, 235); Genoa, Biblioteca Durazzo, C I 31 (Kristeller 1963-, I, 246, II, 523); Lucca, Biblioteca Governativa, no. 1437 (Kristeller 1963-, I, 257); Messina, Biblioteca Universitaria, Inv. no. 109 (Fondo Antico 110) (Kristeller 1963-, I, 276); Modena, Biblioteca Estense, Fondo Campori 101 (Gamma D1, 20) (Kristeller 1963-, I, 386); Motecassino, Biblioteca della Badia (Kristeller 1963-, I, 394); Naples, Biblioteca Governativa dei Gerolamini, cart. 32 (XI, X). S. M. XXVIII 2-15 (Kristeller 1963-, I, 397, II, 546); Padua, Biblioteca Capitolare, D 45 (Kristeller 1963-, II, 5); Ravenna, Biblioteca Classense, no. 228 (Mazzatinti, IV, 198); Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, 1023 (C II 24) (Kristeller 1963-, II, 95); Sandanzele del Friuli, Biblioteca Comunale, Inv. 106 (Mazzatinti, III, 127); Siena, Biblioteca Comunale, K X 34 (Kristeller 1963-, II, 157); *ibid.*, K X 35 (Kristeller 1963-, II, 169); Trento, Museo Nazionale, Vindob. lat. 3498 (formerly Vienna, Nationalbibliothek) (Kristeller 1963-, II, 193); Urbino, Biblioteca Universitaria, Fondo dell'Universita, no. 104 (Mazzatinti, LXXX, 27); Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Latini, Classe X. 21, cod. 150 (5523) (Kristeller 1963-, II, 230) (on the variants of this MS., written in Bologna in 1462, see Masius 1879, 52); *ibid.*, Latini, Classe XIV, cod. 273 (4346) (Kristeller 1963-, II, 250). MSS. in libraries elsewhere in Europe include: Brussels, Bib. Nat. 361; London, British Museum, Inv. Add. 17, 375 (Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the B.M. in the years 1818-1853, 10); *ibid.*, Inv. Add. 21, 956 (Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the B.M. 1854-1860, 565); Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, Ser. n. 261 (Epitoma *Romea instauratae*); and the former Biblioteca Corviviana MS. (Csapodi 1967, 48).

20. On Gaspare Biondo, and his edition of the *Roma instaurata*, see D. B. L., 10, 559-560.

21. Hain, no. 3242 = Schudt 1930, no. 1216. The incunabulum is undated, but the *terminus ante quem* is given by the signed copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris: 'hic liber q. petri gossi: quem sibi comparavit rome anno dhi 1471 mese augusto fer.' (f. 62).
The Roma instaurata was subsequently printed at Verona in 1481-1482 by Bonino de Boniniis, in conjunction with Biondo's Italia illustrata and his late fragment, the De gestis Venetorum; at Venice in 1503 'per Bernadinum Venetum de Vitalibus', in conjunction with the same works; at Venice in 1510 (G. de Gregoriis) again with the same works; at Turin in 1527 (Bernadinus Sylva), with the Italia illustrata and works of Sabellius and Merula; and at Basel in 1531, included in Froben's folio Opera Omnia, reprinted, with improved index, at Basel in 1559.

A volgare translation of the Roma instaurata, together with the Italia illustrata, made by Lucio Fauno, was published at Venice in 1542 and again in 1543 by Michele Tramezzino; another edition was issued by the same printer in 1548; and yet another edition was printed by Domenico Giglio of Venice in 1558.

From the later 16th century to the 19th century no new editions of the Roma instaurata, either in the original Latin or in the volgare, appeared. Even in our own century no complete critical

---

The attribution to a Roman printer otherwise rests on the occurrence of the same type in an undated Statius, Thebais et Achilleis, the copy of which at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, is bound with several early Roman books. See further B.M. Catalogue, IV, 143.

22. Hain, no. 3243 = Schudt 1930, no. 567. The incunabulum contains two colophons, one (f. 57b) dated 1481, the other (f. 151b) dated 1482. See further B.M. Catalogue, VII, 951-952.

24. Ibid., no. 569.
25. Ibid., no. 570.
26. Ibid., nos. 571, 576.
27. Ibid., nos. 572, 573. On Michele Tramezzino, the leading publisher of Roman antiquities in the mid-16th century, see Mandowsky and Mitchell 1963, 20.
28. Schudt 1930, no. 574.
29. Ibid., no. 575.
edition of the work has been attempted. The version made by Valentini and Zucchetti for inclusion in the final volume of their Codice Topografico della Città di Roma (1953), though extremely valuable for its commentary and notation, is neither complete nor critical; their much-abbreviated text derives from an unspecified, presumably printed, source, and does not claim to make any contribution to the MS. problem.

The text employed in the following synopsis and analysis of the Roma instaurata equally does not arise from any comparison of the earliest MSS. It is based, with modernised punctuation, on Froben's well-printed, and complete, edition in the Basel Opera Omnia of 1531 (B). A collation with the text in the 1470 editio princeps (R) has revealed few substantive variants.

4. Synopsis

Biondo divided his Roma instaurata into three books, containing respectively 104, 124, and 114 chapters. The work is introduced by a prooemium, in dedication to Pope Eugenius IV.

(a) Prooemium

The prooemium is, in itself, an indispensable exposition of

30. It had originally been my intention to edit the Roma instaurata, until I discovered that Dorothy Robathan of New York was already engaged on a critical edition, and had already collated several of the MSS.
31. CTR, IV, 247-323.
the author's intentions. Many things, Biondo begins, persuade him to review the fame of the ruins of Rome, rather than of the buildings now standing. But his main motivation was, such was the long-standing ignorance of humane studies, that little was known, not only to the ignorant populace but even to the more cultivated, of the buildings belonging to the ancient city - an ignorance exemplified in the false and barbaric names with which many of them were defiled:

"Urbis Romae, rerum dominae, ruinarum potius quam aedificiorum, quae nunc cernuntur, notitiam pro viribus innovare, Eugeni pontifex sanctissime, multa mihi suadent. Sed illud maxime impellit, quod tanta fuit praeteritorum diu saeculorum hominibus studiorum humanitatis ignoratio, ut cum pauxa singulis in urbis ipsius aedificiorum partibus quae olim fuerint, non ab imperita solum multitudine, sed ab his etiam qui doctrina cultores sunt sciantur, tum multa ac paene omnia falsis et barbaris appellationibus inquinata vel potius infamata cernamus."35

Within a short space of time Rome, its buildings overtaken by obscurity, had suffered a loss of fame and glory even greater than that in material things and power:

"Unde brevi futurum apparat, ut Roma, ingeniorum parens, virtutum alumnæ, celebritatis specimen, laudis et gloriae columnæ, ac omnium quæ universus orbis ubique habet bonarum rerum seminariolum, in suis obscurata structuris maïorem celebritatis et famæ jacturam faciat, quam in rebus pridem factum ac potentia videamus."34

Biondo's intention of describing the buildings of antiquity had now been fortified by the return of Eugenius IV to Rome - a return so necessary for the preservation of the pontifical seat that it was clear that, had the Pope stayed away for a further decade, there would have been nothing left to preserve:

"Confirmavit etiam nostrum describendi propositum tuns in ipsam pontificatus tui sedem reditus, adeo illius conservationi utilis atque necessarius, ut constet eam

33. Opera, 222.
34. Ibid.
Biondo praises Eugenius for cherishing the Romans not only through his accompanying Curia, which had always been to the greatest benefit of the city, but also by his restoration at the greatest expense of many buildings which had collapsed and fallen into decay - a most noble venture and one worthy of a magnanimous prince:

'Neque enim sola comitantis curiae praesentia, quod semper civitatis opulentiae plurimum profuit, Romanos fovea, sed collapsa deformataque edificia multis in locis maximo instauras reficisque impendio, decorum certe et magnanimo principe dignissimum facinus...

Conceding that he owes all he has to the Pope, Biondo asks why he too should not strive to renew Rome by the literary monuments his talent was capable of, at the same time that the Pope was attempting to do so with stone-masons and carpenters:

'Quando itaque ego omnia, quae mihi adsunt, tuae Sanctitati debeo, cur non etiam ipse contendam, ut sic tu Romam per ingenioli mei litterarum monumenta, sicuti caementiariorum fabrorumque lignriorum opera, pergas instaurare?'

Apart from their mutual renewal of the city, which would redound above all to the fame of Eugenius, Biondo also intends to include in his work a reminder of the buildings erected by that Pope's predecessors, pointing out, in the course of his description of the various parts of the city, according to their ancient and modern nomenclature, the basilicas, churches, shrines and holy places, and what popes and other Christians were responsible for their foundation, enlargement or renovation:

'Accedit enim nostrae huic urbis instaurationi, quae dignitatis tuae sanctimoniam in primis deceat, et tuam

35. Ibid.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid.
Biondo declares, in addition, that, since in describing the magnificence of the buildings of the city, he would not deprive admitted pagans of the praise they deserved, it was equally his intention to point out the glory of the martyrs who had fallen prey to tyranny:

'Et quando in describenda urbis operum magnificentia multos Romanos, praestantes certe viros sed idolatras gentilesque, merita laude non fraudabo, est animus nostrorum quoque martirum gloriem, ubi scilicet quidam patiendo vicerint, et libidini insaniaeque tyrannorum succumbendo triumphaverint, indicare.' 39

Returning, at the close of the prooemium, to the great theme of restauratio, Biondo approaches the task he has taken on to the glory of Eugenius, in the hope that posterity would one day decide whether he could possibly imitate the Pope's restorations on the basilica of St. Peter, including its new bronze doors, the palace and walls of the Vatican, the Lateran palace, and his paving of the streets of the city, and whether his inexperienced pen could hope to compete with works carried out at such great expense, and whether the renewal undertaken with cement, bricks, timber, stone, or bronze would remain more durable than that effected with letters:

'Aggrediar itaque assumptum mihi tuam in gloriam munus futurum confusam, ut posteri aliquando diiudicent utrum ne resarcita et magna ex parte innovata basilicae principis apostolorum et Lateranensis palatii tecta, vel additae ex aere aedii celeberrimae Sancti Petri maiores valvae, aut palatii moeniaque Vaticani suburbiorum restitutio, et stratas urbis vias, utrum ne, inquam, tanto facta impendio opera vel rudi stilo potuerim imitari, et calce, latericio, materia, lapide aut aere an litteris facta solidior diuurniorve maneit instauratae.' 40

---

38. Ibid.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid.
The *Roma instaurata* commences with an account of the site of Rome, its etymology, and the extent of its circumference in ancient times (L. 1-3). There follows, on traditional lines, an enumeration and description of the gates into the city, including the three gates of the Janiculum (L. 4-27). Biondo passes on to the monuments, both Christian and pagan, of the Janiculum in general (L. 28-37), and of the Vatican (L. 38-61); on the basilica and palace of St. Peter, their enlargement and decoration throughout the Middle Ages, up to and including the contemporary restorations of Pope Eugenius IV, he furnishes a concise survey (L. 49-60).

Last among the ornaments of the Vatican Biondo recorded the Vatican obelisk, which serves as a pretext for an excursus on obelisks in general and on the other obelisks to be seen in Rome (L. 61-64).

His description of the Transtiberine regions concluded, Biondo recrosses the Tiber and addresses himself to the seven hills of the city and the monuments located on each of them respectively (L. 65-104, and, further, Book II. 23-29). This topographical survey - the most substantial section of the whole work, broken up though it is by digressions - opens with the names of the hills and their Varronian etymologies (L. 65-71). After a brief account of the historical growth of the city, under Romulus and the seven Kings, with regard to the gradual inclusion within its perimeter of all seven hills, according to Livy and Tacitus (L. 72), Biondo turns to each of the hills in turn:

---

41 Livy, *ab urbe condita*, L. 30.1, L. 44. 3; and, on the extent of the pomerium first laid out by Romulus, Tacitus, *Annals*, XII. 24. The literary evidence, notoriously contradictory, is not resolved by Biondo, though he later presumed that the brazen statue of a bull on Continued
the Capitol (L. 73-74), the Aventine (L. 75), the Palatine (L. 76), and the Caelian (L. 77-89), the description of the latter being preponderantly devoted to its ecclesiastical monuments, including the Lateran (L. 83-86).

Having indicated the extent of the Esquiline, Quirinal, and Viminal hills (L. 90-91), and the situation of the Suburra (L. 92), Biondo explains that these were once so unbroken that no one taking a close look at the matter could separate them:

'Nec vero nos fugit descriptos supra montes adeo inter se alicubi continuatos, ut nec ab intentius inspiciente munere eorum divisio secerni nec satis intelligi possit.' (L. 93)

Confirmation of this view he found in Pliny's account of the Agger Tarquini (L. 94) and, with even greater credulity, in Pliny's fantastic description of the urbs pensilis, beneath which, through a network of sewers tunnelled through the hills of the city, 'men travelled in boats during Marcus Agrippa's term as aedile...'

(L. 95)

Though it is Biondo's contention that the Esquiline, Quirinal, and Viminal hills could not be separated, he has attempted to group together the monuments located in the first of them (L. 96-104); in fact, most of these monuments belong rather to the Quirinal; they include the twin River-Gods (L. 98) and the Dioscuri (L. 99). Biondo's evident confusion between the two hills

---
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the Forum Boarium, which Tacitus records as the starting-point of the ceremony by which Romulus, with a plough, laid out the original pomerium, was commemorated in the bucrania to be seen in the vicinity (II. 55): '... cuini aenei bovis memoria nos opinari facit capita bourn, quae omnibus in aedificiis multa videmus insculpta ab optimo bovis auguria...' (Opera, 247).

42. Opera, 239.
43. Pliny, N.H., III. v. 67.
44. Ibid., XXXVI. xxiv. 104-105.
45. On Biondo's error in identifying the Quirinal with the Esquiline, see Michaelis 1898, 249-250.
is confirmed in the following chapter, in which the Gardens of Maecenas on the Esquiline are equated with the ruins in the gardens of the Palazzo Colonna (hence the turris Mecoenatis) (I. 100). The error persists in his association, in the medieval tradition, of these Gardens with the house of Vergil on the Esquiline (I. 101).

Book I is concluded with an account of the Baths of Diocletian, which, in the 1130 years following the decline of the Roman Empire, had proved indestructible to barbarians, age, and stone-robbers alike (I. 104):

'Quam multos etiam in agros suburbanaque compulisse credimus sive honesto natos loco, sive plebeios et rusticos Dioecitianum imperatorem, ut thermas in Exquiliis aedificaret, quas nec barbari victores iratique nec vetustas, nec improba manus eorum qui lapides ac marmora in alias sordidissimas extractiones asportarunt, ita per annos mille et supra centum. XXX. post Romani imperii inclinationem demoliri potuerunt, ut non admirabile etiam nunc extet aedificium, et tale cui quatuor simul maiora quae nunc habeat alibi Italia principum virorum palatia, magnitudine et operis sumptuositate nullatenus sint aequiparanda.'

(c) Book II

Taking up the thread left by the final chapter of Book I, Book II opens with an account of the thermae of Rome, of which Biondo

1. Mecenatis  R


47. Cf. CTR, III, 183, note 1, with further literature on the legendary association of Virgil with the Quirinal.

48. Opera, 241. On Biondo's dating of the inclinatio of the Empire from Rome's sack by Alaric in 410 (which he mistakenly puts in 412), see Decades, I. 1. Cf. Hay 1959, 114; Mazzarino 1966, 79-82. In this light, the figure of 1130 here given by Biondo can only be a miscalculation; if we assume 1446 to be the year in which he was writing, the correct number should have been 1034 years.
counted twelve; after touching on their nature and function, as evinced by the classical sources, particularly the various authors of the Historia Augusta (II. 1-6), Biondo treats each of them separately (II. 7-22).

'Sed de thermis satis supraque multa sunt dicta, ad Exquillinarum montem unde discessimus redeundum est'. Thus Biondo closes his description of the thermae of Rome, and resumes his topographical survey of the Esquiline monuments, broken off at the end of Book I (II. 23-26). It is followed by an account of the few monuments belonging to the Viminal (II. 27-28) and the Quirinal (II. 29) (to the latter Biondo assigns only the Porta Collina and the Aedes Fortunae). Biondo goes on to describe the monuments situated in the contiguous localities of Carinae, Suburra, Tabernola, and Sacra Via (II. 30-39); these had been grouped together by Varro, 'who spoke a great deal about the parts of the city which were decaying with antiquity no less than the things new and intact in Varro's age which are now dilapidated':

'Nam cum libro quinto de lingua latina de partibus urbis multa diceret, quae non minus tunc vetustate obsolverint, quam nobis nunc paene perierint ea quae ipsius Varronis aetate nova et integra erant.'

Having concluded his hill-by-hill survey of the city's antiquities, Biondo now gives an explanation of his method for proceeding (II. 39). He protests that, such was the size of Rome, and the profuseness of its monuments, that he could not hope to preserve a coherent order. But to enable him to explain individual scattered mon.

---

49. Opera, 244.
51. Opera, 244. Varro, De lingua Latina, V. 47-50.
features and at the same time to bring them together in a certain
order he intends to classify what was left in four groups: Group 1
consisting of monuments of religion and cult (II. 40-60), Group 2
of monuments of public administration (and civic amenity) (II. 61-102),
Group 3 of monuments of spectacle and games (II. 102 - III. 39), and
Group 4 of minor and miscellaneous antiquities in various parts of the
city (III. 41-76):

'Nam in tanta rerum vetustate, et infinitarum tantae urbis
partium, innumerabiliumque aedificiorum, a nullo dum etiam
integra fuerunt (quot quidem legerimus) descriptorum
multitudine certum ordinem servare nec posse speramus, nec
etiam ducimus intentandum. Itaque ut singula sparsim
quodam tamen ordine comprena possimus explicare, quadrpartita
distributione, quicquid est reliquum, complectemur. Ut primo
loco sint quae ad religionem caerimoniasque; secunda quae ad
rei publicae administrationem; tertio quae ad spectacula et
ludos pertinuerint; quarto minuitiora quaedam partim
superiorum declarationi, partim implendae intentioni nostrae
plurimum facientia.'52

Such is Biondo's plan for the remainder of the work. But it
is not one he rigorously implements. In the first of his four groups
he mentions the Temple of Janus (II. 46), but uses the Ovidian source
on which he bases his account,53 fortified by some numismatic evidence
(II. 47), to indulge in a short digression on the cult of Janus,
including its alleged association with the Forum Boarium (II. 49) and
the Forum Piscarium (II. 50). There follows, at random, chapters on
the Varronian derivation of Velabrum (II. 51), the Clivus Capitolinus
(II. 52), the Argiletum (II. 53), and the church of S. Giorgio ad

52. Opera, 245-246.
53. Ovid, Fasti, I. 231-244, 257-258. Biondo mistakenly attributes
Ovid’s description, which refers to the shrine of Janus Geminus on
the Forum Romanum, to the four-way arch of Janus Quadrifons on the
Forum Boarium: 'Id est nunc templum quod candido marmore
exstructum patentibus quadrifarius portis ad sanctum Georgium in
velo aureo
extat paene integrum...' (Opera, 246). Cf. Platner-Ashby, 278-
280; Nash, I, 502-504.
Velabrum (II. 54). Returning to the Forum Boarium (II. 55), Biondo fallaciously attributes the round temple located on it to Vesta (II. 56). From the Bridge of S. Maria on the Forum Boarium to the Tarpeian rock stretched the district which he correlated with the ancient Asylum; it was one frequented, in his own day, by prostitutes, fugitives from parents or husbands: hence — a stroke of wit — 'alterum nunc asylum videatur institutum' (II. 57-58). To the patron saint of prostitutes, S. Maria Egiziaca (Mary of Egypt), was dedicated the eponymous church on the Forum Boarium, converted (in the 9th century) out of an ancient temple, which Biondo identifies with the Templum Asili (II. 59).

A brief mention of the Curia Vetus (II. 60) leads on to the second of Biondo's groups, that dealing with public monuments: those places 'in quibus rei publicae cura vel aliqua ex parte a maioribus gerebatur' (II. 61). The description appropriately commences with the secular monuments on the Forum Romanum (II. 62-67). A short

54. Biondo professed to have found confirmation of this view in Ovid, Fasti, III. 11-18, and also in numismatic evidence, but the temple in question, now consecrated to S. Maria del Sole, was probably dedicated to Portunus: Jordan, I. 2, 489; Platner-Ashby, 430-431; Nash, I, 411-413. Poggio made the same identification (CTR, IV, 234), and, indeed, the error is still popularly entertained today: Weiss 1969, 65; Robathan 1970, 204-205.

55. Pons Aemilius: Platner-Ashby, 397-398.

56. Opera, 248. On the prostitutes' quarter in Renaissance Rome, see further Gregorovius, VII, 761-762; Rodocanachi 1894; Lanciani 1906, 63-68. Only the poorest (those later denominated cortesane puttane in the Cesimento of Leo X, as opposed to the altogether more rarified cortesane honeste) dwelt along the Ripa.

57. Opera, 248: '...templum, quod saxo ingenti quadrato extructum sanctae Mariae Aegyptiacae dedicatum ad aream pontis sanctae Mariae...' I.e. the Ionic pseudoperipteros on the Forum Boarium: Platner-Ashby, 330-331; Nash, I, 411. On the church, called in the Middle Ages S. Maria de Gradellis, see Huelzen 1927, 336-338, no. 48, but Huelzen is mistaken in saying 'Il nome di S. Maria Egiziaca occorre per la prima volta nel catalogo del 1492...'; cf. CTR, IV, 300, note 3.

58. Opera, 248.
excursus on the Comitium as an institution (II. 68) leads on to the Suetonian account of the Comitia in the Campus Martius (II. 69-71). After discussing the Campus Martius itself (II. 72), Biondo proceeds to describe some of its notable monuments (II. 73-77).

Following this excursus given over to the monuments, and institutions, of the Campus Martius, Biondo returns, in topographical sequence, to the Forum Boarium and its environs, with a view to describing the Isola Tiberina, its antiquities and bridges (II. 78-81). Another public monument, the Aerarium, Biondo locates on the nearby Tarpeian rock (II. 82); he follows this up by devoting a short excursus (taken from Pliny) to its function, the aspect of the earliest Roman coinage, and the inception of gold minting (II. 83-86).

A general chapter on the law-courts of the city in antiquity (II. 87) leads on to a survey of its military monuments: the Castra Ravennatium (II. 88), the Castra Praetoria (II. 89), and the Aedes Castrorum (II. 90). Among other public monuments of the city Biondo includes the Port of Rome (II. 91), the eight bridges of Rome, of which he could only find evidence in the classical sources for the five already described (II. 92), and the triumphal arches, of which four were still extant (II. 93). Both bridges and arches are separately described passim through the Roma instaurata, but in Book II. 94-101 Biondo has brought together his description of the city's ancient aqueducts, including a critique of the reasons generally advanced for their destruction (II. 98-101).

The remainder of Book II is taken up with a discussion of the third group of monuments which Biondo outlined above: De locis

59. Suetonius, Julius, LXX. 4; Augustus, XL. 2.
spectaculorum' (II. 102-124). Having briefly indicated the scope and content of the group (II. 102), he turns to the theatre in general, its origins (II. 103) and its main architectural features (II. 104-107), before providing an extended description of the Theatre of Pompey in Rome and its immediate environs (II. 108-112). The remaining chapters of Book II are taken up with a discussion of such general topics as the origins of spectacle, acting in antiquity, Roscius, stage-usage, and the genres of classical drama (II. 113-124).

(d) Book III

Biondo continues his survey of monuments dedicated to spectacle with a consideration of amphitheatres (III. 1-15) and circuses (III. 16-40). This completed, he introduces the fourth group of monuments as already outlined: 'De minutioribus et dispersis in genere' (III. 41). The section consists of miscellaneous monuments - by no means of minor significance - in various parts of the city, including the Golden House of Nero (III. 42-47), the Forum of Trajan and its environs (III. 48-56), the Septizonium (III. 57-58), the triumphal arches of Severus and Constantine (III. 59-60), the Pantheon (III. 62-66), and Monte Testaccio (III. 74-76).

This description of miscellaneous monuments is interrupted with Biondo's apologetic observation that, having entered on such a vast field, namely of describing places scattered through the city, he was far from confident of his ability to do it justice (III. 77): 'Amplum et vastum nunc ingressi sumus campum, dispersi per urbem loca describendii, cui parti tantum abest, ut plene satis posse facere

60 Cf. R.I., II. 39.
confidamus...' 61 Anyone, indeed, who had surveyed the city, Biondo continues, would realise that the parts now densely inhabited had been left almost untouched by him - a situation, he declares, which had arisen from ignorance rather than inadvertence:

'Si quis enim urbis Romae aetatis nostrae partes singulas vel mente, vel oculis lustrando pervagabi tur, ea quae populo nunc et domibus frequentata sunt, a nobis paene intacta intelliget; quod quidem nulla a nobis negligentia aut inadvertentia magis factum est, quam ne ignota imprudenter asserere, aut impossibilia vane et leviter conari compelleremur.' 62

From the uncertainties of Roman antiquities, Biondo turns to the more indisputable monuments of his faith,devoting the rest of his treatise to the city of the Popes (III. 78-114). He begins with chapters on three churches distinguished by the titular Cardinals who, in Biondo's day, resided in the palaces adjoining them: S. Marco (III. 78), SS. Apostoli (III. 79), and S. Marcello (III. 80). 63

But even of Rome's sacred places Biondo feels bound to profess due ignorance, electing to leave them to be described by those who would perhaps take it in hand to describe the contemporary city, 'the Rome which we now enjoy' (III. 83): 'Sunt etiam alia per urbem tunc speciosa, sed simili vetustatis suae ignorantione obscura, quae illis relinquimus describenda, quibus fortassis curae erit hanc describere, quam nostrum habet seculum Romam...' 64 Biondo, for his part, though he had been so moved by the name of Rome that he honoured nothing after his religion with greater reverence, would not allow his enthusiasm to sway his judgement, to such a degree as not to realise how far the state of the city in his own day was removed from Rome in

61. Opera, 270.
62. Ibid.
63. See further infra, Appendix E.
64. Opera, 271.
the heyday of the Empire:

'Et quidem licet Romano nomini ita affecti sumus, ut nihil post religionem maiori colamus veneratione, non tamen passione ita abduci a vero iudicio nos patimur, quin discernamus quantum longe absit urbis Romae nostri temporis rerum statusque conditio ab illa, quae olim illi affuit potentatus et imperii maiestate.'

On the other hand, Biondo declares that he does not belong to those who scorned the present state of Rome, as if they regarded it as a nonentity, and as if all memory of it (the city in the prime of antiquity) had utterly perished along with the legions and consuls, the Senate, and the adornments of the Capitol and Palatine. Rome still flourished, and, though spread over a less extensive part of the world, the glory of Roman majesty rested on a more solid foundation (III. 84):

'Sed e contra non sumus ex illis quos videmus praesentem Romanae rei statum haud secus spernere et pro nihilo duce, ac si omnis eius memoria simul cum legionibus, consulis, senatu et Capitolii Palatique ornamentis penitus interisset. Viget certe, viget adhuc et quamquam minori diffusa orbis terrarum spatio, solidiori certe innixa fundamento urbis Romae gloria maiestatis.'

Thus begins Biondo's vigorous defence of Papal Rome, and more particularly the Rome of Eugenius IV. A rhetorical comparatio between ancient and modern Rome, in the course of which the Pope is likened to a 'dictator perpetuus' and the Cardinals to Senators (III. 84-90), leads on to a rather perfunctory enumeration of the city's most holy places and its most precious relics (III. 94-110).

To see these relics and holy places pilgrims came, not only from Europe, but also from Asia and Africa - thanks to Pope Eugenius's reconciliation, at the Council of Florence, of the Churches of East and West (III. 111):

65. Ibid.
66. Ibid.
No other city in the world, indeed, was so frequented by visitors from all over the world than Rome (III. 112). Each year, during Lent and Eastertide, according to Biondo's computation, 40,000 to 50,000 pilgrims flocked to the city from many of the provinces of the Church, and visited its antiquities (III. 113):

'The book ends in a eulogy of Papal Rome, and the power it exerted in the world; the glory of Roman majesty still flourished, and a not inconsiderable part of the world had voluntarily, without recourse to the clamour of arms, prostrated itself in veneration to the name of Rome (III. 114):

'Itaque viget adhuc solido innixa fundamento Romanae gloria maiestatis et non parva terrarum pars sponte et absque armorum strepitu dulci reverentia Romano nomini colla submittit.'

---

67. Opera, 272.
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid.
5. Sources

The range and richness of source-material drawn on by Biondo in the Roma instaurata has already been commented on by Weiss. But his account leaves room for elaboration.

(a) Classical

In its authoritative display of the classical sources — perhaps its most distinctive feature — the Roma instaurata is preeminently a treatise engendered by the revival of learning; it is, in the words of Jordan, 'die erste mit systematischer Benutzung der Schriftquellen entworfene Topographie'.

It may be said that Biondo's main purpose in the Roma instaurata was, by topographically correlating the ancient monuments of Rome with their incidence in the classical sources, to reconstitute, in the mind’s eye, the image of the city as it had existed in antiquity. This task of instauratio could only be accomplished through the classical sources in which the monuments, now vanished altogether, or sunk into ruin, were revealed in their pristine state. In an undated letter, assigned by Nogara to 1446, Biondo tries to interest Ernolao Barbaro, Bishop of Treviso, in his (at that time) almost completed work on the antiquities of Rome, pointing to the testimony given by the great writers of classical Rome on the subject:

'Quid, quod urbem Romam, qualis olim fuerit, eiusque ruinas, quae nunc visuntur, singulas, cuius sint aedificii reliquiae, et quisque celebris olim locus

71. Jordan, I 1, 77.
ubi fuerit, additis ubique Varronis Livii Vergilii
Ovidii Plinii et quorumdam aliorum vetustorum
scriptorum testimoniis, tribus iam paene libris absolvi,
munquid non tibi salivam moveo?'72

If Biondo's object was, as Burckhardt put it, 'not only the description
of what existed but still more the recovery of what was lost', 73 it was
only through such classical authorities that this recovery could be
accomplished.

For this reason, a quite substantial part of the Roma
instaurata consists of straight quotation from the classical sources.
These quotations are pieced together into a kind of literary jigsaw.74
The method of composition - a string of quotations interspersed by
linking glosses - is not anything new. It has precedents in the
equally jigsaw-like compendia of the Trecento proto-humanists, and,
earlier yet, in the endless encyclopaedias and florilegia of the
central Middle Ages; the method, reinforced by centuries of biblical
commentary and sermonic literature, can ultimately be traced back to the
parasitic enterprises of late Roman lexicographers and epitomizers
Biondo, however, differed from generations of florilegists in being
obliged to start from scratch, from the primary sources themselves.
There were no thesauri of Roman antiquities, no digests or anthologies
of suitable excerpta to ransack. This is what gives the Roma
instaurata as a source-book its magisterial tone. Unaided by
Pauly-Wissowa, or any of the indices and corpuses of modern times, again
and again he manages to parade the correct quotation at the correct time.

74. Cf. Robathan 1970, 204, who talks of 'Biondo's painstaking method
    of piecing together the jigsaw puzzle from literary sources.'
It is striking, in reviewing the topographical literature about Rome of the Trecento and earlier Quattrocento, how little even the available classical literature was drawn upon. Petrarch himself drew more readily from the *Mirabilia*. Giovanni Cavallini is exceptional, in that, in his description of the gates of Rome, he did make use of Livy. Niccolò Signorili relied extensively on medieval sources, while Poggio Bracciolini seems more concerned with remains *in situ*, particularly inscriptions, than in classical literary sources. Biondo, accordingly, differs from his predecessors in the sheer scale of his classical borrowings, as well as in the impressive range of the sources he used. Of Latin authors he quotes Piso, Varro, Cicero, Virgil, Horace, Livy, Valerius Maximus, Ovid, Seneca the Younger, Lucan, Pliny the Elder, Frontinus, Martial, Juvenal, Tacitus, Suetonius, Aulus Gellius, Festus Pompeius, Ulpian and other jurists used in the *Digest*, Solinus, Donatus, Servius.

75. CTR, IV, 27-41, *passim.*
77. *Passim.*
78. *De Natura Deorum*: R.I., I. 76; *Epistulae*: II. 1; *De off*: L. 77, II. 27; *orationes*: L. 73, II. 77, 115.
81. *Passim.*
82. R.I., L. 73, II. 1.
83. *Ars Amatoria*: R.I., II. 109; *Fasti*: *passim*; *Metamorphoses*: L. 76.
84. R.I., II. 123, III. 10.
85. R.I., L. 76.
86. *Passim.*
88. R.I., III. 3, 45. 89. R.I., L. 18, 76.
89. *Annals*: L. 43, 45, 64, 72, 84, 99, II. 55, 108, 114, III. 1, 24, 27, 42; *Histories*: L. 11, II. 89.
93. R.I., L. 5, 6, 7, 9, 27, 38.
94. R.I., L. 3; II. 77, 94.
95. R.I., L. 5, 18.
96. R.I., L. 101.
97. R.I., L. 76.
Nonius Marcellus, Ammianus Marcellinus, the various authors of the Historia Augusta, Macrobius, Cassiodorus, and Boethius. Of Greek authors Biondo quotes, in Latin translation, Herodotus once, Josephus once, and Eusebius once.

These classical quotations serve not only to illuminate existing monuments, or to bring to mind those no longer extant, or of disputed location, but also, in some cases, form, in themselves, digressions on topics of rather more general antiquarian interest. Thus, the lengthy quotations from Ammianus Marcellinus in Book I. 62-64, from Pliny in Book II. 83-86, from Frontinus in Book II. 94-101, and from Cassiodorus in Book III. 6 and 9, constitute, in each case, an introductory excursus on, respectively, the obelisks, the coinage, the aqueducts, and the circuses of ancient Rome. Other digressions form, as Weiss has put it, 'short dissertations on some antiquarian point'.

98. R.I., I. 3, II. 23.
99. R.I., I. 11, 61-64, 73; II. 2, 19; III. 48-49.
100. Passim. Historia Augusta is a 19th century portmanteau; Biondo refers to the separate authors of the imperial vitae subsumed under this title: Iulius Capitolinus, Helius Lampridius (sic), Trebellius Pollio, Helius Spartanus (sic), and Flavius Vopiscus. But his allocation of the various vitae to these 'authors' (in Syme's view, fictitious) is not that sanctioned in modern editions.
101. R.I., II. 57, 82; III. 39, 62, 74.
102. R.I., I. 8, 73, 75; II. 74, 97, 100, 103, 106, 114, 119, 123; III. 1, 6-9, 21, 33, 34.
103. Consolations: R.I., II. 123.
106. R.I., III. 3.
107. Ammianus Marcellinus, XVII. 4, 1-16; Pliny, N.H., XXXIII. 42-47; Frontinus, De Aquaeductibus, I. 4, 23, II. 88, 96-100; Cassiodorus, Variae, III. 49, V. 42.
108. Weiss 1969, 69. As an instance of such a 'dissertation', Weiss mentions the section on the Velabrum (R.I., II. 51-55), in which Biondo attempts to explain the etymology of the name, beginning by rejecting the medieval corruption 'velum aureum' and then Continued
At the close of Book II Biondo digresses into a lengthy, and mainly irrelevant, dissertation, culled from various classical sources, on such related topics as the origin of the theatre, actors in antiquity, stage-usage, and the genres of classical drama (II. 113-124). Biondo's chief classical source in the Roma instaurata is the ab urbe condita of Livy (cited, often more than once, in 54 of the 342 chapters). Biondo's extensive knowledge of Livy can only have been fortified by his contribution, when in Florence, to the edition, or emendation, of the ab urbe condita commissioned in 1435 by Cardinal Prospero Colonna, one of the most assiduous patrons of humanistic antiquarianism during the second quarter of the century. Livy is followed in frequency as a source by Varro's De lingua Latina, a work known in the Trecento but becoming increasingly diffused and influential during the first half of the Quattrocento (Biondo cites it in 44 chapters). Next in frequency of quotation is Pliny's Historia Naturalis (cited in 31 chapters).

The preponderance of quotations from Livy and Varro, and passing on to discuss the evidence offered by Varro, Ovid, Livy, Tacitus, and the inscriptions left in the locality.

110. This concerted emendation of the text of Livy is referred to by Lorenzo Valla (Opera, Basel 1540, 602): '... testimonio est manus Caroli, Cintii, Poggii, Flavii aliorumque multorum, qui Florentiae, ut audio rogatu cardinalis Columae, una cum Leonardo Livium, quatenus potuerunt, emendarunt.' See further Masius 1879, 19; Billanovich and Ferraris 1958, 246-248; Hay 1959, 119. On Biondo's relations with Cardinal Colonna, see further infra, Chapter VIII. 7(b).
111. The renewed interest in the De lingua Latina in the early decades of the Quattrocento is indicated by the production of MSS., for instance Laurentianus Li. 5, written at Florence in 1427. The work was prized (as it had been already by Boccaccio) (Sabbadini 1905-14, I, 30-31) for its etymological explanations of the origins of Roman antiquities, and in R.L., II. 30, Biondo seems implicitly to compare Varro's rôle, as antiquary, in Roman society with that of his own (Opera, 244, quoted supra, Chapter VIII. 4 (c)).
also from Ovid's *Fasti* (cited in 23 chapters), might suggest that Biondo was more interested in the Republican aspect of the city. But this is not the case. Though in Book I the republican nomenclature of the gates is preserved, and though in Book II many monuments associated with the Republican are described, Biondo purposely ignores the political implications. Moreover, he by no means overlooks the imperial sources: the *Historia Augusta* (cited in 25 chapters), Suetonius (cited in 23 chapters), Tacitus (the *Annals* cited in 13, the *Histories* in 2 chapters), Ammianus Marcellinus (cited in 10 chapters). One 6th century source, Cassiodorus, is quoted in no less than 19 chapters. Far from ignoring the Empire, or minimising its contribution to the antiquities of Rome, Biondo spends much time describing the monuments which are peculiar to it: the obelisks, the imperial *thermae*, the aqueducts, the circuses, the triumphal arches, etc.

Among the Roman imperial sources more extensively quoted by Biondo are the *Histories* of Ammianus Marcellinus, and the *De Aquaeuctibus* of Frontinus. Both figure among those classical texts discovered by the Italian humanists in the decade immediately preceding the composition of the *Roma instaurata*, enabling Biondo to draw on source-material denied to, or ignored, by previous writers. Of Ammianus Marcellinus, a MS. of Books XIV-XXXI of whose *Histories* was recovered by Poggio at Fulda in 1417 and presented to Cardinal

Colonna, Biondo makes good use: Ammianus' excursus on the obelisks of Rome is quoted in extenso in Book I. 62-64.

The book on the aqueducts of Rome by Frontinus was also unknown during the Middle Ages. In 1425 Poggio had been informed that a codex of this work was preserved at Monte Cassino, but it was not until he visited the monastery in 1429 that it was actually found. Poggio took the MS. back to Rome, copied it, and then returned it to Monte Cassino, where it still remains. It is conceivable that Biondo's quotations from the De Aquaeductibus derive from the exemplar

114. For Poggio's recovery of the Fulda codex of Books XIV-XXXI of Ammianus Marcellinus in 1417, see Sabbadini 1905-14, I, 80, 123, II, 192, 200-201. Poggio brought the codex, not a copy of it, back to Italy, where, in the Vatican, it still remains: Vat. lat. 1873, with the double inscription (f. 41 and 78) 'monasterii fuldensis est liber iste'. See further Clark 1904, 3-4; Pralle 1952, 58ff; Rubinstein 1958b, 388-389. In a letter to Francesco d'Arezzo (Epist. II (IX. 32), 375), Poggio announced the discovery: 'Ammianum Marcellinum ego latinis musis restitui cum illwn eruissem e bibliothecis ne dicam ergastulis Germanorum. Cardinalis de Columna habet eum codicem, quem portavi, litteris antiquis, sed ita mendosum, ut nil corruptius esse possit. Nicolaus Nicolus illum manu sua transcripsit in chartis papiri. Is est in bibliotheca Cosmi.' On the appearance of an Ammianus MS. among the Hersfeld codices in Niccoli's Commentarium, see Rubinstein 1958B, 390 and note 1; and on Poggio's negotiations with the Hersfeld monk to acquire this and other MSS., see Sabbadini 1905-14, I, 107-109. Biondo need not have derived his knowledge of Ammianus Marcellinus direct from Vat. lat. 1873, since at least two other MSS. of the Histories appeared during the pontificate of Eugenius IV: the codex of Books XIV-XXVI recorded in the 1434 inventory of Cardinal Orsini and now Archivio della Basilica Vaticana E 27 (Sabbadini 1905-14, I, 123-124, II, 201); and Vat. lat. 2969, with the dated subscriptio (f. 221): 'Absolutus Rome die IIII. juliis anno incarnationis domine MCCCCXLV. pontificatus dni. Eugenii pp. IIII anno . XV. ex exemplari plane corruptissimo.' (CTR, I, 284) Both these MSS., the first indirectly, the second directly, derive from the Fuldensis: see Clark 1904, with reconstructed history of the text. Biondo, one may add, is likely to have been familiar with Giordano Orsini's library in Rome (where Orsini died in 1438); cf. Scaglia 1964, 153. The inventory of the library, which contains items of topographical and geographical interest, is published in F. Cancellieri 1786, 906f.

115. On Poggio's recovery of the De Aquaeductibus, see supra, Chapter VII, note 114.

116. Monte Cassino, Codex no. 361. See further CTR, I, 10.
listed in the Commentarium of Niccoli as being extant at the monastery of Hersfeld, but it seems more plausible that he was relying either on the Monte Cassino MS. itself (since he alleges to have visited the monastery), or on a transcript of it. Though it is to Poggio that the honour of discovering the De Aquaeductibus belongs, Biondo may fairly claim the distinction of first making substantial use of the work as an antiquarian source. So much was already recognised by Thomas Ashby in his pioneering study of the aqueducts of ancient Rome (though rather with regard to Biondo's letter of 12 September 1461 to Gregorio Lolli Piccolomini, in which he describes an expedition of Pope Pius II and his Court, earlier in the same month, to the summit of Monte Affliano, and speaks at some length of the aqueducts in the Valle d'Empiglione and along the Via di Casciano encountered by the party on the way back).

Among other Roman imperial sources frequently drawn upon in the Roma instaurata are the various imperial vitae included in the Historia Augusta, a work which, after a somewhat obscure, and localized, late medieval tradition, was, by the dissemination of the parent Fulda codex, coming into more widespread prominence at this time. Though

117. Sabbadini 1905-14, II, 224.
118. R.I., I, 18.
120. The Carolingian Fulda codex (now Vat. Palat. 899) found its way, at an unspecified date, into the Cathedral library of Verona (Sabbadini 1905-14, I, 2ff, II, 228-229), where c. 1310 it was studied by Benzo d'Alessandro (ibid., II, 144-145). From Verona the codex passed to Florence, where it eventually entered the library of Gianozzo Manetti (ibid., I, 147, II, 229). The severe localization of interest in the source during the Trecento gave way as, during the early Quattrocento, transcripts of the Fulda codex became disseminated. For the 15th century MSS., see Hermann Peter's edition of the Historia Augusta (2nd ed., Leipzig 1884, Praefatio, xxxiif); they include the holograph transcript of Poggio: Codex Riccardianus 551. Cf. Ballou 1914, 29.
Cf. Pius II, Tractatus in Opera Inedita, ed. J. Cugnoni, 241:
'De Roma restaurata cum pridem scripsisset Blondus, cuncta volumina pervoluit, si quid adhuc forte reperiret, quod operi suo aptum videretur. Sed cum nihil occurreret ex sententia, suadet Cassinense monasterium accedamus: obsequimur; recepti a monachis, avide libris ostendi iubemus. Hic ille consularis viri Sexti Ruffi libellum reperit, in quo tempia vetusta et universa urbis Rome palatia, quia erexerit et cuius fuerint, vel splendoris, vel amplitudinis conscriptum est. Quo viso et ab archimandrita ad rescribendum obtento, veluti grandem thesaurum effodisset, alacer et iocundus effectus: Cum scriberem, inquit, ad Eugeniunm quartum de Roma restaurata, venerat in manus meas hoc opusculum, sed librariorum incuria vitiatum et sine nomine conditoris; nunc, cum auctorem agnosco excellentem, blandior ipsemet mihi, qui auctoritate non futulis hominis me secutum invenio.'
the *Historia Augusta* had been extensively excerpted by the Veronese proto-humanists of the Trecento, and diligently glossed by Petrarch.\textsuperscript{121} Biondo was, in effect, the first to digest the information it gave about the later imperial antiquities of Rome; his description of the imperial *thermae* of the city, in particular, is indebted to it.\textsuperscript{122}

One other Roman imperial source used in the *Roma instaurata* is more problematical. This is the source Biondo himself calls Sextus Ruffus. He introduces the author in Book I. 18 thus: 'Ea vero omnia templae eas aedes videmus in vetusta urbis Romae descriptione, cuius auctorem librariorum incuria suppressum nos in Cassinensis monasterii bibliotheca legimus fuisse Sextum Ruffum consularem virum...\textsuperscript{123} Biondo, therefore, came across a MS. in the library of Monte Cassino containing a description of the temples and shrines of ancient Rome, which, he noted, bore the name of Sextus Ruffus. This author is further identified in Book II. 94: '... Sextus Ruffus vir consularis, qui Frontino posterior Diocletiani temporibus urbem Romam descriptis, aquas ipsas ad XIX enumerat...\textsuperscript{124} The work, then, also contained an enumeration of the aqueducts of the city.

Who is this Sextus Ruffus? In his *Roma triumphans* Biondo suggests that he was none other than Rufus Festus, 'magister memoriae' under Valens, and author of the *Breviarium* (c. 363-370 A.D.):\textsuperscript{125} '... Sexti Ruffi viri consularis breve compendium ostendit.'\textsuperscript{126} This

\textsuperscript{121} On Petrarch's marginalia to Vat. *Palat.* 899, see Sabbadini 1905-14, I, 22, II, 229.
\textsuperscript{122} See infra, Chapter VIII. 6 (c).
\textsuperscript{123} *Opera*, 226.
\textsuperscript{124} *Opera*, 255.
\textsuperscript{125} Pauly-Wissowa, VL 2, 2257; Eadie 1967, 1-9.
\textsuperscript{126} *Roma triumphans*, IX, *Opera*, 190.
identification is confirmed by 15th century MSS. of the Curiosum, for instance the Vienna Palatine MS. 3224 (now in Trento),\textsuperscript{127} in which Breviarium and Curiosum are collocated and both given to Sextus Ruffus:

'Ruffi Sexti viri consularis (rerum) gestarum populi Romani
Val(entini)ano Augusto liber; Descriptio urbis Romane per Sextum Ruffum.'\textsuperscript{128} The name 'Sextus Ruffus' is not, indeed, a 15th century corruption, since one of the earliest surviving codices of the Breviarium, the 13th century Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale 4659, assigns the authorship to 'Ruffus Sextus';\textsuperscript{129} in this instance, Eadie, the most recent editor of the Breviarium, supposes that Sextus is probably a misreading of Festus in the miniscule exemplar,\textsuperscript{130} but it seems more likely that it stems - at an unspecified date - from a confusion between the author of the Breviarium and Sextus Pompeius Festus, the late 2nd century A.D. epitomiser of the De significatu verborum of Verrius Flacus.\textsuperscript{131} Whatever its origin, the error persisted long after Biondo: it is astonishing to note that the spurious 'Sextus Rufus' as author of the Breviarium has found its way even into the British Museum Catalogue.\textsuperscript{132}

However, the work purporting to be by 'Sextus Rufus' that Biondo consulted at Monte Cassino was not the Breviarium, but another work altogether. It is quite clear, in fact, that he was using one of the late imperial Regionaries. This conclusion was already reached by

\textsuperscript{127} Urlich 1871, 29; CTR, I, 201; Eadie 1967, 30.
\textsuperscript{128} CTR, I, 201. Cf. Jordan, II, 301.
\textsuperscript{129} Catalogue des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale des Ducs de Bourgogne, I (Brussels and Leipzig 1842), 94; Eadie 1967, 4, 26.
\textsuperscript{130} Eadie 1967, 4.
\textsuperscript{131} L.e. Festus Pompeius. Biondo, at any rate, did not make such a confusion, since he explicitly quotes from both 'Sextus Rufus' and Festus Pompeius: see infra.
\textsuperscript{132} In the B.M. Catalogue (as in that of Edinburgh University Library) Festus is still catalogued under RUFUS (Sextus).
Preller, \(^{133}\) acknowledged by Burckhardt, \(^{134}\) and reiterated by Jordan and Sabbadini. \(^{135}\) As the evidence to support this contention has been set out in detail by none of these scholars, an appendix setting out the correlations between Biondo's explicit quotations from 'Sextus Ruffus' and the corresponding passages from the Regionaries is given below. \(^{136}\) Since Biondo includes in Regio IX the Temple of Minerva Chalcidica, which is not preserved in the extant MSS. of the Notitia, we may assume that the codex he purportedly found at Monte Cassino was of the Curiosum. The codex is no longer in existence there, though the Vatican MS. Vat Lat. 3227, in an early 12th century Beneventan script, containing a text of the Curiosum, apparently did originate at Monte Cassino. \(^{137}\) Biondo's quotations, however, do not seem to correspond to this exemplar. Sabbadini took the view that Biondo's exemplar was another copy of the Regiones urbis Romae discovered by Pietro Donato, Bishop of Padua, at Speyer in 1436. \(^{138}\) In support of this view, it may be noted that the transcript of this lost MS. made by Donato and now in the Bodleian (Oxford, Bodl. 19854, formerly canon. misc. lat. 378) \(^{139}\) contains, as well as the Regionary, a text of the 'Ruffi Sexti viri consularis rerum populi Romani gestarum'. \(^{140}\) The

\(^{133}\) Preller 1846, 38.
\(^{134}\) Burckhardt, Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy, 109.
\(^{135}\) Jordan, II, 301; Sabbadini 1905-14, II, 248 (but Sabbadini's date of 1455 for Biondo's discovery of the Regiones urbis Romae at Monte Cassino is mistaken).
\(^{136}\) See infra, Appendix F.
\(^{137}\) CTR, I, 75: the MS. is signed 'Casinum' on the margin of f. 24r, and bears the subscriptio 'Raynaldus dei gratia' (Abbot of Monte Cassino from 1137 to 1155).
\(^{138}\) Sabbadini 1905-14, I, 119-120, II, 248. On the lost Speyer codex, see further CTR, I, 78; Scaglia 1964, 142-143, with earlier literature.
\(^{139}\) On Donato's transcript: Seeck 1875, 222-226; Mommsen 1883, 78ff; CTR, I, 79-80.
\(^{140}\) Scaglia 1964, 142, note 22.
identical collocation of Regionary and Breviarium is evinced by two further 15th century MSS: the Vatican Ottob. lat. 2089, from the library of Giovanni Angelo d'Altemps, and the former Vienna Palatine MS. 3224, now in Trento, both texts of the Regionary are of the Curiosum, and both are attributed, in the superscriptions, to 'Sextus Ruffus'.

Such collocations of the Breviarium of Festus and the Curiosum led, presumably, to the extension of the same authorship to both texts. In this case, the assumption can be made that at Monte Cassino, sometime before 1444, Biondo consulted, and perhaps copied, a miscellaneous codex containing a text of the Curiosum, combined with the Breviarium, to which the name of 'Sextus Ruffus' had become attached. A directly analogous kind of erroneous extension of authorship, within the context of a miscellaneous codex, is to be deduced in the case of Nicolò Signorili's attribution of the Curiosum to Paul the Deacon. And in a similar manner, Giano Parrasio in the 16th century later attached the name of 'Publius Victor' (a corruption, like 'Sextus Ruffus', of yet another late Roman abbreviator, Aurelius Victor), to another text of the Regionaries (a derivative, in this case, of the Notitia put together by Pomponius Leto). Parrasio's edition of the interpolated Notitia was reprinted on several occasions down to 1538, its authorship unquestioned. One can, indeed, follow this attribution, like that of the Curiosum to 'Sextus Ruffus', into modern times. It gained credence

141. CTR, I, 200-201; Kristeller 1963-, II, 193.
142. CTR, I, 201.
143. Cf. ibid; Jordan, II, 301.
144. Cf. Jordan, II, 300-302. See also supra, Chapter V. 4.
145. On 'Publius Victor' see Jordan, II, 302-303; Urlichs 1871, 29ff; CTR, I, 204-206; Mandowsky and Mitchell 1963, 15, 19, 32.
146. CTR, I, 193ff.
particularly through the publication in 1558 by Panvinio, in his *Republicae Romanae Commentarii*, of texts of both 'Sextus Rufus' and 'Publius Victor'.\textsuperscript{147} Panvinio's combined edition of *Curiosum* and *Notitia* was reprinted by J. J. Boissard (Frankfurt 1597), and in the influential *thesaurus* of Graevius (Utrecht-Leiden 1696).\textsuperscript{148}

Biondo's quotations from the *Curiosum* raise the possibility of a more pervasive influence on the composition of the *Roma instaurata*. Since, apart from the work of Frontinus, which is restricted to aqueducts, the *Curiosum* can have been the only classical source known to him that dealt exclusively with the topography of the ancient city, its influence cannot be treated lightly. Roberto Weiss, indeed, claimed that it was 'his main guide'.\textsuperscript{149} And in their study of Pirro Ligorio, Mandowsky and Mitchell have contrasted Nicolò Signorili's *Descripshio Urbis Romae*, which preserves the thirteen medieval administrative regions of Rome,\textsuperscript{150} with Biondo's *Roma instaurata*, the topography of which is based, they claim, 'on a late antique *Notitia* of the fourteen antique regions of the city which Biondo found recorded in a Monte Cassino manuscript.'\textsuperscript{151} But this is not the case. Whatever use Biondo did make of the *Curiosum*, these fourteen regions of the city are conspicuously absent from the overall scheme of his work. Where Biondo does arrange his material topographically, rather than analytically, he generally does so by hill and not by region. Even his arrangement of monuments on the *Forum Romanum*, Regio VIII of the *Curiosum*, in Book II. 60–68 neither follows the order, nor reproduces the content,

\textsuperscript{147} CTR, I, 204–205.  
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid. Cf. Schudt 1930, nos. 715, 817.  
\textsuperscript{149} Weiss 1969, 68.  
\textsuperscript{150} Cf. supra, Chapter V. 4.  
\textsuperscript{151} Mandowsky and Mitchell 1963, 13.
given in the Regionaries. Equally, his description of the monuments of the Circus Flaminius in Book III. 30-40 cannot be correlated with the Curiosum's catalogue of Regio IX (Circus Flamineus). Nor does Biondo make much use of the classified lists of monuments at the close of the Curiosum; apart from reproducing its list of 19 aqueducts in Book II. 94, he otherwise ignores the Curiosum's lists of the obelisks, bridges, campi, fori, and thermae of Rome. In short, it appears that Biondo's use of the Curiosum was purely incidental; he employs it merely to verify minor points of contested location, and not to impose its topographical system on his own work.

We may now turn from the Regionaries to a related problem involving another of Biondo's classical sources, Festus Pompeius. Gustina Scaglia has recently remarked that the list of city-gates in the Roma instaurata is similar to the compendium of Festus, in that portion entitled De montibus, portis et viis urbis Romae of the manuscript discovered in Speyer and copied (Oxford, Bodl. 19854, formerly Canon. misc. lat. 378) in 1436 by Pietro Donato, bishop of Padua. According to Scaglia, Biondo must have been acquainted with this MS. (she notes that Donato was in Florence in 1438 and 1442, when Biondo was there with the papal court). But the supposed similarity between the list of city-gates in the De montibus and in the Roma instaurata is hardly borne out by the table of concordances which Gustina Scaglia publishes in support of her theory. The following names of gates in the Oxford MS.

155. Ibid., Appendix A. Conversely, the following gates are recorded by Biondo (R.I., L 4), but not by the De montibus: Porta Collina, Exquillina, Naevia, Querulana, Gabiusa, Rudusculana, Latina, Appia, Trigemina, Aurelia.
are not to be found in Biondo at all: Capitolini, Minuacia, Minutia, Navalis, Piacularis, Romana, and Salutaris. That he might have consulted Donato's transcript of the De montibus, seems, in any case, a superfluous conjecture, since it requires no ingenuity to derive the nomenclature of those gates in the Roma instaurata unattested in the Mirabilia from Biondo's explicitly stated sources: Festus Pompeius (R.L, I. 5-25, passim), Solinus (R.L, I. 5), Varro (R.L, I. 5-6, 9), Livy (R.L, I. 5-26, passim), Ovid (R.L, I. 6, 9), Virgil (R.L, I. 6), Tacitus (R.L, I. 11), and Frontinus (R.L, I. 17). 156

Even the ultimate dependence of the De montibus on Festus Pompeius (being basically an 8th century extract from the epitome of Festus made by Paul the Deacon) 157 does not seriously jeopardise this argument, since the list of city-gates in MS Bodl. 19854 contains enough anomalies to preclude the derivation of Biondo's etymologies from this source, or, a priori, from any other MSS transmitted from the lost Speyer codex. 158 It will be sufficient here to note that the etymologies of Festus Pompeius explicitly quoted by Biondo with regard to the Porta Collina and Porta Querqueculana in Book I. 5, and the Porta Scelerata in I. 6 are not to be found in the De montibus. 159

Where, then, did Biondo acquire his knowledge of Festus Pompeius? Probably, he was using a transcript of the De significatione verborum discovered at St. Gall in 1417 by Poggio Bracciolini, 160 or

---

156. Biondo, indeed, explains in R.L, I. 4 how he had discovered the names of the ancient gates 'apud Livium et alios scriptores'. (Opera, 223). Equally, Biondo's chapters defining the hills of Rome (I. 65-71) are basically drawn from Varro's De lingua Latina, and not from the De montibus: CTR, I, 296.
157. CTR, I, 293.
158. CTR, I, 79-82, 294.
159. Cf. CTR, I, 297-300.
160. Sabbadini 1905-14, I, 80, II, 222-223.
possibly from that made at Basel in 1433 and now cod. d. 44 of the Capitolare of Viterbo. 161

Ammianus Marcellinus, Frontinus' De Aquaeductibus, the Historia Augusta, the Curiosum, and now Festus Pompeius – all these classical sources containing information of primary significance regarding the antiquities of Rome were discovered, or disseminated, during the course of the three decades preceding the composition of the Roma instaurata in 1444-1446. Biondo was, in effect, the first to realize their antiquarian implications, and to incorporate in his treatise, in any detail, the evidence they gave about the monuments of Rome. In a real sense, therefore, the Roma instaurata breaks new ground: it capitalises on source-material unknown in the Middle Ages.

(b) Medieval

Medieval sources play a minor but not negligible part in the Roma instaurata. Biondo, of course, had already drawn upon an extremely wide range of medieval historiographical literature in the Decades. 162 And his critical study of such literature is, moreover,

161. Ibid., I, 134 and note 34: the title-page (f. 1) bears the inscription 'Excerpta ex libris Pompei Festi de significatione verborum explicunt' and the date 'Die XVI mensis novembris 1433, Basileae.' This 15th century MS. possibly itself derives from the MS. of Festus Pompeius in the library of Nicholas of Cusa, mentioned by Francisco Pizolpasso in a letter to Nicholas dated 'Basileae XVII decembris MCCCCXXXII' (Sabbadini 1905-14, II, 19, 23; Paredi 1961, 201) On the fragmentary MS. containing letters A-N of the De significatione verborum in cod. Magliabech. I. 8, dated 1427, and inscribed 'Hactenus in exemplari reverendae vetustatis scriptum reperi. Antonius Marii filius florentinus civis transcripsit Florentiae IIII non. aug. MCCCCXXVII', see Sabbadini 1905-14, I, 134-135, note 34.

162. On the sources used by Biondo in Decades I and II, see the study by Buchholz 1881, and, in general, Hay 1959, 111-112, 117-118; Pubini 1966, 546.
testified by at least two MSS. in the Vatican Library with notes and marginalia in his hand: firstly, a 12th-to-13th century miscellaneous codex (Vat. lat. 1795), containing a text of Paul the Deacon's Historia Longobardorum (Books I-VI); secondly, a 12th century MS. of Geoffrey of Monmouth (Vat. lat. 2005), with Biondo's well-known anathema at the end. A third MS., which, it has been said, Biondo made use of, a text of the Liber Pontificalis supplemented to Martin V (Cod. Urb. lat. 395), seems to be of the later 15th century.

The Liber Pontificalis is, nevertheless, Biondo's main medieval source in the Roma instaurata. He refers to it on several occasions, attributing the compilation of the version he was using to a 'Petrus bibliothecarius' or, more fully, 'Petrus Lateranensis ecclesiae bibliothecarius'. Any doubts as to who this was are removed by Biondo's reference to the same source in the Decades: 'Petrus Guglielmus Lateranensis ecclesiae bibliothecarius, omnium est antiquissimus, quos de rebus gestis ecclesiae, et Romanorum pontificum ordine videmus scripsisse.' Petrus Guglielmus, or Pierre-Guillaume, as he is usually called, was not, in fact, librarian of the Lateran, but of the Abbey of Saint-Gilles in France during the first half of the

164. Nogara 1912, 271-272: f. 121, notes on the history of Forli 1347-1384, with marginalia by Biondo on f. 120v.
165. Ibid., 403-404; cf. Hay 1959, 118.
166. Ibid. Stornajolo 1902, 376-377, dates the MS. to the 14th century, but this can only be a misprint, since the Liber Pontificalis is taken up to Martin V. Duchesne in L.P., I, CLXX, dates it to the end of the 15th century. The MS. also contains an excerpt from Biondo's Decades (Charlemagne to Pope Joan) (f. 231v).
167. R.I., L. 88 (Opera, 238).
168. Opera, Decades, 140.
12th century. He was responsible for a version of the Liber Pontificalis supplemented to Honorius II (1124-1130), which survives in a single MS. from the abbey of Acey in Franche-Comté, signed, and dated 1142: 'Petrus Guillermus bibliothecarius, apud Aceium, dum ibi moraretur anno dominice incarnationis millesimo co XLII'. This MS., now in the Vatican Library (Vat. lat. 3762), was, as Billanovich has shown, in the library of Landolfo Colonna in Rome in the early 14th century (Colonna had recourse to the Vat. lat. 3762 redaction of the Liber Pontificalis when writing his Breviarium historiarum). During the early years of the 15th century Pierre-Guillaume's MS. was supplemented with a 12 folio-addendum containing the lives of Honorius II's successors down to Martin IV (who died in 1281), based on Martinus Polonus and his continuators.

Biondo, it may be inferred, consulted either Vat. lat. 3762 or a transcript of it at the Lateran. His use of it as a source in the Roma instaurata can now be considered. In Book I. 89 he quotes the Life of Silvester as confirmation that S. Croce in Gerusalemme was built within the 'palatium Sessorianum'. In Book II. 12 he uses the same Life to elucidate a point of classical topography, namely the location of the baths of Domitian: Silvester, so the Liber Pontificalis asserts,

170. L. P., II, XXIV; Billanovich 1958, 110.
171. Ibid., 113ff.
172. L. P., II, 447. A further MS., based on Vat. lat. 3762 with its supplement, and including a continuation to Pope John XXII and the year 1328, is Vallicellanus C 79, dating to the 15th century. During the pontificate of Eugenius IV, this MS. apparently formed the basis of a new edition of the Liber Pontificalis: L. P., II, 447-448.
built a church 'iuxta thermas Domitianas'.\textsuperscript{175} The church in question was S. Martino ai Monti,\textsuperscript{176} but Biondo thought it was S. Silvestro in Capite (now on Piazza S. Silvestro), and, on this assumption, identified the baths with the ruins adjoining this church - a view he attempted to reinforce by noting some ostensibly Domitianic brick-stamps found there.\textsuperscript{177} Since Domitian built no baths, Biondo was seriously misled by the \textit{Liber Pontificalis} in this instance. But Poggio Bracciolini, in his account of the apocryphal \textit{Thermae Domitiani}, was similarly misled by the identical source: 'Domitianas, quarum perpauca rudera conspicuntur, fuisse in iis locis, ubi nunc Sylvestri ecclesia est, scriptum in vita Pontificum adverti.'\textsuperscript{178} In Fubini's opinion, Poggio's account actually derives from the \textit{Roma instaurata},\textsuperscript{179} but a shared misrepresentation cannot, in this case, be taken as proof of such a hypothesis.

In his section on the \textit{thermae} of Rome, Biondo, in Book II. 20, again uses the \textit{Liber Pontificalis} as a source for another \textit{thermae} absent from the classical literature, the \textit{Thermae Novatianae}:

'Thermarum quas ultimo loco Novatianas appellari diximus, meminit Petrus Lateranensis ecclesiae bibliothecarius, sive ille scriptor beatus Hieronymus, sive beatus Damasus papa fuit in vita Pii papae, qui patria Aquileiensis fuit, a beato Petro decimus pontifex Romanus. Ipsum enim Pium pontificem scriptum est rogatu sanctae Praxedis dedicasse ecclesiam thermas Novati in vico Patricii in honore sanctae Pudentianae sororis suae.'\textsuperscript{180}

The relevant passage from the \textit{Life} of Pius I (140-155) reads: 'Hic ex

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{175} \text{Opera}, 243. Cf. \textit{L. P.}, I, 170, 188; \textit{CTR}, II, 230.
\item \textsuperscript{176} Huelsen 1927, 405, no. 57; \textit{L. P.}, I, 188; \textit{CTR}, IV, 292, note 1.
\item \textsuperscript{177} See further \textit{infra}, Chapter VIII. 5 (c).
\item \textsuperscript{178} \textit{CTR}, IV, 236.
\item \textsuperscript{179} Fubini 1966, 547.
\item \textsuperscript{180} \text{Opera}, 243.
\end{itemize}
rogatu beatae Praxedis dedicavit ecclesiam thermas Novati in vico Patricii, in honore sororis suae S. Potentianae. As Duchesne has pointed out, this is a late 11th century interpolation from the Acts of SS. Pudenziana and Prassede. It only exists in either Vat. lat. 3764 and its derivatives (including Vat. lat. 3762), or the 15th century Florentine MS., Laur. LXVI, 35. Though these Acts constitute the only known literary source for the Thermae Novatianae, excavations carried out underneath the church of S. Pudenziana in the years 1928-1933, disclosing baths dating to the middle of the 2nd century A.D., have largely confirmed their accuracy.

In his chapter on the Sacra Via (Book II. 31) Biondo refers to the Life of Felix IV in the Liber Pontificalis:

'Hinc proxime videmus posuisse Petrum Lateranensem bibliothecarium, quom in vita Felicis quartil pontificis Romani scribit illum ecclesiam sanctorum Cosmae et Damiani fecisse via sacra in templo Romuli vel urbis Romae.'

Both Huelsen and Duchesne take the view that the 'templum urbis Romae' adjoining which, according to the Liber Pontificalis, the church of SS. Cosma e Damiano was built, is to be identified with the Basilica of Maxentius, rather than the Temple of Venus and Rome behind SS. Cosma e Damiano. Biondo's situation of the church, in this case, 'in templo Romuli vel urbis Romae' is closer to the truth, though it is clear that, in accordance with medieval practice, he ascribed the Temple of Romulus 1. Felicis tertii B.

---

183. L. P., I, CXXV, CC.
185. Opera, 245.
186. L. P., I, 279.
rather to the founder of Rome than to the deified son of Maxentius. 188

In Book II. 38-39, in his account of the Suburra, Biondo refers to the Liber Pontificalis account of the dedication by Gregory (590-604) of S. Agatha in Suburra:

'. . . estque certissimum eius nostrae assertionis testimonium in vita beati Gregorii papae, in qua Petrus bibliothecarius Lateranensis dicit ipsum pontificem ordinesse ecclesiam Gothorum, quae est in Suburra in nomine virginit Agathae.' 189

In Book II. 111 he refers to the life of Damasus, the authorship of which he confesses he does not know whether to give to the pope himself, to St. Jerome, or to Petrus bibliothecarius, on the location of S. Lorenzo in Damaso next to Pompey's Theatre:

'Nam in Damasi papae vita, sive illam idem ipse pontifex, sive beatus Hieronymus, sive Petrus bibliothecarius scripsit, haec verba habentur, Is Basilicam iuxta Pompei theatrum construxit sancto Laurentio, quae ex conditoris sui nomine vocatur.' 190

In a similar manner, in Book III. 54, he notes the location of S. Adriano 'in tribus foris' (i.e. the Forum Romanum, Forum Traiani, and Forum Transitorium). But the epithet 'in tribus foris', which Biondo

188. The attribution to Romulus, son of Maxentius, rests on rather flimsy (mainly numismatic) grounds: Platner-Ashby, 450, 607; Nash, II, 268-271. On the identification of the rectangular building which forms the main part of SS. Cosma e Damiano with the Temple of Penates Dei, see Platner-Ashby, 388-389. And on the relationship of the church to antique remains: Huelsen 1927, 242, no. 27; Nash, I, 439; CBCR, I, 137ff. On the templum Romili in the Middle Ages, cf. CTR, III, 57, 90, 219, and 408. The Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis explicitly identifies the Temple of Romulus with that of Peace: CTR, IV, 117. Poggio, on the other hand, identified the Temple of Peace with the Basilica of Maxentius, and the Temple of Romulus with the rectangular structure occupied by SS. Cosma e Damiano: 'Romuli templum, cuius pars muri vetustissima quadrato lapide nunc quoque mirandam speciem sui praebet, hodie Cosmae et Damiano consecratum' (CTR, IV, 234).


purportedly derived from the Liber Pontificalis Life of Honorius I, is in fact a corruption of 'in tribus fatis'. 191

Another instance where Biondo, with the help of the Liber Pontificalis, attempts to correlate an early Christian basilica with an adjoining classical monument occurs in Book III. 78, in his account of S. Marco, founded by Pope Marcus:

'Eam scribit Petrus bibliothecarius a Marco pontifice Romano eius nominis primo iuxta Pallacinas1 fuisse aedificatam. Et licet multorum, ut appareat ingentium olim aedificiorum ruinae multa nunc cernantur fundamenta. Quid tamen illae fuerint Pallacinae ignoramus.' 192

Though Biondo here quotes the Liber Pontificalis' statement that the basilica was built 'iuxta Pallacinis', he is unable to resolve his own doubts as to whether the huge ruins visible in his day in the vicinity of S. Marco actually belonged to the 'Pallacinae', a name which occurs in the classical sources only in Cicero and his scholia in connection with balnea and a vicus, which may have been situated in the vicinity of S. Marco: 193 in medieval sources the name is associated with a porticus in the same area, but the porticus in question probably belonged to the Saepta Julia, 194 so that Biondo's scepticism is justified.

In his account of another church in this region, S. Marcello, founded by its eponymous Pope (308-309), Biondo (in Book III. 80) again quotes from the Liber Pontificalis:

1. pallaturas R and B.

Ecclesiam vero Sancti Marcelli, quam Nicolaus patria Surrentinus, et eiusdem ecclesiae tituli cardinalis, appellatione Capuanus, inhabitat, scribit bibliothecarius a Lucina, nobili muliere, via Salaria fuisse aedificatum in Catabulo, quod lanii carnifices pro animalium stabulo habere consuevissent, quo in sordidissimo loco tentus et passus fuerit beatus pontifex Marcellus.¹⁹⁵

A final explicit reference to the Liber Pontificalis needs to be explained. In Book III. ⁴⁰ Biondo quotes from another text altogether, the 12th-century redaction attributed to Pandolfo,¹⁹⁶ which, as he notes, includes a mention of the church of S. Apollinaris not extant in the redaction made by Pierre-Guillaume: 'Pandulphus autem Lateranensis ecclesiae hostiarius quod Petrus omiserat bibliothecarius habet: Hadrianum primum pontificem Romanum aedificasse sancti Apollinaris ecclesiam, ubi prius Apollinis aedes fuit.'¹⁹⁷ In here employing the Liber Pontificalis to reinforce his view of the Prata Flaminia and its Temple of Apollo,¹⁹⁸ Biondo points out the analogy between the alleged transformation of a pagan temple into the church of S. Apollinaris¹⁹⁹ and that of the nearby Pantheon: 'Sic in

---

¹⁹⁶. On Pandolfo, see Duchesne in L. P., II, XXXV-XXXVII; Billanovich 1958, 109-110. A Roman, nephew of Cardinal Hugo of Alatri, and a contemporary of Gelasius II (1118-1119), in whose vita he mentions himself (Billanovich 1958, 110), Pandolfo began work on his continuation of the Liber Pontificalis after 1133, concluding it by 1138 (it included lives of the popes down to Honorius II (1124-1130)). Pandolfo was a partisan of Anacletus II, and with the fall of that pope, and the accession of Innocent II, he became 'persona non grata'; his equally partisan continuation of the Liber Pontificalis fell into disfavour; the sole MS. was transferred to Languedoc, to the monastery of Psalmodi, passing into the hands of Pierre-Guillaume, who used it to form his own redaction a few years later.
¹⁹⁸. Platner-Ashby, 15, 432. Cf. Livy, III. 63. 7. On Biondo's interpretation of the Prata Flaminia, see further infra, Chapter VIII. 6 (f).
¹⁹⁹. The association between temple and church is quite fictitious: the Temple of Apollo in the Campus Martius was situated immediately to the north of the Theatre of Marcellus (Nash, I, 28).
Pantheone proximo illi loco haud diu antea omnium idolorum, quibus id templum erat dedicatum, cultus in omnium Christi domini martyrum memoriam fuerat mutatus. 200

How Biondo acquired his knowledge of Pandolfo's redaction of the Liber Pontificalis is not clear. But presumably a transcript of the parent MS., which, already in Pandolfo's lifetime, had been transferred from Rome to the monastery of Psalmodi in Languedoc, 201 had, in the course of the later 14th or early 15th century, found its way back to Rome. 202 It is, at any rate, clear that Pandolfo's continuation of the Liber Pontificalis was known during the pontificate of Eugenius IV. A recension made at this time is in part based on it; Duchesne has noticed a copy bearing the inscription:

'Liber iste intitulatur DAMASUS DE GESTIS PONTIFICUM; sed cum non potuerit nisi ad sua tempora scribere, quod superadditum est alterius est cuius nomen non teneo. Verum in vita Gelasii papae II quidam Pandulfus hostiarius affirmat se ista scripsisse, quod intelligi potest vel de toto opere, vel de vita Gelasii tantum, quod ex vita Paschalis II coniectari licet.' 203

The existing manuscripts of this recension made under Eugenius IV are brought together by Duchesne, 204 and Biondo could have derived his knowledge of Pandolfo's continuation from several of them.

It is worth noting, in this connection, that Biondo himself mentions the attribution to Damasus given in the titulus quoted above.

200. Opera, 266. See further Buddensieg 1964-65.
202. The Psalmodi transcript of Pandolfo's redaction of the Liber Pontificalis was subsequently acquired by the Catalan cleric Francesco Cristoual, and removed to the cathedral of Tortosa, where it appears, in the catalogue of Cristoual's books made after his death, in 1375: Billanovich 1958, 108, note 1, and 113.
203. L. P., I, XXXV. Unfortunately, Duchesne does not specify what MS. this inscription is to be found in, but he implies that it exists in several.
204. L. P., II, XLVff.
In Book I, he refers to the 'vita beati Petri apostolorum principis a beato Hieronymo presbytero, ut titulus praefert, sive ut aliqui volunt a Damaso papa scripta'. Similarly, in Book II, he notes that the Life of Pius I was ascribed either to St. Jerome or Pope Damasus, and the Life of the latter, from which he quotes in Book II. III, he does not know whether to assign to the Pope himself, to Jerome, or to Petrus bibliothecarius. The attribution of the earlier papal lives, including that of St. Peter, to Damasus can be traced back to Martinus Polonus at least, and seems to have gained credence in Biondo's time. He himself is careful not to commit himself on the question.

Apart from his explicit quotations from the Liber Pontificalis, it is probable that Biondo derived further information from the same source elsewhere, particularly in his treatment of Trastevere and the Vatican (Book I. 33-53, passim). But he did not invariably consult

205. Opera, 229.
207. On the contested authorship of the Vita Petri, see L. P., I, LIX. The earliest texts of the Liber Pontificalis are preceded by an apparently apocryphal exchange of letters between Jerome and Damasus on the desirability of an actus gestorum of the later's predecessors: L. P., I, XXXIII-XXXIV, 48-49.
it in his description of ecclesiastical antiquities. A case in point is afforded by Book I. 82, where he states that the church of SS. Quattro Coronati was destroyed by the German emperor, Henry II:

'Sed cum postea ad annum Christi octuagesimum quintum supra millesimum ab Henrico secundo imperatore theotonico destructa fuisset, Pascalis secundus papa eam instauratam palatio, quod nunc cernitur, insigni decoravit.'\(^{209}\)

A glance at the Life of Paschal II (1099-1118) would have told Biondo that it was not Henry II (whom in any case he confuses with Henry IV) but Robert Guiscard's Normans who destroyed the church in 1084.\(^{210}\)

Billanovich has drawn attention to the influence of the Liber Pontificalis on the Trecento proto-humanists, with particular reference to Landolfo Colonna's acquisition of the MS. of Pierre-Guillaume.\(^{211}\)

During the first half of the 15th century, notably under Eugenius IV, the proliferation of further redactions, variously derived, suggests that its influence was increasing in Italy. It is coterminous with the humanist interest in the medium aevum. Biondo's use of it is indicative of this. In the Decades, of course, its influence is even more pervasive. What is particularly noteworthy about its use in the Roma instaurata is that it is employed not simply as a source for medieval ecclesiastical monuments, but also to throw light on the antiquities underlying or surrounding them, in default of explanations in the classical sources themselves.

The same historical method is evident in his use of other patristic and early medieval sources. St. Jerome, already alluded to in connection with the Lives of St. Peter and Pius I, is quoted in two chapters: his letters in Book I. 84, on the derivation of the name

\(^{209}\) Opera, 238. Cf. CTR, IV, 279, note 1.


\(^{211}\) Billanovich 1958.
Lateranus from the Roman imperial family of the same name; and his Commentaria in Joelem Liber in Book III. 4, on the Flavian date of the Temple of Peace, since, as Jerome records, it was erected by Vespasian and Titus to contain spoil from the Temple of Jerusalem.

Two further early medieval sources are adduced: in his account of S. Pietro ad Vincola (II. 35), Biondo quotes from an unspecified work of Bede on the early history of the relic after which the church is named, the chains of S. Peter; and in his account of S. Agatha in Suburra (II. 39), he quotes from the Dialogues of Gregory the Great on the reconsecration of this previously Arian church.

On three occasions Biondo has recourse, either at first-hand or from quotations in another source, to the Acta martyrum. In his account of the Janiculum (I. 31), he mentions finding the alternative appellation urbs Ravennatium in this source:

'Eam urbis Romae Ianiculi, sive regionis transtiberinae, partem a nostris, qui martirum gesta scripserunt, aliquando Ravennatium urbem appellari, saepe offendimus.'

Biondo may have derived this information from the Life of Pope Calixtus (217-222) in the Acta martyrum, but it may be noted that the Life of the same Pope in the Liber Pontificalis also attests the regio

212. Opera, 238. Jerome, Epist., LXXVII.
214. Opera, 245. Cf. Huelsen 1927, 416, no. 16. I have been unable to trace the quotation in the opera of Bede.
216. See supra, Chapter V, note 98.
217. Opera, 228.
The interpolated passage from the *Acts* of SS. Pudenziana and Prassede in the *Liber Pontificalis* cited in Book II. is immediately followed by a quotation purporting to be from the *Life* of St. Lawrence, to the effect that the church of S. Lorenzo in Panisperna had been erected in the *Thermae Olympiadis*:

'Sed in gestis martirii beati Laurentii legitimus monasterium monialium Sancti Laurentii in Pane et perna aedificatum esse in thermis Olympiadis...'  

Since, as Jordan has already pointed out, the *Acta S. Laurentii* in fact locate the saint's martyrdom 'ad thermas iuxta palatium Salustii', Biondo was evidently, again, quoting at second-hand. Two further points throw some light on the matter. Firstly, the *Thermae Olympiadis* are apocryphal: the only anterior sources to mention them are the various texts of the *Mirabilia* up to and including the early 15th century *Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis et Situ urbis Romae*. Secondly, the name of the church, which Biondo explicitly associates with the *Acta martyrum*, cannot be traced back before the 11th century. Formerly, the church was known as S. Laurentii in Formoso, a name which, as Krautheimer has pointed out, 'disappears from the list of Roman churches at the very time when S. Lorenzo in Panisperna first appears in the early versions of the *Mirabilia*, ca. 1030'. We find, therefore, that both elements allegedly attested by the 'gesta martyrri

---

218. L. P., I, XCIII and note 2, 141; CTR, II, 224.  
222. Huelser 1927, 292, no. 25.  
223. Ibid.  
224. CEBR, II, 185.
beati Laurentii', the baths of Olympias and the church of S. Lorenzo in Panisperna, can be traced back, not to the Acta Sanctorum, but to the Mirabilia. Moreover, even the church of S. Lorenzo in Formoso played a quite insignificant rôle in early medieval times; its association with the site of St. Lawrence's martyrdom is, apparently, post-Carolingian. 225 We may conclude that the account of the Saint's martyrdom used by Biondo in Book II. 20 was at least post-11th century.

What this account might have been is to be explained in conjunction with another problematical medieval source used by Biondo on three occasions, and to which he gives the name Apollodorus. Firstly, he cites Apollodorus' attribution of the twin River-Gods then on the Quirinal to Saturn and Bacchus (I. 98):

'Eas Saturni Bacchique statuas fuisse Apollodorus quidam, qui Romam annum ante centesimum descripsit, affirmat....' 226

Apollodorus, then, was writing, in Biondo's view, in the earlier Trecento. Secondly, in his chapter on the Baths of Constantine (II. 19), he cites the tradition stemming from Apollodorus, which located them in the area then marked by the Dioscuri (close, that is, to the River-Gods mentioned in Book I. 98):

'Constantinianas thermas ab Apollodo traditum legitimus fuisse in Exquiliis ubi nunc equi marmorei Praxitelis et Phidiae opera cernuntur.' 227

Thirdly, in Book II. 22, after having noted that the Gesta martyrii beati Laurentii locate S. Lorenzo in Panisperna within the so-called l. lapidei R.
Thermae Olympiadis, Biondo wonders whether these baths were identical with the Thermae Novatianae recorded in the Acts of SS. Pudenziana and Prassode. Unable to resolve this problem, he goes on to remark, apropos of the visible ruins in the vicinity of S. Pudenziana on the Viminal (II. 20-22), that: 'si Decii imperatoris sicut Apollodorus tradit pallatium fuerunt, binas Novati et Olympii thermas parvas fuisse relinquitur.'

'Apollodorus', then, can be summed up as an early Trecento source, in which are described (inter alia) the River-Gods, on the Quirinal, the Baths of Constantine with the associated Dioscuri, and the ruins of the 'pallatium Decii' on the Viminal. On the strength of this, Jordan supposed that he was either a compiler of the Graphia Aurea or an associate of Martinus Polonus. Valentini and Zucchetti similarly suggest that Biondo was here referring either to an independent version of the Mirabilia or to that incorporated in the Chronicon of Martinus Polonus. There can be little doubt that Apollodorus, whoever he was, had assimilated at least part of the Mirabilia, whether in its original form, or in a later recension. The 12th century Ur-text of the Mirabilia successively describes — in a manner reminiscent of Biondo's use of Apollodorus and the tendency of his argument between Book II. 19 and II. 22 — the Palace (i.e. Baths) of Constantine, the Temple of Saturn and Bacchus, with the adjacent River-Gods, the Dioscuri, and the Baths of Olympias, where St. Lawrence had been martyred:

'In cilio montis fuit templum Iovis et Dianae, quod nunc vocatur Mensa imperatoris, super palatium Constantini. Ibi, in palatio, fuit templum Saturni et Bachi, ubi

228. Opera, 244.
230. CTR, IV, 282, note 2.
nunc iacent simulacra eorum. Ibi iuxta sunt caballi marmorei. In thermis Olimpiadis, ubi fuit assatus beatus Laurentius, fuit templum Apollinis.'

But the 'pallatium Decii' located by Apollodorus, according to Biondo, on the Viminal, is not attested in either Mirabilia, Graphia Aurea, or Martinus Polonus. It is probably a corruption of the same palace, to which, according to the De Mirabilibus Civitatis Romae (dating to the first half of the Trecento), Decius and Valerius withdrew after St. Lawrence's death:

'... thermae Olimpiadis, ubi assatus fuit beatus Laurentius, in Panisperna; palatium Tyberianum, Traiani, ubi Decius et Valerianus recesserunt mortuo sancto Laurentio, ubi dicitur thermae de Cornutis.'

The passage refers us back to the spurious quotation from the Acta S. Laurentii in Book II. 20, which appears to derive from a version of the Mirabilia. Similarly, the 'pallatium Decii' of Apollodorus appears to derive from an account of the martyrdom of St. Lawrence (which took place under the Emperor Decius) similar to that in the De Mirabilibus Civitatis Romae. It may, then, be deduced that in his description of monuments on the Viminal between Book II. 20 and II. 22, Biondo was relying on a single source, namely a version of the Mirabilia dating to the first half of the 14th century, of which Apollodorus was the compiler or redactor (in a similar manner, it may be supposed, to Pierre-Guillaume's redaction of the Liber Pontificalis).

A final medieval source used in the Roma instaurata is unique in that it is archival. In his account of SS. Apostoli (III. 79), Biondo explains that there was extant in the basilica a 12th century

---

231. CTR, III, 61. Cf. the similar texts in the Graphia Aurea (CTR, III, 93), and Martini Oppaviensis Chronicon, 401.
232. CTR, III, 189.
233. The correspondence between the De Mirabilibus and Biondo, R.I., II. 20 has already been noticed by Krautheimer: CBCR, II, 185.
document, which located the hortus Veneris between the parish of SS. Apostoli and the Campidoglio:

'Quis vero ipsam aedificaverit ecclesiam, aut quae fuerint aedificia, quorum ingentia apud eam cernuntur vestigia, mihi penitus est ignoratum et tamen extantia ipsius ecclesiae monumenta ante annum trecentesimum scripta fuisse dicunt intra ipsius ecclesiae parrochiam et prope Capitolium, Veneris hortum, cognomine mirabilem, et muta haud quaquam ignobilia, quorum loci et situs nullam scire possimus certitudinem.'

Biondo's source may be identified in a forged bull of the 6th century Pope John III, datable to the 12th century, which refers to the hortus Veneris in defining the boundaries of the parish of SS. Apostoli.

(c) Epigraphic

In comparison with Poggio, Biondo makes little use of in situ inscriptions as historical evidence. He was no epigraphist, and the few extant inscriptions either quoted or otherwise referred to in the course of the Roma instaurata are commonplace. They include the inscription on the Aventine branch of the Aqua Claudia (I. 79); the inscriptions on the pedestals of the Dioscuri (I. 99), and of the Constantinian portrait statues then on the Quirinal (II. 19); the inscription on the Arcus Argentariorum (II. 54); that on the

---

234. Opera, 270.
236. C.I.L., VI, 1259.
237. Opera, 240: 'Proximo ac paene contiguo loco sunt lapidei caballi, Praxitelis unus, alter Phidiae, ut tituli indicant...' On these spurious inscriptions, see Michaelis 1898, 250, 260-274; in Michaelis' view, they probably belonged to the restoration of the Baths of Constantine undertaken by Quadratianus in 443 A.D. Cf. C.I.L., VI, 1750.
239. C.I.L., VI, 1035.
Aqua Virginica (II. 73); \(^{240}\) that on the Pons Fabricius (II. 80); \(^{241}\) that on the column of Trajan (III. 50); \(^{242}\) that on the architrave of the Temple of Minerva on the Forum of Nerva (III. 53); \(^{243}\) that on the Arch of Severus (III. 59), \(^{244}\) and on the Arch of Constantine (III. 60); \(^{245}\) and that on the architrave of the Pantheon (III. 62). \(^{246}\) All these inscriptions are, in fact, included in the sylloge appropriated by Signorili, which, as has been suggested, derived from the epigraphic transcripts of Poggio Bracciolini. \(^{247}\)

Biondo's relationship to the epigraphic tradition of Poggio is made even more apparent in his discussion of a recently found inscription belonging to the Theatre of Pompey in the Campo dei Fiori (II. 109), an inscription also mentioned by Poggio in Book I of the De varietate Fortunae. \(^{248}\) Biondo tells us that, in the vicinity of the Theatre of Pompey, facing S. Lorenzo in Damaso, the lawyer, Angelo Pantano, while recently excavating a place for a wine-cellar, \(^{249}\) had discovered foundations built of huge square stones. On one of them, recovered by the building-workers, were cubit-high letters saying GENIUM THEATRI POMPEIANI. On the force of this fragment, Biondo conjectures that the stone was laid during the foundation of the

\(^{240}\) C.I.L., VI, 1259.
\(^{241}\) C.I.L., VI, 1305.
\(^{242}\) C.I.L., VI, 960.
\(^{243}\) C.I.L., VI, 953.
\(^{244}\) C.I.L., VI, 1033.
\(^{245}\) C.I.L., VI, 1139.
\(^{246}\) C.I.L., VI, 896.
\(^{247}\) See supra, Chapter VI. 1, and infra, Appendix C.
\(^{248}\) CTR, IV, 239.
\(^{249}\) On the situation of Pantano's house on the Via dei Chiavari, close to the scaena of the Theatre of Pompey, see CTR, IV, 239, note 3; Robathan 1970, 207. Cf. Nash, II, 423-428, and fig. 1216, showing relationship of Via dei Chiavari to the theatre complex; Jordan I, 3, 529-530.
theatre - which would have been made clear (he explains) had the remainder of the inscription been recovered:

'Sed remotissimo ab inde loco, qua certiores ex fama theatri ipsius ruinæ ad Sancti Laurentii in Damaso aream ecclesiae vergunt, Angelus Pontianus, iure consultus, cum proxinis diebus cellæ vinariae locum altius effoderet, fundamenta reperit saxo quadrato ingenti structa, in quorum uno quod caementarii extraxerant litterae essent cubitales Genium theatri Pompeiani dicentes: ut conicere liceat Genium ibi pro iacti primo fundamenti theatralis initio, in ceteris, si educerentur, litteris ostendi.'

Biondo here mentions only one of the two inscriptions from the Theatre of Pompey recorded by Poggio - a proof that Poggio does not depend on him. Both accounts, indeed, seem to be independent of each other, since they each mention circumstantial details omitted by the other. This fact alone casts doubt on Henzen's inclusion of the 'Genius Theatri' inscription among his falsae. Huelsen, taking this into consideration, in conjunction with Ciriaco d'Ancona's record of an inscription 'in porticu theatri Pompeiani', thought the patently suspect formula 'Genius Theatri Pompeiani' was corrupt rather than bogus, and attempted a credible reconstruction on this assumption. If the corruption crept in with Poggio, Biondo makes no attempt to rectify it (nor, for that matter, did Gruter). What, from our point of view, is significant is that Biondo is prepared to use the inscription as a primary historical, and archaeological, source towards determining the correct location of the Theatre of Pompey.

250. Opera, 258.
251. See supra, Chapter VII. 2 (a) (vii).
253. C.I.L., VI, pars V, 55*.
254. C.I.L., VI, 1193.
256. Cf. C.I.L., VI, pars 5, 55*. Huelsen 1899B has commented on the perpetuation of the inscription by 16th century antiquaries.
There is another instance in the *Roma instaurata* of the same method. Writing about the presumed *Thermae Domitiani* (II. 12), Biondo explains that he had personally seen squared bricks of very large size pulled out of the ruins surrounding S. Silvestro (*in Capite*), some of them having the name *Domitiana* impressed upon them, 'stamped by the brick-maker before the cement was dry'. These Biondo took to be proof that the ruins surrounding S. Silvestro were the work of Domitian:

'Nos vero quadratos lateres amplissimos ex ruinis, quae ecclesiam Sancti Silvestri eiusque monalium, nunc celebre monasterium saepiant, extractos vidimus, quorum pars litteras habet a figulo, prius quam caementum exsiccatur impressas, in haec verba Domitiana maior, pars Domitiana minor. Unde coniecimus quicquid sive thermae, sive metodium, sive naumachia fuerit, Domitian opera teneri debere omnia quae ad Sanctum Silvestrum undique nunc cernuntur.'

Since the area in question is devoid of Flavian remains, being associated rather with Aurelian's Temple of the Sun, Biondo's argument inspires scepticism. Closer analysis reveals that he was referring, not to the brick-stamps of Domitian, but to those issued in the later 2nd century A.D. by the *'figilinae Domitianae maiores et minores'* , a Roman brick-yard, the name of which has been variously derived from Domitia, wife of the Emperor Domitian, and from the *gens Domitia*; bricks from this yard - common in Rome - have been found dating to the time of Faustina minor, Commodus, and Severus. If Biondo's interpretation is wrong, at least his field-observation receives corroboration from the

260. On the *'figilinae Domitianae maiores et minores'* , see the index in Bloch 1948, 88, and corpus in C.I.L., XV, pars 1, 45-60. On the reasons for the division of the yard between *maiores* and *minores*, see Duesel's remarks in *ibid.*, 47.
fact that brick-stamps from the 'figlinae Domitiana Maior' were recovered from S. Silvestro in 1576. 262

Biondo's relative inexpertness as an epigraphist can be shown by another comparison between him and Poggio, with regard to their respective interpretations of C.I.L., VI, 1259, the imperial inscription recording a Severan restoration of the Aqua Claudia; Poggio interprets it correctly, 263 whereas Biondo (Book I. 79) assumes it to commemorate the construction by the Emperor Caracalla of an aqueduct leading from the Aventine to the Capitol (no such aqueduct exists):

'Medio autem in eius montis dorso binae aquaeductus formae superbissimi sumptuosissimique operis etiam nunc extant, quorum unam cubitales litterae Antonini Caracallae, quam in Capitolium perduxit, alteram a Claudio in Aventinum perductam tituli eius imperatoris, marmorea incisi tabula, quae iuxta Lateranense xenodochium cernitur, fuisset ostendunt, quamquam veteres illas fuisse credimus formas a Claudio Antoninoque instauratas.' 264

(d) Numismatic

The keen interest Biondo took in Roman coins has already been revealed in the letter of February 1146 to Leonello d'Este, quoted above, in which he refers to a specific passage in the newly completed Roma instaurata dealing with the invention of money (II. 82-35). 265 Together with a transcript of this passage, Biondo sent Leonello d'Este some Roman Republican coins, as an aid to understanding some passages in

262. C.I.L., VI, pars 1, no. 164: OP DOL. EXR AUG N FIGLIN DOMITIANA MAIOR. The stamp, in this instance, is probably Severan in date.
263. CTR, IV, 238.
264. Opera, 237.
Ovid and Pliny which describe the iconography of the earliest Roman coins:²⁶⁶

'Sociavi autem originis suae descriptione nummos ipsos iam bigatos quadririgatosque, ut sculpturam videns, licet vetustate obliteratam, quid velint Ovidii et Plinii verba, melius intelligas.'²⁶⁷

The relevant passage in the Roma instaurata, as it happens, shows more readily Biondo's mastery of the classical sources than it does of actual coins, since it consists preponderantly of quotations from the Elder Pliny, who, in Book XXXIII of the Historiae Naturalis, provides a well-informed account of the earliest Roman coinage.²⁶⁸ Biondo quotes the greater part of this, including Pliny's description of the reduced as minted in Rome during the first Punic war, with 'on one side a Janus facing both ways and on the other the ram of a battleship'.²⁶⁹ The same denomination of early Republican Aes Grave is used by Biondo to elucidate another problem: the location of the Temple of Janus in Rome. He identifies it with the four-way arch of Janus Quadrifons on the Forum Boarium (II. 46):²⁷⁰

'Id est nunc templum quod candido marmore extractum patentibus quadrifariam portis ad Sanctum Georgium in Velo Aureo extat paene integrum....²⁷¹

In order to throw more light on this presumed temple, Biondo explains that he would quote from Ovid's Fasti, and also point to a coin of Janus,

²⁶⁶. On the Este coin collection, which by the close of the 15th century contained over 400 gold coins and over 3,000 silver ones, see Weiss 1969, 167, note 3.
²⁶⁹. Ibid., XXXIII. Cf. R.I., II. 84, Opera, 252-253.
²⁷⁰. On the genesis of this error, see Marchetti 1915, 110-111; CTR, IV, 298, note 3. Cf. Platner-Ashby, 277-280; Nash, I, 500-505.
²⁷¹. Opera, 246.
one specimen of which he says he had recently acquired in Rome (II. 47):

'... ut autem id templum cortiori testimonio indicemus, libet ponere versus Ovidii de fastis, in quibus templi locus et causa aedificandi demonstratur; cruntque simul rationem redditae Latiae et Saturniae vocabulorum, atque etiam numismatis Iani cusi, cuius sculpturae unus proximis diebus in urbe nacti sumus.'272

The quotation from Ovid's Fasti, in fact, gives an explanation of the iconography of such a coin of Janus — the same coin described by Pliny: 'Why,' the poet asks of the god, 'is the figure of a ship stamped on the side of the copper coin, and a two-headed figure on the other? 'The figure,' Janus replies, 'is of himself, and the ship represents that which brought Saturn to Latium.'273 Biondo accepts this Ovidian account of the Aes Grave as representing, on the obverse, the ship that brought Saturn to Latium. He goes on to quote the Ovidian etymology of Latium (from the hiding of the god Saturn) (II. 48):

'Dicta quoque est Latium terra, latente deo.'274 And he finds confirmation of such a location of the Temple of Janus in Ovid's testimony of the god having 'a temple adjoining two forums'.275 These Biondo readily identified in the Forum Boarium (II. 49) and the Forum Piscarium (II. 50). Though thoroughly confused in its topographical assumptions, the passage represents a precocious exercise in applied numismatics, in which an attempt is made to relate a particular coin both to the classical sources in which it is described, and to the monuments on the ground.

Yet another monument on the Forum Boarium is subjected by Biondo to a similar analysis. The round temple on this forum he took to

272. Ibid.
273. Ovid, Fasti, I. 229-244.
274. Ibid., 238. Opera, 246.
275. Ovid, Fasti, I. 258.
be the Temple of Vesta,\textsuperscript{276} and again quotes, in support of this identifications, from Ovid's \textit{Fasti},\textsuperscript{277} reinforced with quotations from Horace, Livy, and Varro. He then turns to certain imperial coins, on which could be seen, he claims, a circular temple of Vesta (II. 56):

'Quando itaque in nummis aeneis argenteisque Mammeae, genitricis Alexandri imperatoris, et Liviae, genitricis Aurelii Antonini, aedem Vestae sculptam videamus rotundam, columnis in circuitu altare munientibus, non dubitamus eam fuisse quae nunc ad Tiberim contra Iani templum propemodum integrat.'\textsuperscript{278}

Here, however, Biondo's numismatics are as confused as his topography.

Denarii of Julia Mamaea, mother of Alexander Severus, do include, on the reverse, the figure, but not (as far as is known) the temple, of Vesta.\textsuperscript{279} It seems probable that Biondo is confusing her coins with some other Roman imperial coins representing, with inscription, the round temple of Vesta in Foro, of which there are several, dating from those struck by Nero to those struck by Postumus in the 3rd century.\textsuperscript{280}

Biondo's confusion, in this instance, extends even to genealogy, since the Aurelius Antoninus cited (i.e. the Emperor Antoninus Pius) certainly never had any mother called Livia, nor were any coins struck in honour of Arria Fadilla, to whom he was actually born.\textsuperscript{281} In any event, whatever

\textsuperscript{276} See \textit{supra}, note 54.
\textsuperscript{277} Ovid, \textit{Fasti}, III. 11-18.
\textsuperscript{278} Opera, 248.
\textsuperscript{279} BHC, Emp., VI, 156 and pl. 15.
\textsuperscript{280} Brown 1940, 40-46. The series begins with gold and silver coins struck between 64-68 A.D. by Nero to commemorate the reconstruction of the Temple of Vesta in Foro after the fire: Fuchs 1969, 46 and Taf. 12, 129-130. Subsequently the same temple appears on coins of Vespasian (71-79 A.D.), Titus (72-73), Domitian (73), Trajan (107), Faustina Sr. (c. 140), Lucilla (164-169), Crispina (177-183), Julia Domna (196-211) (cf. Nash, II, fig. 1326), Caracalla (214-215), Etruscilla (250-251), and Postumus (264).
\textsuperscript{281} Antoninus Pius was born at Lanuvium in 86 A.D. to Aurelius Fulvus and Arria Fadilla: \textit{Hist. Aug.}, \textit{Antoninus Pius}, I. 4. See P. W., II, 1259-1260.
coins Biondo based his observation on almost certainly illustrated the Temple of Vesta on the Forum Romanum, and not the circular temple on the Forum Boarium.

Biondo's application of numismatics to the elucidation of two further problems, one of topography, and the other of portrait-iconography, have proved equally unsuccessful. The first concerns the column of Marcus Aurelius, which Biondo, like Poggio, attributes to that Emperor's predecessor, Antoninus Pius. He does so, both on the force of the *Curiosum*, which combines the 'templum Antonini et columnam coclidem' in Regio IX (Circus Flamininus), and on its alleged representation on coins (II. 76):

(Columnam autem Cocolidem Antonini Pii fuisse honori positam constat, quod facies sua nobis multisque actatis nostrae ab numismatum imaginibus notissima illis in rebus gestis, quibus centum septuaginta quinque pedes alta insignit columnam insculpta cernitur. Sexti etiam Ruffi urbis descriptio, cum duas tantummodo in urbe Roma fuisse ccollides columnas dicit, hanc ~ ara Flaminii regione sitam Antonini Pii appellat.)

Biondo's claim that the appearance of the column was very well known to him, and to many of his time, 'because of its representation on coins', lacks assurance, since the column to which he was, in fact, referring, that of Marcus Aurelius, was never represented on coins. He must surely have had in mind the *sestertius* of the Deified Antoninus, minted under his successor (c. A.D. 161), which shows on the reverse a column surmounted by a Corinthian capital and statue of Antoninus — in fact, a representation of the red granite monolithic column erected in honour of that Emperor in the Campus Martius, no longer standing in

282. Platner-Ashby, 557-559; Nash, II, 505-509.
283. CTR, IV, 240.
284. CTR, I, 125.
285. Opera, 251.
286. BMC, Emp., IV, 528, no. 893; cf. ibid., 526, no. 880; Nash, I, fig. 326.
Biondo's day, and excavated only in 1703.287

The instance involving coins and portrait-iconography concerns the colossal bronze head of Constantine, then displayed at the Lateran. In his account of the Golden House of Nero (III. 42-45), Biondo has occasion to mention the Colossus associated with it (III. 46), as described by Suetonius288 (a source which Biondo omits to adduce) and Martial.289 He quotes the statement in the Life of Commodus from the Historia Augusta that later that Emperor 'removed its head, which was a likeness of Nero, and replaced it by a likeness of himself.'290 This head of Commodus Biondo readily identifies in the colossal bronze head now in the Conservatori, but in the Middle Ages situated outside the Lateran basilica, where, as early as the 13th century, it had been seen by Magister Gregorius.291 And, moreover, he professes to find confirmation of this identification in portrait-heads of Commodus on coins (III. 47):

'Nosque caput Commodi in numismatibus noscentes, videmus id aeneum et certe maximum caput, quod nunc ad Lateranensem basilicam cernitur, fuisse illud quod spurcissimus ipse Commodus flagitosissimi Neronis capiti subrogavit.'292

Yet it is hard to see how the comparison could have been sustained, since the profile, invariably bearded, of Commodus on coins struck in his honour bears no resemblance to the fleshy, heavy-jowled, but clean-shaven portrait represented by the Conservatori bronze, which is now generally

287. Jordan, I. 3, 603-604; Platner-Ashby, 131; Nash, I, 270-275. The column was badly damaged by fire in 1764; the pedestal, sculpted with the famous relief of the apotheosis of Antoninus and Faustina, was later placed in the Cortile della Signa in the Vatican: Helbig, I, no. 420.


292. Opera, 266-267.
thought to portray Constantine. Nevertheless, Biondo's attribution of it to Commodus, avowedly on the basis of the numismatic evidence, was piously repeated by Giovanni Tortelli, librarian to Pope Nicholas V, in his De orthographia.

(e) Iconographic

From the iconography of coins we may pass on to consider the use Biondo makes, as source-material, of the iconography of sculpture. Here again, as in the case of the coins of Commodus, Biondo's visual perceptions of objects, and consequently the intellectual deductions he drew from them, are generally faulty. Thus, in support of his attribution of the Arco di Portogallo to Domitian (II. 14), he notes that it was possible to see on the arch the image of Domitian himself, as described by Suetonius, tall in stature, but there sitting down and sleeping, and, in his dream, seeing his patron goddess, Minerva, disarmed by Jupiter, ascend from her shrine to tell him she could no longer protect him:

'Nec dubitamus quin triumphalis ex marmore arcus ille, quia nunc paene integer cernitur, Triphali dictus, ecclesias inter Sanctorum Silvestri et Laurentii in Lucina, viam amplessas Flaminiam, Domitianus fuerit honoris positus, in quo ipsum cerne re est, qualis a Suetonio descriptur, statura procerum sed tunc sedentem dormientemque et Minervam, quam superstitione colebat, somniatem excedere sacrario negantemque se ultra eum tueri posse, quod exarma ta esset a Iove.'

\[293\]

Helbig, II, no. 1578, with literature. Cf. BMC, Emp., IV, pl. 91-111.

\[294\] Tortelli, De orthographia (Venice 1484), f. q4r: '... et certe apud Lateranense ecclesiam non longe ab amphitheatro caput grande aeneum etiam nunc aspicimus, quod Commodi fuisse ex numismatum imagine deprae hendi mus.' Cf. Weiss 1969, 72, 174.

\[295\] Suetonius, Domitian, 15.

\[296\] Opera, 243.
Though misconceived, it is fairly clear how Biondo arrived at this interpretation. Demolished in 1662, the Arco di Portogallo was an imperial triumphal arch on the Via Lata of indeterminable date (possibly as late as the 4th or 5th centuries), which incorporated earlier fragments, including the two famous Hadrianic reliefs now in the Conservatori: the Allocutio of Hadrian and the Apotheosis of Sabina. Biondo evidently thought the second of these portrayed Domitian, as described by Suetonius. Since the reliefs were, in his day, difficult to see, being positioned well above eye-level, it can be understood how Biondo came to perceive the goddess Minerva in the flight of Aeternitas, on whose wings the deified Sabina is being transported to heaven— the more so, since, on the force of the supposedly Flavian brick-stamps from the nearby S. Silvestro (II. 12), he had already persuaded himself of the presence of Domitian's monuments in the locality.

A further iconographical deduction drawn from Roman reliefs is made by Biondo in his account of the church of S. Martinella (or S. Martina, as it is more commonly called) (III. 55). He records


299. Helbig, II, no. 1800, on the iconography of the relief. Biondo's interpretation of it as representing Minerva and Domitian was later echoed by Bernardo Rucellai: '... marmoreus arcus,... in quo siguidentem Minervae effigies expressa est, quam Princeps idem superstitiisque colebat, pro certo creditur Domitiani opus extitisse.' (CTR, IV, 452).


301. Huelsen 1927, 381, no. 107, with literature.
the popular theory that this church had originally been erected within
a temple of Mars. 302 Though he admits to ignorance regarding the
presence of such a temple there, he points out that within the church
was to be seen a life-size carving of a Roman cohort of soldiers, and
that the standard-bearer of this cohort held a labarum, 'an adornment
befitting no building but a temple of Mars':

'Est autem ipsius Sancti Hadriani ecclesiae propinqua
alia ecclesiae Sanctae Martinellae nunc appellata, quam
vulgō fertur in Martis templo fuisse aedificatam  Sed
quod templum ibi Mars habuerit ignoramus, et tamen
videmus ipsa in ecclesia cohortem Romanam militum more
ad instar hominis figuram incisorum, cuius vexillifer
labarum, pro insigni habet, quae ornamenta nullum alium
magis quam Martis templum decebant.' 303

What carving did Biondo have in mind? Until their removal in 1515 to
the cortile of the Palazzo dei Conservatori, the church of S. Martina
housed three reliefs from a demolished triumphal arch of Marcus
Aurelius; 304 one of them depicts two barbarians submitting before the

302 Cf. CTR, IV, 312, note 3.
303 Opera, 267.
304 Rodocanachi 1904, 143, note 6; Jones 1906, 252; Jones 1926, 22-29;
Helbig, II, no. 1444; CTR, IV, 312. Cf. Francesco Albertini,
Opusculum (1510): 'In qua ecclesia (S. Martina) tabulis marmoreis
antiquae caelaturae parietes undique exornati sunt.' (CTR, IV, 475).
The removal of the three Aurelian reliefs from S. Martina in 1515 was
instigated by Leo X without the knowledge or assent of the rector,
whom the Conservatori eventually compensated for the loss on 29 March 1525.
Lanciani 1902-12, I, 221: 'Iohannes Aloysius primus Conservator
exposuit quod, inscio rectore Ecclesie Sancte Martine, fuerunt capte
tabule marmoreae a dicta Ecclesia et posite in cortili palatij
Conservatorum...' The triumphal arch of Marcus Aurelius, to which
belong these three reliefs, as well as the eight matching Aurelian
reliefs walled into the attic of the Arch of Constantine (Nash, I, 104-
112), probably spanned the Clivus Argentarius at its junction with the
Via Lata (i.e. close to S. Martina) - the same arch as that described
'in Capitello arcaus Panis Aurei' in the Mirabilia (CTR, III, 19; cf.
ibid., 61, 132, 155; CTR, IV, 120). The inscription, commemorating
the victory of Marcus Aurelius over the Germans and Sarmatians in
176 A.D. is only preserved in the Sylloge Einsidelsens (no. 38):
C.I.L., VI, 1014. See further Jordan, I, 2, 213, note 48, II, 414-415;
Jones 1906, 251 ff; Platner-Ashby, 35; and bibliographical note in
Helbig, II, 257. For the two further reliefs from S. Martina described
in Flaminio Vaceca, Memorie, cap, 63, see Jones 1906, 223-224.
Emperor on horseback, surrounded by Roman soldiers, among whom are two vexillarii, or standard-bearers. Biondo appears to have identified one of their banners as a labarum, an imperial banner bearing the monogram of Christ and associated with Christian emperors from Constantine onwards; the identification seems to reflect, albeit unconsciously, the medieval notion, assumed by Helbig, that the emperor portrayed was none other than Constantine (hence, the preservation of the reliefs in a church). Yet it is curious that Biondo ignores the presence of the dominant figure in all three reliefs, and seizes instead on the minor detail of a banner, in order to associate the locality with a presumed Temple of Mars - an association which a true labarum would have precluded. Doubt, however, still attached, in his mind, to the association. For, in the following chapter, Biondo is disinclined to submit to the popular opinion, that the statue of a recumbent river-god, known as the Marforio, displayed close to the church of S. Martina, also represented Mars; he points out that the better-informed Romans asserted it to represent Jupiter Panarius instead - a memento of the bread which the elders on the Capitol, to confound the rumour that they were starving, threw down to the besieging Gauls (III. 56): 307

305. For a description of the vexilla, see Jones 1926, 28.
306. Helbig, II, 255. The notion would have been sustained by the resemblance between the Emperor on horseback on one of the reliefs (the Clementia Augusti, the same relief described by Biondo) and the Emperor, presumed to be Constantine, of the equestrian bronze at the Lateran: cf. Helbig, II, no. 1161, and no. 1444 (A).
307. Livy, V. 48. 4; Florus, I. 7. 15. Cf. Ogilvie 1965, 736: the story of the bread being thrown to the Gauls is a myth to explain the cult of Jupiter Pistor (Valerius Maximus, VII. 4. 3; Lactantius, Inst., I. 20-33; Ovid, Fasti, VI. 350). See further J. G. Frazer, The Fasti of Ovid, IV, 231-233. The cult-name Jupiter Panarius has no classical authority, and seems to be a late-medieval variant of Jupiter Pistor, who, however, in the view of Preller and Wissowa, had originally nothing to do with bread or...
Est item eidem propinqua loco statua ingens marmorea iacens Mars fori nunc vulgo appellata, quam peritiores Romani perhibent Iovi Panario fuisse dicatam, argumentaque afferunt quod marmorum statuae stratum tanquam panibus marmoreis videatur obtectum, dicuntque eam statuam ideo positam esse, ut memoriam referret panis, quem maiores a Senonibus gallis in Capitolio ossessed, cum famae perirent in hostem, ut mentitam copiam rerum praetenderent, proiecerunt.

Such attempts to exploit the iconography of Roman sculpture as auxiliary source-material should also be viewed in the context of Biondo's evident indifference to such sculpture as art. In this he differs fundamentally from Poggio Bracciolini. Unlike him, Biondo is not known to have collected antiques, and his account, in the Roma instaurata, of the residual free-standing statuary in the city is unmarked by the aestheticism of early Quattrocento humanist thought; it is essentially in the medieval (i.e. Mirabilia) tradition - demonstrably so in the case of the River-Gods on the Quirinal (I. 98).

So perfunctory is his approach to the subject that he omits altogether to mention the most imposing bronze statue left in the city: the equestrian portrait of Marcus Aurelius at the Lateran.

(f) Archaeological

In the context of the history of archaeology, an important,

---

bakery, the name being derived from pinsere 'to crush', with reference to the crushing effect of the god's thunderbolts. On the popular medieval identification of the Marforio as a 'simulacrum Martis', see CTR, III, 25, 54, 83, 90, 121, 189, 226; CTR, IV, 73 (Dondi), 241 (Poggio). Cf. Jordan, II, 348, 451. The Marforio, generally now thought to represent the river-god Tiber, remained at the foot of the Capitol opposite the church of S. Pietro in Carcere until 1596, when, as part of Giacomo Della Porta's remodelling of the Piazza del Campidoglio, it was incorporated into the terrace-wall of the Aracoeli. It is now displayed in the cortile of the Capitoline Museum: Helbig, II, no. 1193.

308. Opera, 267.
309. Opera, 239-240.
though small, component of the source-material employed in the Roma instaurata is constituted by those instances, where Biondo reports on recently discovered antiquities, excavated in the process of reconstruction, and attempts to relate his observations about them to the local topography and the associated literary sources. Two instances of such excavated finds, made in Biondo's own day, have already been recounted: the brick-stamps recovered from S. Silvestro (II. 12), and the Theatre of Pompey inscription recovered from Angelo Pontano's cellar (II. 109). A third instance is even more empirically illustrative of how Biondo's Roma instaurata developed pari passu with that of his patron, Eugenius IV. It concerns the discovery of Roman remains while the foundations of Eugenius's reconstructed Lateran monastery - one of the chief ornaments of that Pope's instauratio - were being sunk. At a depth of 8-10 feet below the vineyard and the garden, Biondo reports, were found arches, rooms, pavements, recumbent columns of various colours, carved marble tablets, beautiful statues, and other things (I. 86):

'Monasteriumque magni ac ut in aetate nostra insani operis addidisti, cuius fundamenta cum in vinetis altius efferentur quanta ibi olim fuerit operum magnificentia ostenderunt; quando quidem octonos denosque pedes sub vinea et horto defossa tellus aperuit fornice, camerae, pavimenta et iacentes diversi coloris columnas, exsecatasque marmore tabulas, ingeniosique operis statuas et alia quae non modo aetate nostra, sed multis ante saeculis excitata, ceteris in Italiae urbis superant aedificia.'

It is generally thought that these impressive remains, which, in Biondo's eyes, surpassed not only the buildings erected in his own age

310. See further supra, Chapter IV. 1.
311. Opera, 238. Following Huelsen in Jordan, I. 3, 245, note 62, I take Biondo's 'octonos denosque pedes' to mean 8-10, not 18, feet under the ground.
but even those raised in antiquity in the other cities of Italy, belonged to the imperial domus Laterani. Yet since the surviving documentation of Eugenius’s reconstruction at the Lateran dates from June 1433 to December 1439, years which Biondo, like the Pope he served, spent in exile in Florence, it is far from certain that he actually visited the site at the time. He does not admit to as much, and this, coupled with his disinclination to draw any historical deductions from the excavated remains, beyond remarking on their antiquity and magnificence, casts some doubt on the immediacy of his report.

Biondo, indeed, had no interest in drawing such deductions independently of literary evidence, and in this respect he lacked the archaeological acumen of Poggio in the field. Characteristically, in his account of Monte Testaccio (III. 74), Biondo deduces nothing from the overwhelming ceramic deposit, but bases his dismissal of the absurd medieval explanation of it — that it represented the pottery pitchers and jars in which the peoples subjected to Roman rule had brought their tribute to Rome — firmly on classical literary precedent: the tribute had been exacted by quaestors in the provinces, and had been brought to Rome, as in Cato’s case, not in pottery vessels but in leather sacks:

312. Gregorovius, VII, 661; Müntz 1878-82, I, 46, note 4; Lauer 1902-12, I, 49; Jordan, I. 3, 243-245; Platner-Ashby, 183-184.
314. Cf. Cavallini, CTR, III, 40-41; Vergerio, ibid., 98; and Signorili, supra, Chapter V. 4 and notes 186-187. The notion associating Monte Testaccio with Roman tribute appears to be late-medieval: Graf 1923, 120-121.
315. I.e. Cato Uticensis (95-46 B.C.), who in 58 B.C. was sent to undertake the annexation of Cyprus. Plutarch, Cato minor, 38, has described how he transported the vast tribute he accumulated there back to Rome by packing it in boxes, each holding 2 talents, 500 drachmae, and each attached to a long rope with a piece of cork tied to the end — to stop the boxes from sinking in the event of shipwreck. Cf. Velleius Paterculus, II. 45. 4-5. There is no
Alia item multorum interrogatione saepenurnero agitati
fuirnus quid munis ille fuerit cui portam inter
Tergeminam nunc Sancti Pauli et Tiberim testarum
laterunque fragmentis aggerato nunc monti Testatii est appellatio. Fama enim multis ante seulis
continuata habet eam montis molem quae procul dubio
magna est in id celsitudinis crevisse ex urnis alisique
testaceis, in quibus imperio subditi Romano populi
tributa Romam pertulissent. Et quidem nos eam famam
esse falsissimam certius probare possumus quam quo
auctore qua institutione id factum sit edocere.
Quantum vero attinet ad famae falsitatem norunt mecum
qui Romanorum gestas res legerunt, consuevisse
quaestores in provincias mitti, quibus curae esset
tributa exigere, et sive legionibus in spipendia
distribuere, sive in aerarium Romam deferre. M. Cato
Uticensis quaestor in Asiam, in Cyprumque missus,
habita a provincialibus tributa, non fictilibus urnis
gessit, quas homo legum observantissimus in Testacci
montis exaggeratione confugneret, sed tenacissimo
confutos corio sacculos in summa navis puppi
gestavit...''316

6. Aspects of Biondo's Roma antica

(a) Walls and Gates

Flavio Biondo, like the Mirabilia before him, begins his
description of the antiquities of Rome with an account of the
circumference of its walls, and the gates leading into it (I. 3-27).

1. sic.

mention of leather sacks: cf. P. W., XXII. 1, 182. Biondo,
indeed, does not divulge his source (an uncharacteristic lapse),
and it may be assumed that his account of Cato's Cyriote tribute
ultimately derives from a mistranslation of Plutarch's Greek. -
perhaps through a late-medieval De viris illustribus. But
boxes or sacks: his refutation of the medieval interpretation
remains unaffected.

316. Opera, 269.
He differed from Poggio, in concluding, after long investigation, that the ancient walls, though frequently breached by the barbarians, and frequently restored, still rested on their ancient foundations, and retained their original circuit\(^{317}\) (I. 3):

'Et nos quidem sciremus moenia urbis alicubi aperita, a saepeque a maioribus instaurata. Sed orbem ipsum inter instaurandum strictiorem factum, nec legimus, nec hoc tempore ab aliquo ruinarum signo, nisi parva parte post longam investigationem potuimus intelligere. Quamquam enim muri partim collapsi et corrosi sint, partim ruinam multis in locis minentur, in ipso tamen permanent prisco vestigio veteris fundamenti.'\(^{318}\)

Yet if the circuit of the walls of Rome had remained basically unaltered, Biondo had still to account for the huge discrepancy in the measurements of it as successively given by Pliny\(^{319}\) and Flavius Vopiscus in the time of Aurelian.\(^{320}\) To resolve this discrepancy (twenty miles on the one hand, and fifty on the other), Biondo turned to the authority of the Digest, and its distinction between the walled city proper and the total urban area, including outlying suburbs:

'Fuitque ambitus Plinii temporibus, sicut ipse ex Augustis\(^{1}\) traditionibus scribit, milia passuum viginti. Et Flavium Vopiscum scribere videmus, Aurelianum imperatorem, 1. Augusti R and B.'

\(^{317}\) Cf. CTR, IV, 242-245.

\(^{318}\) Opera, 223.

\(^{319}\) Pliny, N.H., III. 66-67, computed the moenia of Rome to measure 13.2 miles (13,200 paces), not 20 miles, and it is generally thought that this refers not to the Servian wall, but to the total built-up area: Jordan, II, 87; CTR, I, 7, note 2. The other measurement of 20.765 miles given by Pliny, loc. cit., which Biondo doubtless had in mind, was arrived at by adding up the distances between the central milestone in the Forum Romanum and each of the 37 gates. Jordan, II, 87; Huelsen 1897, 148ff; further bibliography on Pliny's survey of Rome in CTR, I, 6.

qui prope annos ducentos ante Visigothorum irruptionem fuit, ambitum Romae ad quinquaginta milia passuum amplissasse. Huius autem ingentiis differentiae, quae Plinii Veronensis Flavii Vopisci in urbis amplitudine assertiones videmis habere, causam nostro judicio certam, et quae omnes tollat ambiguitates, quinnullatemus hic duo scriptores discordent, in iuris civilis digestorum libris reperimus... Plinium itaque duum viginti milia passuum scribit urbis marorum ambitum, et Vopiscum dum quinquaginta Romae et aedium continentium amplitudinem iuxta legum definitiones considerasse crediderim. Et quidem Plinii verba sunt de urbe, quum Vopiscus de Roma dicit.'

Biondo, for his part, has computed the circuit of the city, including the Transtiberine and Vatican regions, to be, in his own day, 14 miles:

'Si ad nostrae aetatis consuetudinem metiri volemus, vix passuum milia quatuordecim omnis Romae et Ianiculi sive Transtiberinae regionis et Vaticanii ambitus implebit.'

As for the gates into the city, Pliny, according to Biondo, had accounted for 30 open ones and 7 closed ones. But their names were no longer all known. What names could be recovered from the ancient sources amounted to 24, which Biondo lists (I, 4):

'Portas urbis Plinius triginta apertas, et septem clausas tunc fuisse scribit. Barum omnium nominis nec ipse ponit, nec nos satis invenire potuisse, quamquam omnia investigare nominis vetusti portarum loca hinc superfluum esse scimus, quod apud Livium et alios scriptores aliqua inventumur nornia portarum, quae olim dum sucta fuit urbs Roma in medio civitatis remanentes, et formam portae et usum simul amisere. Et quidem nomina quae apud priscos fuerunt haec invenimus: Flumentana, Collatina,

---

321. Opera, 223.
322. The figure does not radically differ from that of Poggio, who computed the circumference of the Aurelian walls, excluding the Vatican, to be not more than 10 miles: CTR, IV, 243.
323. Opera, 223.
Collina, Quirinalis, Exquilina, Viminalis, Nevia, querculana sive Querceculana, Gabiuse,1 Levernalis, Ruduculana, Rutumena,2 Saginalis,3 Latina, Appia, Capena, Trigentia, Aurelia, Fontinalis, Carmentalis quae Scelelata, Pandina vel Libera, Lugonia quae et Trigillia, Catularia, Trumphalisque.325

The last of these gates could, for present purposes, be excluded. But of the other 23 ancient names of gates, Biondo tells us that only 13 (discounting those in the Vatican suburb) were still extant in his own day. These residual gates of the city he intended to correlate with their ancient names, as recorded by the classical authorities (I. 6):

'Attulimus a vetustissiminis petita trium et viginti portarum nomina, et nostra aetate Roma omnis tredecim tantummodo habet, nisi forte suburbii Vaticani, quam civitatem Leoninamuisse ostendamus, portas quoque velimus addere, quas omnium novissimas nove quoque habere nomina suo docebimus loco. Satis ergo atque operosissimum fuerit Romanae urbis et Ianiculi portas, quae aetate nostra cernuntur, vetustae appellations nominibus applicare.'326

To this task of correlating the ancient and modern names of the gates Biondo brought his extensive knowledge of the classical sources, particularly Festus Pompeius, the 2nd century etymologist, whom he supplemented with citations from Varro, Livy, Ovid, and Virgil. But all these classical sources referred to the Republican Servian wall, not to the 3rd century circuit of the Emperor Aurelian, to which the existing gates belong. Biondo, indeed, had already, in effect, equated the two,327 and it was on the assumption that the city wall of Rome in antiquity followed only one circuit that he proceeded to make such false toponymic correlations as Porta Populi = Porta Flumentana (I. 7); Porta Pinciana = Porta Collatina (I. 8); Porta Salaria = Porta Collina (I. 9); Porta S. Agnetis (Numentana) = Porta


325. Opera, 223.
326. Opera, 224.
327. R.I., I. 3.
Viminalis (I. 10); Porta S. Laurentii (Tiburtina) = Porta Exzullina (I. 12); Porta Maior = Porta Nevia (I. 13); Porta S. Ioannis (Asinaria) = Porta Colimontana (I. 14); Porta Appia = Porta Capena (I. 17); and Porta S. Paolo (Ostiensis) = Porta Trigemina (I. 19). In each equation, the gate in the Servian wall is topographically the closest to the corresponding one in the Aurelian circuit.

Biondo's enterprise, then, in attempting to 'restore' the ancient names, as recorded by the classical authors, to the modern gates of the city was vitiated from the outset by his supposition that the circuit of the wall's had not altered its course from the time of Pliny to the fall of Rome to the Visigoths. The medieval topographical literature, unencumbered by the Republican etymologies, perpetrated less confusion. Biondo, we may concur, in this instance, 'was in the last resort the victim rather than the master of his sources.'

(b) Obelisks

Among the antiquities of the Vatican Biondo includes the monolithic obelisk of Caligula, without hieroglyphics, which stood in the Middle Ages adjacent to the circular chapel of S. Andrea. That such

---

328. Cf. CTR, III, 17-18 (Mirabilia); ibid., 80 (Graphia); CTR, IV, 111-113 (Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis); ibid., 167-169 (Signorili). The contamination of the gates in the Aurelian circuit with Republican nomenclature applicable to the Servian wall had, however, been anticipated by Cavallini: CTR, IV, 27-41.

329. Hay 1959, 112.

330. Huelsen 1927, 190, no. 46. The obelisk is shown in front of the church, to the south of St. Peter's, in the Heemskerck drawing: Heemskerck, II, f. 7r. Excavations in 1957-1959 established that this was its original position on the spina of the Circus Gai et Neronis. In 1586, under the supervision of Domenico Fontana, Sixtus V's architect, it was moved to its present position in the

Continued
obelisks were not locally manufactured, but were brought from Egypt, was testified by both Pliny and Ammianus Marcellinus, the Vatican obelisk being the third to be transported to Rome (I. 61):

"Gentilium quae extent alia Vaticanus ager nulla habet opera praeterquam Cai obeliscum, de quo quia unicus ex majoribus nunc stat plura dicere nequaque absurdi iudicamus. Eas lapides moles nullius Romani opera aut cura fuisse excidas constat. Nam ipsos qui Romae integrae corrupti aut fuerint, aut nunc cernuntur a Thebis, aut aliis Aegypti urbis fuisse perductos, Plinius Veronensis Ammianusque Marcellinus ostendunt. Hunc autem qui in Vaticano visitur Plinius in XXXVI tertium ex majoribus qui fuerint advecti ponit libro XVI, ubi de magnitudine arborum tractat."

Having quoted Pliny's description of the giant ship used to transport the Vatican obelisk from Egypt to Ostia, Biondo passes on to the transportation of the obelisk of the Circus Maximus (erected in 357 A.D.), as recounted by Ammianus Marcellinus, who proceeds, in Book XVII. 4 of his Histories, to treat of obelisks in general, and to give a brief explanation of the linguistic principles underlying the hieroglyphics carved on them. Biondo quotes this excursus in toto (I. 62-64). To it he adduces a relevant quotation from Tacitus:

"The first people to express their ideas graphically were the Egyptians; this they did by representations of animals, such as are still to be seen graven upon their monuments of stone, those most ancient of human records."

Later, in his description of the antiquities of the Campus Martius, Biondo identifies one of the two obelisks attached to the Mausoleum of Augustus with one 'qui Pinciano nunc in colle prostratus

---

332. Ammianus Marcellinus, XVII. 4. 1-16.
333. Opera, 231.
334. Platner-Ashby, 367-368; Nash, II, 142-143.
335. Tacitus, Annals, XI. 14.
cernitum. But of the other obelisks of the city, notably the Capitoline obelisk re-erected in the Middle Ages, he says nothing.

Though the obelisks of Rome were, apart from the Vatican obelisk, which was thought to be Caesar's tomb, ignored in the Mirabilia, Biondo was not the first to include them in a survey of the city's antiquities. They had already been extensively catalogued in the Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis. But here there is no explanation of their original purpose, and no recognition of their Egyptian provenance. Poggio Bracciolini appears to have been the first to

336. The obelisks, testified by Ammianus Marcellinus, XVII. 4. 16, were discovered shortly before 1527 near the church of S. Rocco, not far from the Mausoleum of Augustus: Platner-Ashby, 370; Nash, II, 155-156. See also supra, Chapter VII, note 135. But the obelisk which Biondo saw on the Pincio had nothing to do with the Mausoleum. It was the 'alter in hortis Sallusti' also recorded by Ammianus Marcellinus (loc.cit.), the obelisk erected in the Gardens of Sallust on the Pincio; its recumbent position between the Porta Pinciana and Salaria is shown in several 16th century pictorial maps of Rome. It was eventually re-erected in 1789 in front of SS. Trinità dei Monti, where it remains: Platner-Ashby, 368; Nash, II, 144-147.

337. See supra, Chapter I. 3 (c).

338. CTR, III, 43, 85, 116, 190.


340. They are not even called obelisks, but aguliea 'needles', a medieval corruption, probably, of acula, a vulgar Latin diminutive of acus ('needle' or 'pin'), which can be traced at least as far back as a bull of Leo IX of 1053: 'agulia, quae vocatur sepulcrum Iulii Caesaris'; cf. the 12th century Mirabilia (CTR, III, 43): 'Iuxta quod est memoria Caesaris, id est agulia...'. Cf. Jordan, II, 182; Battista (C.) and Alessio (G.), Dizionario Etimologico Italiano, I (Florence 1950), 100. But the etymology is complicated by a cluster of semantically related words: Meyer-Weber (W.), Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, 3rd ed. (Heidelberg 1935), no. 297 agulia 'obelisk', Italian guglia, provisionally derived from no. 123 aculea; cf. ibid., nos. 118-130. Dannenfeldt 1959, 24, points out that the connotation survives as late as Rabelais, in whose Gargantua and Pantagruel obelisks are described as aiguilles. And in English, of course, it persists even today in the name popularly given to the two Egyptian obelisks from Heliopolis now on the Thames Embankment in London and in Central Park, New York: Cleopatra's Needles. Cf. Huntingdon in John Ray's Collection of Curious Travels and Voyages, London 1693, II, 153: 'The Franks call them Auguiala's, the English particularly Cleopatra's Needles.' The English connotation goes back, at least, to Trevisa's 1387 translation of Higden's Polychronicon (Rolls Ser.), IV, 211: '...Iulius his pilier, that now pylgrys clepe Seynt Petres nedle.' I.e. the Vatican obelisk.
point out the latter: apropos of the obelisk in the Circus of Maxentius, he explained that the various animals, birds, and figures carved on it served as letters to the Egyptians. Yet it is perhaps curious that he did not there expand on the point by reference to the Egyptological excursus of Ammianus Marcellinus, since it was he who had recovered a codex of Books XIV-XXXI of the *Histories* from Fulda in 1417. It was left to Biondo to be the first to exploit its information about the obelisks of Rome, their transportation from Egypt, and their hieroglyphics. Indeed, Biondo's reproduction in Book I. 62-64 of the greater part of Ammianus' excursus must be reckoned one of the first contributions to Egyptology in modern times.

It is striking to observe, in this respect, how a train of independent events concurred during the first half of the Quattrocento to give Egyptology its academic basis. The basis was supplied not so much by Western travellers to Egypt (though Ciriaco d'Ancona, among others, made antiquarian investigations there), as by the rediscovery of classical texts, in which Egyptian antiquities are described. Egyptology, in short, originated as a humanistic venture. As early as 1419 a Greek MS. of the *Hieroglyphica* of Horapollo was recovered from

---

341. GTR, IV, 240. Ciriaco d'Ancona in 1435 apparently pronounced them 'Phoenician': Dannenfeldt 1959, 12.
342. See supra, note 114.
343. The recent survey by Roullet of incipient Egyptology in Europe from late antiquity to the close of the 16th century makes no mention of either the humanistic discovery of Ammianus Marcellinus, or of Flavio Biondo. Dannenfeldt 1959, 23, however, refers to Biondo's description of the obelisks of Rome.
344. On Ciriaco's two visits to Egypt (the first in 1412, the second in 1435), see the *Itinerarium*, ed. Meeus, 52; De Rossi 1857-88, II, 356, 362, and 382; Dannenfeldt 1959, 12; Roullet 1968, 135.
the Island of Andros, and brought to Florence a few years later.345
Neither Poggio nor Biondo appear to have been familiar with it. But the
former was later himself to contribute to Egyptology, in collaboration
with Georgios Trapezuntios, in the translation of the first five books of
the Bibliotheca of Diodorus Siculus - a mine of information about
ancient Egypt - which was commissioned of them by Pope Nicholas V; a
Greek MS. of the work was brought to Italy by Garatone da Trevigi already
during the pontificate of Eugenius IV.346 Simultaneously, Lorenzo Valla
was engaged on his entire translation of Herodotus, unfinished at the
time of Nicholas V's death,347 its second book an invaluable introduction
to the antiquities of Egypt. The rediscovery, translation, and
diffusion of these and other Greek sources (e.g. Apuleius, Plutarch,
Strabo),348 in which the ancient Egyptians, their monuments, and their
religion are described, constitute the chief basis on which Egyptology
developed in the course of the 15th century.

(c) Thermae

Among the monuments of the Esquiline Biondo included the Baths
of Diocletian, his description of which, and his expatiation on its
remarkable preservation, brings Book I of the Roma instaurata to a close
(I. 104).349

At the beginning of Book II Biondo launches into a description

345. Boas 1950, with English translation; Panofsky 1965, 178 and note 2;
Roulet 1968, 125. On the Hieroglyphenkunde of the Renaissance
humanists the fundamental study remains Giehlow 1915; see further
Enking 1939, 7-13; Dannenfeldt 1959, 7-27.
346. Voigt 1893, II, 185-186.
347. Ibid., II, 185; Momigliano 1966, 138.
348. Cf. Dannenfeldt 1959, 8-10; Roulet 1968, 124.
of the other imperial thermae of Rome. He lists twelve of them (II. 1):

'Thermas in urbe duodecim fuisse compertum habemus: Agrippinam, Neronianam, Titi Vespasianam, Domitianam, Antonianam, Alexandrinam, Gordianam, Severianam, Diocletianam, Aurelianam, Constantianam et Novarianam.'350

As to the purpose of these thermae, Biondo throws light on their imperial function by quoting from the Historia Augusta on the washing habits of Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius, and Gordian (II. 1).351 Of the vast scale of the balnea themselves, the marble columns were an indication (some of which were still standing, others lay on the ground, while others, as Biondo rightly points out, had been removed for the construction of Christian basilicas) (II. 2):

'Erant etiam in thermae areae amplissimae porticibus circumdatae spaciosissimis, camerataque superbissimis fornicibus aedificia in circuitu habentes, in quibus columnarum diversi coloris marmorearum ordines immensarum fuisse hinc constat, quod etiam nunc nonnullae stant, nonnullae fitentes columnae partim integrae partim comminutae loco cernuntur, nonnullas alias in basilicarum aedificia scimus fuisse translatas.'352

Other aspects of the imperial thermae — their vast size, their various functions, their public usage — Biondo found described in the Life of Severus contained in the Historia Augusta (II. 5-6).353

After these prolegomena, Biondo can turn in more detail to the individual thermae of Rome. Those of Alexander Severus he identifies in the then extensive ruins of the Thermae Neronianae, out of which they were built,354 situated between the Pantheon and the Stadium of Domitian.

350. Ibid.
351. Hist. Aug., Hadrian, XVII. 6-7; Marcus Aurelius, XXIII. 8; Gordian, VI. 6.
353. Hist. Aug., Severus, XXIV. 2, 5-6, XXV. 3-4, 6-7, XLII. 1.
(Piazza Navona); parts of them, in Biondo's day, abutted houses owned by Giovanni Baroncelli, the lawyer, and the two towers of Giovanni Moroni, the protonotary. Biondo found confirmation of the location of these baths in the Curiosum, which conjoins them to the Thermae Agrippinae in Regio IX (II. 7):

'Braepostero itaque ordine sicut in Dioclitiani thermis incepimus, in istis continuantes, Alexandrinas eas fuuisse thermas tenemus, quarum ingentes ruinae ab ecclesia Sancti Eustachii et aedibus Iohannis Baroncelli, iureconsulti, et a campo Sanctae Mariae Rotundae hinc ad Aenobarborum sive, ut vulgus appellat, Longobardorum plateam et circum Flaminium, nunc Agonem, inde ad binas paene turres Iohannis Moroni, prothonotarii Reatini, variis in locis videmus attolli. Quod autem Alexandrinae fuerint hae et non aliae, colligimus ex descriptione Sexti Rufi nonae regionis, circae Flaminii, in qua Pantheonem et binas thermas Agrippinianas et Alexandrinas ponit.'

On the strength of the Curiosum's collocation of these two thermae, reinforced by Agrippa's construction of the adjacent Pantheon, Biondo correctly identified the Thermae Agrippinae in the ruins in the vicinity of S. Maria sopra Minerva, where, in Biondo's day, were the houses of the Porcari, of the poet-humanists Cencio de' Rustici and Battista de Lenis, and of the protonotary Georgie Cesarini (II. 8):

'Marcum Agrippam aedificasse Pantheum, quae nunc est Sancta Maria Rotunda, etsi prope vulgo notorium est, suo tanen loco ostendemus. Quando itaque ad Pantheum et circum Flaminium binas fuisse thermas Agrippinianas et

1. R.

355. On the precise location of these properties, see CTR, IV, 290, notes 5-8.
356. CTR, I, 126: 'Thermas Alexandrinas et Agrippianas.'
357. I.e. Piazza dei Lombardi, now Piazza Madama. On the relationship of the Thermae Neronianae to S. Eustachio, the Piazza della Rotonda, Piazza S. Luigi dei Francesi, and the Palazzo Madama, see Nash, II, figs. 1266-1272.
Alexandrinas Sexti Rufi descriptio urbis habet, verisimile est Agrippinas fuisse quas nunc Pantheoni contiguis e regione Minervae conspicuas aedes Portiorum et Cincii Rustici, collegae nostri, et Baptistae Laen1s atque etiam Georgii Caesarini prothonotarii videmus esse complexas. 360

The *Thermae Antonianae*, or Baths of Caracalla, Biondo locates 'in regione olim Piscina Publica et ad Viam Ardeantinam'; 361 to the north they reached to the church of S. Prisca, 362 and to the east of SS. Nerei et Achillei. 363 Other than quoting the record of their construction from the *Historia Augusta*, 364 however, Biondo makes no comment about one of the most imposing monuments of the whole city (II. 9).

After briefly noting that the *Thermae Neronianae* had been rebuilt by Severus, whose name they then took (II. 10), 365 and after postponing a description of the *Thermae Vespasiani* to a later chapter (II. 11), 366 Biondo turns his attention to the Baths of Domitian (II. 12), which, on the basis of a faulty interpretation of the Life of Silvester in the *Liber Pontificalis*, 367 he located in the vicinity of S. Silvestro in Capite. The supposedly Domitianic brick-stamps recovered from this church Biondo took to be corroboration of this location, 368 and he goes on to adduce the presence of other monuments erected by the same emperor in the vicinity (II. 13-14). 369

---

366. Biondo treats it as part of the Flavian complex at the Colosseum: *R. I.*, III. 3.
367. See *supra*, note 175; cf. CTR, IV, 292, note 1.
368. See *supra*, Chapter VIII. 5 (c).
For the following three baths Biondo relied for his information on the scanty descriptions in the *Historia Augusta*. Of the Baths of Severus nothing was definitely known, beyond the fact that Severus had built them in the Transtiberine region (II. 16). The probably fictitious *Thermae Gordianae* are identified in some large ruins beyond the church of S. Eusebio (II. 17). And the Baths of Aurelian, for the use in winter, were situated, according to the Emperor's *vita*, in Trastevere (II. 18).

Biondo's account of the Baths of Constantine on the Quirinal (II. 19) rests on two literary sources: Apollodorus, whom we have identified as a Trecento redaction of the *Mirabilia*, and Ammianus Marcellinus. From the former Biondo derived his conventional attribution of the *Dioscuri* to Praxiteles and Phidias. From the latter he obtained the only classical allusion to the baths he could find. But their Constantinian association was suggested by the eponymous inscriptions on the pedestals of the four marble statues of standing figures, which stood, at the time, in the *porticus* or *loggia*, close to the *Dioscuri*.

---

375. On the loggia, see supra, Chapter I, note 171; Michaelis 1898, 253-254. By the early 16th century one of the four Constantinian statues mentioned by Biondo had been lost; the other three were removed, between 1536 and 1544, to the Campidoglio and set up on the stairway leading to the Aracoeli; in the following century the statues of Constantinus Caesar and Constantinus Augustus were re-erected on the balustrade overlooking the *cordonata*, where they remain: Helbig, II, nos. 1166, 1167. The third statue was taken, in 1734, to the Lateran, and set up in the vestibule of the...
As for the Thermae Novatianae (II. 20), Biondo derived his information about them from a late 11th century interpolation from the Acts of SS. Pudenziana and Prassede in the Liber Pontificalis.  

He goes on to consider whether these baths were identical with the Thermae Olympiadis attested in another martyrological source, the Gesta of St. Lawrence, which situated S. Lorenzo in Panisperna within them (II. 22). Such was the confusion of ruins, however, that Biondo admits he could not positively identify them, but if the suggestion of Apollodorus that the ruins in the vicinity of S. Pudenziana on the Viminal were of the palace of Decius, then it followed that the Thermae Novatianae and Olympiadis were small.  

Having concluded his description of the thermae of Rome, Biondo reverts to his interrupted survey of the monuments of the Esquiline, which he began in Book I. 96.

Biondo's enumeration of the imperial thermae does not derive from the catalogue of eleven baths preserved in the Curiosum, nor does it tally with the list of ten given in the Mirabilia, or with the seven described by Poggio. His survey derives instead from a fresh basilica. Biondo is surely right to associate them with the Baths of Constantine, whence they probably came: Michaelis 1898, 254; Nash, II, 442, 445.  

376. Opera, 243.  
377. See supra, Chapter VIII 5 (b).  
379. Opera, 244.  
381. CTR, III, 20, 81, 186-187; CTR, IV, 236.
examination of the literary record, preponderantly the various imperial vitae of the Historia Augusta, which he was the first to exploit for their archaeological information, supplemented by medieval sources. The elucidation of this disparate literary evidence exhibits both the strengths and the weaknesses of Biondo’s method. But the resultant picture of the ancient thermae of Rome - one that is both sociological and archaeological - is undoubtedly the most comprehensive to date.

(d) Arches

In his account of the Porta triumphalis (I. 41), based largely on Josephus, Biondo addressed himself to the triumphs of imperial Rome - a subject to which he was later to aptly devote the culminating book of his Roma triumphans - and in Book II. 93 of the Roma instaurata he furnishes a short chapter on the triumphal arches of the city, only four of which, he says, were still extant: that of Domitian, which he had already described (II. 14), and those of Constantine, Septimius Severus, and Titus Vespasian:

'Pariter dicemus de arcubus triumphalibus quorum perpauci nunc integri vel non maiori ex parte comminuti cernuntur. Nec dignum satis censimus loca, ubi magna illorum pars fuerit, investigare. Quatuor vero ex ipsis nunc extantium quos constatuisse triumphales, unum, Domitian ad Sanctum Silvestrum, descripsimus. Reliquos tres Constantini, Lutii Septimii Severi et Titi Vespesiani accomodationi tempore describemus.'

To the second and third of these triumphal arches Biondo reverts in the course of Book III (59-60), recording, in both cases, the one

---

384. Opera, 243.
385. Opera, 254.
abbreviated, the other in toto, the imperial commemorative
inscriptions on which the attributions rested:

'Idem Severus arcum triumphalem habuit sibi et Marco
Aurelio communem a Senatu populoque Romano positum,
qui nunc integer ad sanctum Hadrianum sub Capitolio
cernitur. Estque titulus Imperatori Caesari L.
arcu Constantini, quem in Neronis stagnis aedificatum
fuisse diximus, paucarum dicere expedit, quod in eo nunc
integro talis titulus habetur. Imperatori Caesari
Flavio Constantino Maximo Publili filio Augusto.
S. P. Q. R. quod instinctu mentis avininitatis
magnitudine cum exercitu suo tam de tyranno quam de
omni factione uno tempore iustis rempublicam ultus est
armis, arcum triumphis insignem dicitur.387,388

Apart from what he took to be specifically triumphal arches,
Biondo mentions two other imperial arches of Rome: that of Gallienus
near the church of S. Vito (II. 26);389 and the Arcus Argentariorum,
dedicated to Septimius Severus, his wife Julia Domna, and his sons
Caracalla and Geta, situated next to the church of S. Giorgio in
Velabro (II. 54).390

In two further cases, Biondo refers not to single, but to
multiple arches: firstly, to some ruined marble arches 'ubi nunc
ecclesiae sunt Sanctae Mariae de Gratia et Sanctae Mariae de
Inferno',391 which he thought had originally been built in the same

closely follows the medieval tradition, even to the
perpetuation of the error in reading the dedicatory inscription." Biondo's
confusion between Caracalla and Marcus Aurelius is also apparent
in his reference to the C.I.L., VI, 896, recording a Severan
restoration of the Pantheon: B.L., III. 62.
387. C.I.L., VI, 1139. Biondo's transcript does not appear to derive
directly from either the Syllobre Barberiniana (no. 5), nor the
Sylloge Poggiana (no. 45), both of which are more accurate.
388. Opera, 268.
389. Platner-Ashby, 35; Nash, I, 115-117.
391. Opera, 226.
spot by Romulus (I. 18), and secondly, to some marble arches beyond S. Maria in Cosmedin, erected in honour of Horatius Coles, and recently demolished for lime (I. 21). In both instances, it seems, Biondo was referring to stretches of aqueduct.

The account of the ancient arches of Rome contained in the *Roma instaurata* is neither systematic nor comprehensive. Biondo omits, inter alia, the *Arcus Novus* of Diocletian on the Via Lata, and the Arc of Arcadius, Honorius, and Theodosius at the western end of the Pons Neronianus. In general, his account is inferior to the catalogue of arches in the *Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis* and to Poggio's survey in the *De varietate Fortunae*.

(e) Aqueducts

Biondo's use of the *De Aquaeductibus* of Frontinus, his principal literary source for the ancient aqueducts of Rome, has already been mentioned. It remains to describe how he elaborated on it, and what other conclusions he drew from the monuments on the ground.

Biondo begins by thus introducing the source on which his description of the aqueducts was to rest (II. 94):


393. Opera, 226. Cf. Marchetti 1915, 113; CTR, III, 62, note 3; CTR, IV, 265, note 1. Presumably the same as the Arch of Lentulus and Crispinus described in the *Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis*: Marchetti 1915, 112-113; Platner-Ashby, 40; CTR, IV, 121.

394. The *Aqua Marcia*, and *Aqua Appia*, respectively: Jordan, II, 380; Platner-Ashby, 40, 602; Ashby 1935, 54.
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398. CTR, IV, 237.
Hac etiam in parte aquaeductibus ostendere expediens videtur. Iulius Frontinus curandis aquis praefectus a Nerva imperatore institutus scribit opus, ex quo nonnulla ad rem nostram facientia hic exerpsimus. Quae autem fuerint istae aquae et unde, quoque passuum milibus, vel sub terram vel arcubus ducerentur, etsi Frontinus copiose scribit, parum nobis intelligibile est, quod et ipsae formae maiori ex parte corruerunt, et nomina locorum per quae illorum fines decursumque describit, interierunt. Formarum autem magnificientiam totius orbis et ipsius urbis miracula superasse, infra scripta ostendunt.  

The laudatory quotations from Frontinus that follow are complemented, at the close of the same chapter, by the catalogue of the aqueducts of Rome which Biondo reproduces from the codex of the Curiosum he had found at Monte Cassino.  

Turning to the individual aqueducts of the city, Biondo supplements these sources with the Elder Pliny, quotations from whom supply the brunt of the descriptions of, successively, the Aqua Martia (II. 95), the Aqua Virginea (II. 96), and the Aqua Claudia (II. 97). He then addresses himself to the problem of the destruction of these and other aqueducts of the city. How had this come about? Biondo explains that two causes were commonly adduced: antiquity, and the savagery of the Goths. But it was Biondo's intention to exculpate both (II. 98):  

'Quod vero causas tantae iacturae quantum fecit urbs Roma in aquarum eiusmodi per formarum demolitionem aversione duas vulgo afferri videmus, vetustatem scilicet et Gothorum crudelitatem; hos ab iniusta immerso et per caluniam nota cum purgaverò, vetustas etiam, quo ad formarum demolitionem, sua invidia liberabitur.'

---

399. Sextus Julius Frontinus was appointed to the post of water-commissioner under the Emperor Nerva in 97 A.D. See further CTR, I, 9-15, with bibliography.
400. Frontinus, I. 4.
401. Opera, 254.
402. Frontinus, I. 23, II. 88. For the quotation from the Curiosum, see infra, Appendix F.
403. Pliny, N. H., XXXVI. 121.
404. Ibid., XXXVI. 121-123.
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The Goths, then, in Biondo's submission, had been impugned.

Theoderic, King of the Ostrogoths, during the 38 years of his rule over Rome, had, indeed, given 'the greatest benefits to the city of Rome'. He had cleared its monuments of shrubbery, restored and reconstructed them, so that during the 70 years of Ostrogothic rule over Rome and Italy there had been no need to lament the passing of the great emperors of Roman antiquity (II. 99):

'Et quidem quantum ad Gothos attinet, Theodericum, qui fuit primus gentis Ostrogothae rex, et Romam duo de quadraginta annis dominio subactam tenuit, et alias diximus et identidem affirmamus, urbem Romam summis beneficiis prosecutumuisse, moenia illius, theatra, amphitheatra, palatia, thermas, cloacas, et imprimis aquarum formas instaurari arboribus sentibus purgari, et aliqua ex parte refici curavisse, ut per annos septuaginta, quibus ostrogothi regno Romae et Italiæ sunt potiti, Octavii Augusti, Traiani, Hadriani, Antonini Pii, aut Alexandri Severi amplex in Romanam rem desiderari nequaquam oportuerit.'

Since this proposition would arouse incredulity in those ignorant of the situation, Biondo intends to corroborate it with a single testimony: Cassiodorus, whose Variae, III. 53 he goes on to quote in its entirety (II. 100):

'Quod quidem quia multis ignorantibus incredibile futurum non ignoramus, libet uno testimonio confirmare ad aquarum, de qua nunc agimus materiam faciente, assertque id testimonium, non doctissimus modo, sed Christianus et vitae laudatissimae senator primo Romanus et postea monachus, Cassiodorus.'

Yet if the Goths were to be exonerated from the destruction of the aqueducts, so, equally, was vetustas. Confirmation of this Biondo found in the realisation that during the period of a little more than a

406. On Biondo's more extensive eulogy of Theoderic as the restorer of Rome, see the Decades, I. 3, Opera, 33-34.
408. Opera, 256.
millennium since the sack of the Goths\textsuperscript{409} such solid structures could not have collapsed and completely disappeared of their own accord — especially when parts of them remained intact in the countryside, although of use to no one (II. 101):

\begin{quote}
\textquote{Vetustatem vero tanti mali causam non fuisset, hinc judicamus, quod annorum paulo plus mille, quot a Gothorum excidio effluxerunt, adeo corruisse ac penitus evanuisset tam solidae extractiones, quarum partes quae in agris a multitudinis commodo quam longe abfuerunt, integrae nunc visuntur.}\textsuperscript{410}
\end{quote}

In short, it was the Romans themselves, who were, in Biondo's opinion, solely to blame, and in particular those who had quarried the aqueducts for masonry, either to be burnt into lime, or to be inserted into the walls of their sordid houses:

\begin{quote}
\textquote{Solae igitur incusandae ac detestandae sunt manus improbas illorum qui, ut privata et quidem sordidissima erigerent aedificia, lapides aut in calcem decoquendos aut casarum muris adhibendos ab illa moenium maiestate non sunt veriti asportare....}\textsuperscript{411}
\end{quote}

Biondo's digression on the destruction of the ancient aqueducts of Rome invites comment on three scores: its exoneration of the Goths, in the light of Theoderic's \textit{restauratio}, its archaeological observation about the differential preservation of the aqueducts, and its indictment of the damage done by Roman lime-burners and stone-masons.

The first advances a flattering interpretation of Ostrogothic Italy, which is avowedly founded on that of Cassiodorus, whose rescripts in Theoderic's name Biondo had closely studied. Nor is it one which is inconsistent with the generally-expressed judgement of humanist historiography — a judgement (of Theoderic in particular) which

\textsuperscript{409}. On Biondo's chronology of the \textit{excidio Gothorum}, see Hay 1959, 114; Mazzarino 1966, 79.
\textsuperscript{410}. \textit{Opera}, 256.
\textsuperscript{411}. \textit{Ibid.}
Machiavelli, and later still Muratori, was to perpetuate. A distinction should be drawn here between the disruptive Visigothic incursions, and the stabilized Ostrogothic regime: the former had, in Biondo's view, indeed inaugurated the inclinatio of the Roman empire; it had not only led to the sack of Rome, but also to the corruption of the Latin language. At the same time, however, Biondo, not unlike Leonardo Bruni, regarded the barbarian age as one of adversity, whereby vigour was eventually restored to a body-politic stifled, at least since Arcadius and Honorius, by despotism, and enfeebled by the elimination of the best men. By the early 5th century that age was, to all intents and purposes, over. The barbarian invaders had already, in Biondo's view, become assimilated into the mainstream of Italian culture, Theodoric, with his Roman entourage and aspirations to civilitas, having adapted himself so well to the imperial heritage as to vie with the great emperors from Augustus to Alexander Severus.

As for Biondo's remarks about the state of the aqueducts in his own day, it is their intention to contrast the unbroken stretches of aqueduct in the uninhabited Campagna with the collapsed, or non-existent, parts close to, or within, the walls of the city. The argument, on this score, is not entirely convincing; it ignores the cutting of the aqueducts by the Goths as recounted by Procopius. But undoubtedly the

---

quarrying of the aqueducts had been directed at its more accessible stretches. Biondo himself must have had occasion to observe this fact. That he was thoroughly familiar with the further reaches of the aqueducts in the Campagna is shown by his letter of 12 September 1461 to Gregorio Lolli Piccolomini, describing an expedition of Pius II and his court to the summit of Monte Affliano, in the course of which he expatiates on the imposing aqueducts to be seen in the Valle d'Empiglione and along the Via di Carciani. 417

Thirdly, we should consider Biondo's indictment of the Romans, who, in order to lay their hands on accessible building materials, were busily destroying their heritage. The humanist invective against the reckless demolition of Roman antiquities is not anything new. The mode was quickened, if not inaugurated, by Petrarch in the earlier Trecento. His followers later took up the hue. 418 And in the 1430's both Ambrogio Traversari and Ciriaco d'Ancona were aroused to indignation by the activities of the lime-burners in Rome. 419 Poggio Bracciolini, in his De varietate Fortunae, ruefully noted some of their depredations, 420 and Biondo, in the Roma instaurata, had already lamented that the marble arches near S. Maria in Cosmedin had been demolished for lime (I. 21):

'... ecclesia sanctae Mariae de schola graeca, sive ut appellant in Cosmedin, ad primas Aventini radices, qua is mons vergit ad pontes, ubi nunc vetustissimos arcus marmoreos, ut in calcem decoquerentur dolentes vidimus a fundamentis excidi.' 421

The lime-burning industry, which naturally flourished in periods of urban renewal, seems, indeed, to have taken on a new lease of life in the period after 1420. So short was the ready supply of

418. See supra, Chapter II. 2 (a).
419. Gregorovius, VII, 584-585; Lanciani 1902-12, I, 50.
420. GTR, IV, 233, 235, 240.
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building materials that even the Popes, with varying degrees of complicity, were obliged to countenance its spoliations. Thus, in July 1426 letters of patent were issued to a company of lime-burners authorizing the demolition of parts of the Basilica Julia, and on 10 October 1431, a few months after the elevation of Eugenius IV, a papal permit was issued to Filippo di Giovanni di Pisa, marmorarius, to excavate and to convey to the apostolic palace 'quaecumque marmora de muris antiquis existentibus in loco ubi fuit Secca antiqua.' So reckless became the hunt for suitable marbles to burn into lime that, on 29 March 1436, the same Pope was obliged to publish a brief, complaining about the pilfering of marbles from Roman basilicas - a practice which his predecessor had encouraged - including St. Peter's, where, it was alleged, some slabs of porphyry and other marbles had even been wrenched off the pontifical throne:

'Eugenius... quamquam in omnibus orbis terrarum locis, in quibus Christiana fides excolitur, rerum sacrarum, vel ad sacros usus deputatarum solertem curam ne distrahantur dissipenturque, habere cupiamus; in alma tamen Urbe, in qua Omnipotens primatum Ecclesiae suae sanctae statuit et firmavit, id eo diligentius fieri exoptamus, quo major ad illam precioso apostolorum, et martyrum pene innumerorum sanguine rubricatam, populorum universi orbis multitudo confluit. Sane per hos dies nonnullorum ex venerabilibus fratris nostri sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae cardinalibus, quorumque aliorum, quibus fidem adhibere possamus querula expositione didicimus, licet alias quidam scelestae conditionis homines fuerint reperti, et quotidian reperiantur, qui ex basilicis aliae Urbis, non solum quae a secularibus presbyteris reguntur, sed illis etiam quae dictorum fratrum nostrorum cardinalium titulis deputatae sunt, marmora, aliosque lapides diversi coloris non parvi pretii et valoris ipsarum basilicarum ornamento et usibus deputatos sacrilege abstulerint; novissime quosdam tantae audaciae, et impietatis fuisse, qui de sede nostra [quae] usui nostro, prout praedecessorum nostrorum romanorum pontificum, continu

422. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 47-48.
423. Ibid., 423. On the location of the Zecca antiqua on the Forum Romanum, see Gregorovius, VII, 588; CTR, IV, 139, note 1.
424. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 49. See further supra, Chapter III. 3.
fuit deputata, secus altaro sacratissimum beatissimi apostolorum principis Petri posita, porfiriticas, alteriusque marmoris tabulas ipsius sedis posteriorem spondam, et subsolium ornantes, non minus stupenda quam dolenda audacia abstulerunt. Quare, etc.\textsuperscript{425}

To his credit, Eugenius IV also took steps to curb the demolition of the Colosseum, which had been going on apace since (at least) the earlier Trecento; in effect, he placed a preservation order on it.\textsuperscript{426} But its efficacy is open to doubt, since in December 1439 travertine from the Colosseum was taken to S. Giovanni Laterano to be used in the reconstruction of the apse.\textsuperscript{427} Marbles from the Curia and the Forum Iulium, besides, were used in Eugenius's restoration of the Vatican palace.\textsuperscript{428} The Colosseum was particularly vulnerable to the depredations of the marmorarii. Biondo himself notes that a part of it had been demolished, and he goes on, in the same chapter, to ruefully observe that 'in many cases we see vineyards where we saw the most splendid buildings, the squared travertine masonry of which has been baked into lime' (III. 7):

'Fuisse autem tenemus et affirmamus ipsam amphitheatri oblongam partem et nunc demolitam inter harenae quae nunc extat partem dirutam et arcum Constantini atque ingentes ruinas, quae ad primas Caellii montis radices proxime insurgiunt, quas quidem ruinas fundamenta curiae Hostiliae fuisse tenemus.... Multis enim in locis vineas nunc videmus ubi superbissima vidimus aedificia, quorum quadrati lapides tiburtini in calcem sunt concocti.'\textsuperscript{429}

Corroboration of this sorry state of affairs can be found in a letter of Alberto Averardo d'Alberti to Giovanni de'Medici, datelined 'ex urbe delacerata', 22 March 1443, only a few months before Biondo began work on

\textsuperscript{425} Müntz 1878-82, I, 39, note 3; Lanciani 1902-12, I, 50. Cf. Lanciani 1899, 207.
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\textsuperscript{427} Müntz 1878-82, I, 48; Lanciani 1902-12, I, 50-51.
\textsuperscript{428} Ibid., I, 49.
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the Roma instaurata. Averardo touches on the ruined state of the city, inveighing against the lime-burners, and looking askance at the buildings being erected on the proceeds of their spoliations; every day, he laments, marbles from ancient buildings were being burnt for lime in scandalous fashion:

'Multi edificii di palazzi trionfali, di residenzie, di sepolture, di templi et altri ornamenti ci sono (in Rome), et copia infinita, ma tutti rovinati, porfidi et marmi assai, e quali marmi tutto giorno per calcina di disfanno.'

(f) Amphiltheatres and Circuses

That the Emperor Titus had built the first amphitheatre in Rome was asserted by Cassiodorus, but Biondo refutes the notion by pointing out (III. 1) that two earlier imperial sources had mentioned other amphitheatres preceding the Colosseum: Tacitus had recorded an amphitheatre built in the Campus Martius in the time of Nero, and Suetonius had recorded that erected by Statilius Taurus, which most people, in Biondo's day, erroneously identified in the remains of the brick-built Amphitheatrum Castrense near S. Croce in Gerusalemme (I. 87).
As for the Colosseum itself, it was begun, according to Suetonius, by the Emperor Vespasian, but Biondo is not sure whether it was completed by him or his son. Its association with both was, however, reinforced, in Biondo's mind, by his perception of the tendency of Roman emperors to erect their buildings in one locality – a tendency he had already encountered in reconstructing the ostensibly Pompeian complex in the Campo dei Fiori (II. 108-112). Biondo elaborates the hypothesis by adducing other Flavian monuments in the vicinity of the Colosseum: the Temple of Peace, the Arch of Titus, with its relief of candelabra and other spoils being borne in triumph, and the Baths of Titus (III. 2-3).

Nam quod supra de multis, et nuperrime de Pompeio ostendimus, consueverunt Romani principes omnia eorum monumenta uno in loco aedificare. Et Pacis templum nunc...
dirutum Vespasiani opus via olim sacra, deinde notissimum Titi filii arum, in quo candelabra et alia gentis spolia in triumphum ducta cornuntur, amphitheatro nunc Colosseol propinquu esse videmus, ut nullatenus sit dubitandum, quin omnia vel sanctae Mariae novae monasterii et ecclesiae aedificia, vel maximae apud illam extantes ruinae in Colosseum vergentes dicti Pacis templi, et aliorum Vespasiani ac Titi aedificiorum partes fuerint. Quanquam Suetonius quando scribit Titum aedificasse amphitheatrum, addit quod pariter thermas illi propinquas extruxerit, quas credimus fuisse ubi nunc sunt ruinae a sanctae Mariae novae monasterio in Colosseum, ut diximus, vergentes."142

Having established, to his satisfaction, the Flavian date of the Colosseum, Biondo proceeds to investigate its purpose. That it originally enclosed an arena was indicated by intact moles of comparable type at Verona and at Pola in Illyria, both known as arenas (III. 5):

"Similes enim illi moles, quae nunc Veronae una, Polae Illiriorum altera, integrae extant, dicuntur harenae."143

Further light on the history and nature of the Colosseum was shed by Cassiodorus. Biondo quotes in extenso two rescripts of Theoderic published in the Variae: the first authorizing the use of materials from the amphitheatre to repair the ruined city walls (III. 6);444 the second indignantly describing the bloodthirsty spectacles held in the arena (III. 9).445 The latter leads Biondo on to assemble Roman imperial sources in which the gladiatorial and other games held in the l. coloseo R.
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As for circuses, there were three in Rome (III. 16):
'Decinque circos describere aggrediamur. Eos in urbe tres fuisse Maximum, Flaminium, \textsuperscript{1} et Heronis, nec plures constat.'\textsuperscript{146} In the third of these stood the Vatican obelisk, which Biondo had already described (III. 17):

"De eo qui Heronis est dictus paucus scribit Plinius, ubi de tertio obelisco tractat, qui erat estque nunc in Vaticano. Illun anim dicit suisse in Heronis circo, sicut supra de obeliscis tractantes diximus."\textsuperscript{147}

The Circus Maximus Biondo 'restores' on the basis of relevant quotations from Livy (Book I): its construction under Tarquiniius Superbus (III. 18);\textsuperscript{148} the assignment of places to the patriciate on which they could raise platforms from which to view the games, and the magnificence of the \textit{lori} (or supports) on which those platforms rested (III. 19);\textsuperscript{149} and the games held in the Circus under Tarquinius Priscus (III. 20).\textsuperscript{450} Biondo supplements Livy's account of the Circus Maximus by quoting the bizarre etymology of \textit{circus} supplied by Cassiodorus (III. 21),\textsuperscript{451} and by the Suetonian account of the games held in the circus under Julius Caesar, including chariot-racing and the Troy-game (III. 23).\textsuperscript{452} The origin of the latter is explained in the following chapter by appropriate quotations from Tacitus and Suetonius R. Appollinaris R.
But of the furnishings of the Circus Maximus nothing, in Biondo's day, survived. Demolished of buildings, it had been turned into vegetable allotments, though it still retained its ancient name (III. 26):

'Circi maximi locus etsi omni aedificiorum ornatu modo denudatus est, et in hortos mutatus optimis abundantes cleribus, tamen retinet nomen sub ruinis palatii maioris.'

After a rapid consideration of various monuments in the immediate vicinity of the Circus Maximus (III. 27-29), Biondo turns to the third of the Roman circuses to be considered.

He follows the then current opinion in identifying the Circus Flaminius in the remains of the Stadium of Domitian, now Piazza Navona (III. 30-31). Corroboration of this identification he found in the church of S. Maria in Aquiro (in Campo Marzio). The name he thought corrupt, and mistakenly restored it as S. Maria in Equuria, on

453. Tacitus, Annals, XVI. 21; Suetonius, Aug., 43, 2; Calig., 18, 3; Claud., 21, 2-3.
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457. Ibid. The church was originally called S. Maria a Cyro, which by the 12th century had degenerated into Aquiro: CTR, III, 49, 88, 191, 218, 231, 273, 294, 361, 438. Biondo's 'restoration' S. Maria in Equuria compounds this corruption, and, moreover, invests it with a spuriously erudite pedigree: Jordan, I, 3, 476, note 13; Huelsen, loc. cit.
the basis of its alleged association with the sacred horse-races (Equuriae) held, according to Ovid and Varro, in the Campus Martius (III. 33-35). That these Equuriae were held in the Campus Martius, between the Mausoleum of Augustus and the circus 'qui nunc Agonem est nomen', Biondo thought confirmed by Cassiodorus (though the quotation in question is corrupt) (III. 34), and his theory of the relationship between church, Equuriae, and circus was further reinforced by the evidence of his own eyes: if anyone, he explains, were to climb to the end of Montecitorio, as Biondo himself had done, he would realize that there had existed a road (now built-up) leading from the Mausoleum of Augustus to S. Maria in Equuriae, and from this church to the Circus Flamininus (i.e. Piazza Navona) there remained a short stretch of straight road (III. 35):

'Bon si aliquis quod nos aliquando fecimus, postremam montis Citatorum partem conscenderit et oculo metietur, profecto intelliget ab Augusti sepulcro rectam fuisse viam, aedificiis nunc contectam, quae ducet ad ecclesiam Sanctae Mariae in Equuriae appellatam. Ab ipsa autem ecclesia in circurn Flaminium, nunc Agonem, recta brevis et usus expeditissima nunc est via.'

Biondo certainly had occasion to make such an on-the-spot observation himself, since he lived on Montecitorio - a fact he is pleased to point out in the following chapter. He suggests that the road leading from the Mausoleum of Augustus to the Porta del Popolo, the Via

460. Cassiodorus, Variae, III. 51. 3-4. In Biondo's quotation the correct reading 'in vallem Murciae' (on the vallis Murcia between the Palatine and Aventine, see Jordan, I. 3, 112-113; Platner-Ashby, 348) has been corrupted into 'in vallem Martiam': Opera, 265; cf. M.G.H. Auct. Antiq., XII, 105; Robathan 1970, 206-207.
462. Opera, 265.
Flaminia, took its name from the Campus and Circus Flaminius, but is undecided about whether the road leading from Rome to Imola and the province of Italy were both called Flaminia for the same reason; the problem particularly vexed him, because (as he proclaims) it was at Forli, the most beautiful city in all Flaminia, that he was born and raised, and because, by coincidence, he now lived in Rome on the Via Flaminia under Montecitorio (III. 37):"465

"Utrum vero eadem ratione et regio Italicae nunc Romandiola a foro Cornelii, nunc Imola ad Pisaurum, et via omnis ab ipso foro Cornelii usque in urbe Romanam Flaminium habuerit cognomen incertum est. Hinc magis anginmur animo quod omnium Flaminiae urbium spectiosissima Forum Livii nos genuit aluitque, et forte nunc ab eadem in urbe Roma sub Citatorum monte Flaminiam incolimus viam."466

Having, to his satisfaction, demonstrated the whereabouts of the Equaria, Biondo has no difficulty in explaining how the Circus Flaminius had acquired the epithet Agonis, since the ancient agones persisted in the similar games held in Biondo's own day in the same place (III. 38-39):"467

"De mutatione nominis Circi Flaminii in agonem parum admirari debebunt, qui noverint agonis verbum commune esse cuilibet actioni quocunque in loco publice institutur. Et in tanta tamque absurda omnium appellationum mutatione, quantam fecerunt Romae urbis aedificia, haec satis videtur toleranda, quando locus ipse ne dum florente Roma multorum ludorum spectaculorumque agones habuit, sed nostris quoque temporibus, si quis attente consideraverit ludorum quoque Apollinarium similitudinem repraesentet."468

Furthermore, the similarity between the ancient and modern games was suggested on etymological grounds: Macrobius had commented on the

---
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celebration of the ancient Apollinarian games in the Circus;\(^{469}\) Livy had located the Temple of Apollo in the Prata Flaminia (III. 39);\(^{470}\) and the Libr Pontificalis had recorded that the church of S. Apollinaris in Piazza Navona was built by Pope Hadrian I 'ubi prius Apollinis aedes fuit' (III. 40).\(^{471}\)

Aedes Apollinis - Ludi Apollinaires - S. Apollinaris: such are the links in the chain of Biondo's argument, reinforcing the location of the Circus Flaminius in Piazza Navona. As pursued between Book III. 30 and 40, the argument is elaborate and ingenious. Based on disparate literary sources, the study of place-names, topographic observation, and on the essentially humanistic notion of the survival of pagan forms in the names of Christian 'temples',\(^{472}\) it offered a learned explanation of the site of the Circus Flaminius and of the ancient games in the Campus Martius. Half a century later it was digested by Francesco Albertini.\(^{473}\) But the ingenuity of the argument outstrips its verisimilitude. Nowhere else, perhaps, are the weaknesses of Biondo's enterprise more apparent. While the display of basic or contingent sources is characteristically impressive, the assumptions that dictate their collocation are mistaken.

---

469. Macrobius, Sat., I. 17. 27, 29.
470. Livy, III. 63. 7.
471. Opera, 266. I. P., I, 504. See also supra, notes 197-199.
472. Cf. R.I., III. 40, on the transformation of the Pantheon.
473. CIT, IV, 474.
(a) The *instauratio* of Eugenius IV

Though the *Roma instaurata* was not intended to encompass a description of modern Rome, Biondo's open comparison, in his prefatory remarks, between his literary renovation of the city in antiquity and the physical *instauratio* of Rome accomplished by his patron, Eugenius IV, needs to be taken into account. The very title of his treatise implies this duality: Rome restored by both humanist and Pope. Nor was the *comparatio* a mere rhetorical trope, prompted by duty or flattery. It reflects the dialectic between *antica* and *nova*, which, on the empirical level, manifested itself in the connection between archaeology and the rebuilding of Rome, which Biondo himself, in describing how the workmen engaged on the reconstruction of the Lateran monastery had hit upon antique remains (I. 86), classically illustrates. But not only was *Roma antica* recovered as *Roma nova* rose over it. On a more profound level, the destinies of 'the two cities' - in humanist literature, as in architecture - had become merged. It is this dialectic between the city of antiquity and that of its renaissance that pervades the texture of Biondo's *Roma instaurata*.

The Lateran monastery was one of several restorations undertaken by Eugenius IV which Biondo commemorates in the course of his work. First in precedence, as in order, are the Pope's restorations at the Vatican, to which he devotes a short excursus in Book I (I. 56-60).

---

474. Cf. the opening sentence of the proemium, and Biondo's remarks in R.L., III. 83.
475. *Opera*, 222.
He mentions, in encomiastic terms, the Pope's renovations to the roof and sacristy of St. Peter's, and his donation to the basilica of new bronze doors, the gilt-bronze reliefs of which celebrated the Pope's albeit short-lived reconciliation, at the Council of Florence, of the Greek with the Latin Church (I. 58);  

'Sola una re videris a Leone superatus: quod valvas ille argenteas, tu aeneas basilicae dedisti, nisi par videatur magnificentia pro argenteis nullo exquisitiorti artificio factis, aeneas posuisse inauratas, tantisque insculptas historiae unionis Graecorum, Armeniorum, Aethiopum, Jacobinorum et aliorum populi unius tue opera tuaque impensa ecclesiae conciliatorum, ut quadruplo aeris aurique impediment merces opificis superaverit.'

The artist to whom Eugenius entrusted the sculpture of these bronze doors, which still remain at the entrance to St. Peter's, being among the few items salvaged from the old basilica, was the Florentine Antonio Averlino, better known as Filarete. He came to Rome in 1433, and accepted the Pope's commission probably in the same year. It engaged him, and his six assistants, intermittently for twelve years. The doors were eventually installed on 14 August 1445. Filarete, whose remuneration had so impressed Biondo as a sign of the Pope's munificence, had adapted their iconography to commemorate the achievement marked by the ceremony of 6 July 1439, culminating the Council of Florence, when

479. Opera, 231. On the Porta Argentea of St. Peter's, see CTR, II, 251, note 8; CTR, III, 392; CTR, IV, 379, 397. Cf. Maffeo Vegio's even more encomiastic description (written a decade later) of the new doors donated by Eugenius IV to St. Peter's: CTR, IV, 379.
480. They were re-erected by Paul V in the new basilica in 1619: Muntz 1878-82, I, 42-43.
482. Paolo di Lello Petrone, La mesticanza, 59: 'Sabato a dii lì del mese de agosto fuore puoste in nella porta principale de Sancto Pietro le porte de metallo.' On the alternative date of 26 June 1445 given by Infessura, cf. Muntz 1878-82, 41 and note 2; Paolo dello Mastro, Memoriale, 93.
the Greek and Latin Churches were formally united by the promulgation
of the papal decree 'Laestentur caeli'. They incorporate, besides,
panels of the Apostles, and historical reliefs of the journey of the
Emperor Sigismund from Milan to Rome, his coronation and procession with
Eugenius IV, the departure of the Emperor John VIII Palaeologus from
Constantinople, his arrival in Ferrara and reception by the Pope, the
Council session in Florence, the departure and embarkation of the Greeks
at Venice, and the visit of the Jacobites, under Abbot Andreas, to the
graves of the Apostles in Rome.

Among Eugenius IV's other works at the Vatican was the new mint
or Zecca, the foundation of which accompanied the Pope's reform of the
Roman coinage, when the senatorial currency of the Commune was abolished.
Nothing has survived of this building, but it is thought to have been
situated in the lower palace between the Campanile of St. Peter's and the
main entrance to the palace. Biondo says nothing, beyond recording
its construction, as well as that of the adjacent ornamental palace

Vite di Uomini Illustri, 13-17. The achievement of Eugenius IV at
the Council of Florence was vaunted, in a manner reminiscent of
Biondo, in the epitaph to the Pope's long-demolished sepulchre in
St. Peter's: Gregorovius 1903, 73-76; Montini 1957, 273-276; cf.
CTR, IV, 394 and note 2. The sentiment is echoed - albeit
somewhat inconspicuously - in the epitaph of the surviving tomb of
the Pope (also of the 15th century) in the refectory of S. Salvatore
in Lauro.

484. Cf. Vasari, Le Vite, III, 244-245.
485. On the imperial coronation of Sigismund in May 1433: Gregorovius,
VII, 37-38. On Filarete's portrait of John VIII Palaeologus:
Weiss 1966, 21-22. On the depiction of the oriental envoys on the
doors: Olschki 1944, 102. On the mythological cameos decorating
the borders: Roeder 1947, 150-153; on the equestrian relief-
portrait of Antonio Rido: Keutner 1964, 148; and on the panel of
the Crucifixion of St. Peter and its topographical content:
486. Ehrle and Egger 1935, 92; Tomei 1942, 35; Magnuson 1958, 114;
Monaco 1962, 42-43.
Of the Pope's building-activities at the Lateran, Biondo makes no mention of the restorations undertaken in the basilica itself. He does, however, record the Pope's reconstruction of the Lateran palace, which was becoming so dilapidated as to be almost unfit for habitation, as well as of the adjoining monastery (I. 85-86):

'Nuper vero pallatia tanto principatu dignissima, quibus circumdata fuit basilica, maiori ex parte corruerant, brevi nullum alicubi passura habitatorem. Sed tu, Eugeni beatissime pater, aulae vestigia primum, deinde alias circa particulas magno instauratas impendio perficere porgis. Nonneriuniumque magni ut in aetate nostra insani operis addidisti...'

Eugenius also restored the bridges of Rome. Biondo records, in particular, the restorations of the two bridges linking the Isola Tiberina with both banks of the river, the ancient Pons Fabricius and Pons Cestius, which Eugenius had paved with travertine (II. 81): 'Quos (pontes) nuper tua, pontifex Eugeni, opera instauratos et tiburtino lapide stratos videmus.'

Finally, in Book III of the Roma instaurata, Biondo devotes three chapters to commemorating the restorations accomplished by Eugenius at the Pantheon: the roof was re-lined with sheet-lead; the columns of the pronaos were cleared of booths; and the piazza and the street...
leading to the Campo Marzio were both paved in travertine (III. 64-66): 495

EIius stupendum fornicem vetustate ipsa et terraemontibus scientum ruinamque minantem tua, pontifex Eugeni, opera impensaque instauratum et chartis plumbeis alicubi difficientibus cooptatum laeta inspicit curia. Et cum ipsa insignis ecclesia ceteras facile superans multis ante saeculis celsas quibus attollitur columnas habuisset sordidissimis diversorum quaeestuum tabernis a quibus obsidobantur occultatas, emundatae nunc in circuitu bases et capita denudatae mirabilis aedificii pulchritudinem ostendunt. Acceduntque decori stratae tiburtino lapide subjicta templi area et quae ad ætatis nostraee campum Martium ducit via.' 496

(b) The Cardinalate

An important aspect of both the intellectual and the architectural instauratio of Rome during the pontificate of Eugenius IV (as during that of his predecessor) is represented by the patronage extended to humanists and artists by the cardinals. Several were themselves of some intellectual and cultural distinction: 497 Pietro Barbo (later Paul II), Prospera Colonna, Giordano Orsini, Domenico Capranica, Niccolo d' Albergati, Giuliano de' Cesarini, and Gerardo Landriani are the most prominent. 498 Capranica and Colonna are both

495. Magnuson 1958, 26, 33.
496. Opera, 268.
flatteringly invoked as ornaments of learning in the *Roma instaurata*: the former with regard to his Palatine *vigna* (I. 76), the latter with regard to his ornamental stairway on the slopes of the Quirinal (I. 100).

The particularly fulsome apostrophe to Prospero Colonna, the former Pope's *nipote*, in perhaps surprising, in view of Eugenius' vendetta against the family of Martin V. But Eugenius had formally made his peace with the Colonna in September 1431. Prospero, thereafter, remained an influential, and apparently wealthy, figure in Roman society. Moreover, he took a more active interest in the recovery of *Roma antica* than the Pope himself. Among humanists, he patronised both Poggio and Biondo. Both participated in the new edition of Livy he had commissioned in 1435. Poggio dedicated to him his dialogue on avarice, and it was at his dinner-table in early 1446 that Biondo drew attention to his new work, the *Roma instaurata*.

His association with Prospero Colonna is further revealed in a letter of 13 November 1444 to Leonello d'Este, in which Biondo tells of his exploration of antiquities in the Campagna in the course of a hunt held

---

499. But Biondo omits to mention the Palazzo Capranica, the only early Quattrocento palace of the cardinalate to survive: Magnuson 1958, 227-228. It is thought by Nogara that Biondo's letter of 13 Sept. 1446 to an unspecified prelate, in which he confirms that he had shown him the completed MS. of the *Roma instaurata* was, in fact, addressed to Capranica: Nogara 1927, CIV, 159-160. On Capranica's *vigna* on the Palatine, see Jordan, I. 3, 73, note 85; Lanciani 1902-12, I, 105; CTR, IV, 277, note 3.

502. Sunra, note 110.
in honour of Borso d'Este by Prospero Colonna, 'vir eximius et qui cardinalatum urbisque Romae nobilitatem magis decorat quam ab illis ingentibus otiam aetate nostra fastibus ornetur...'. In the same letter Biondo describes how the Cardinal had also taken him to his hereditary estates at Nemi, where they inspected some fragments of Caligula's sunken galleys dredged up from the lake:

'Qui aliqua operis antiqui ex priscorum monumentis mihi ostensurus ad lacum venit, quem Nemos Cinthianusque praesentis vocabuli oppida super incubant... Estque ipse in lacu demersa navis ingens, cuius extractae ferreis uncis tabulae sunt cypresseae, et clavi vel pedales vel, quos extrahi contingat, maiores ex aere, sunt ita nunc integri, ut, quod auctorem quasvisisse crediderim, incorrupti fuerint in aqua perpetuo duraturi. Harpago etiam aeneus mensura pedalis, cui navis consueverat alligari, saxo cernitur indolumatus adeo integer, ut fore anni unius opera imitetur.'

The discovery of these fragments so whetted Prospero Colonna's curiosity that a few years later — presumably with Biondo's encouragement —

506. The date is a matter of some controversy, since it implicates the date of completion of Alberti's De Re Aedificatoria, in which one of the Nemi ships is mentioned (Book V. 12): L'Architettura, ed. Orlandi and Portoghesi, I, 388-391. The work was presented to Pope Nicholas V in 1452 (cf. R. Palmieri, De Temporibus suis, col. 241). And it is already mentioned in Biondo's Italia illustrata (1443-1453), in which we find a description of Alberti's attempted raising of the Nemi ship: Opera, I, 325-328, with the reference 'Leo Baptista Albertus geometra nostri temporis egregius qui de re aedificatoria elegantissimos compositus libris.' Alberti, moreover, loc.cit., makes it clear that he was still at work on his treatise while the first Nemi ship was being salvaged: 'ex navis Traiani per has dies dum quae scripsimus commentarer ex lacu nomorensi eruta.' For a convenient summary of the chronological implications of both passages, see Krautheimer 1956, 268, note 28. But Krautheimer's firm date of 1447 for the Nemi operation, derived from Lancini 1911, 279-280, is in fact hypothetical. Weiss 1969, 113, more cautiously says 'not later than June 1450'. Uccelli 1950, 7, presumes Alberti's salvage-operation took place as early as 1446. The whole affair is too complex to be categorically pronounced on here; a full study of Alberti's empirical contributions to both archaeology and cartography in Rome and its environs during the years when he was writing the De Re Aedificatoria (cf. Grayson 1960B) remains a desideratum.
he made a spectacular, but abortive, attempt to salvage one of the ships in question; watched by the assembled papal court, Leon Battista Alberti, whom Prospero had appointed to direct the project, tried, with the help of a team of Genoese divers, and elaborate machinery, to hoist it out of the water, but the wood was too rotten, and the ship sank to the bottom again. On the force of the fragments recovered at this time, Biondo wrongly deduced that the vessel belonged to the Emperor Tiberius.

The episode of the Nemi ships, which has been termed 'the first attempt at archaeological recovery', is a striking illustration of collaboration between cardinal and humanist in the recovery of *Roma antica*. Biondo's association with Prospero Colonna seems, otherwise, to have been prolonged and fruitful. Together they made several archaeological investigations in the Campagna. In the compilation of his *Italia illustrata* Biondo was to acknowledge his gratitude to Colonna, who had supplied him with relevant information. And in the *Roma instaurata* he is even more complementary. He hails him as a second Maecenas — an epithet admittedly prompted less by munificence (Biondo's indigence, at least, was to persist to the end), than by the Cardinal's

---

508. Cf. the inscribed 'fistole di piombe': *Italia illustrata*, Opera, I, 326.
510. Ibid., 108.
512. On the poverty of chancery officials under Eugenius IV, see Rodocanachi 1912, 271. Biondo, unable to read Greek, did not subsequently benefit from the largesse of Nicholas V, and his indigence, towards the end of his life, seems to have become acute: Masius 1879, 19-21. Cf. Bishop Domenico of Torelli's epigram on Biondo: 'Laudatur hic et alget.' Nogara 1927, CLXXIV. But no relief came. 'He died a poor man, as was proper for a scholar,' Pius II complacently remarked: Hay 1959, 101.
residence on the presumed site of the ancient *Horti Maecenatia*. And he goes on to pronounce Prospero 'a man of the highest liberal temper, extremely learned in the *studia humanitatis*, and a great lover of cultured men'. Of his contributions to the restoration of Rome, Biondo praises the polychrome marble tessellated pavements which the Cardinal had laid out in his gardens on the slopes of the Quirinal, and which, as we are told, were the admiration of all who inhabited, or visited, the Roman Curia (I. 100):

'*Incolit ea hortorum Maecenatis* aedificia, et quantum opes suppetunt, instaurat alter nostris seculi Maecenas, summae humanitatis liberalitatisque vir et studiorum humanitatis apprime doctus, cultorumque amantiissimus, Prosper Columnensis, sanctae Romanae ecclesiae cardinalis, adeoque purgando instaurandoque illis in aedibus profecit, ut subjectae montis Equiliarum radicibus areae et incipientis ab ea in summam aedem partem ascensus pavimenta marmoreis variis coloris tessellis compacta visantur, et ab omnibus quotquot Romanam curiam aut inhabitant aut adventant, viris ingenio doctrina et virtute praeditis, summa cum delectatione calcentur.' 514

Biondo, unfortunately, says nothing more of the Palazzo Colonna, nor does he mention Prospero's collection of antiquities. Of the palaces belonging to the cardinalate under Eugenius IV, he reserved especial praise for that of S. Lorenzo in Lucina, adjacent to the Arco di Portogallo on the Via Lata (the present Corso). He tells us that this palace was first erected in the Dugento by an English Cardinal over Domitianic remains; in the 1420's it was extended at considerable expense by Jean de la Rochetaille, Cardinal of Rouen, and, later still, I. Maecenatia R.

513. See *supra*, note 46.
514. Opera, 240.
515. Lanciani 1902-12, I, 107; *supra*, p. 130, note 38.
516. CTR, IV, 293, note 1.
517. On the palace of Rochetaille: Reumont 1884, 542ff; Gregorovius, VII, 663, 776; CBCR, II, 162, 165, note 1, quoting part of the commemorative inscription dating to 1427; Magnuson 1958, 227.
greatly enlarged and ornamented - 'at such great expense that the city of Rome has no more beautiful house except for the pontifical palace' - by the Cardinal who inhabited it in Biondo's own day, Jean de Jean de Contaz, Bishop of St. Jean de Moriane (1439-1451) (II. 15):

'Ut consequens etiam sit magnos fornices et amplissima fundamenta super quibus aedificatum est nobile palatium quod Iohannes ex Gallis Picardus, cardinalis Morinensis nunc habitat, Domitiani operum partem fuisse. Id palatium ad annum salutis trecentesimum supra millesimum, a cardinali Anglico in praedictis Domitiani operum ruinis aedificatum, Iohannes cardinalis Rothomagensis anno nunc vigesimo multa impensa adauxit, quod nuperrime Iohannes cardinalis Morinensis, supra dictus, tanto ampliavit ornavitque impendio, ut nullam, praeter pontificale palatium, Sancti Petri domum, urbs Roma nunc habeat pulchriorem.' 518

Unfortunately, nothing remains of this early Quattrocento palace, its site now being occupied by the Palazzo Fiano. 519

The palace of Ludovico Scarampi, the Pope's camerarius, at S. Lorenzo in Damaso disappeared even sooner; only some thirty years after its completion, it was demolished to make way for Raffaele Riario's still-surviving Cancelleria. 520 Biondo tells us that Scarampi, fresh from his double triumph of defeating Piccinino at Anghiari and expelling Francesco Sforza from Picenum, 521 adorned it at great expense (II. 111):

'Eius basilicae aedes inhabitat nunc qui magno exornavit sumptu Lodovicus cardinalis, tuus pontifex Eugeni camerarius, duplici gloria tuis auspiciis tuisque opibus parta, fusi ac delei apud Anglicium Nicolai Picinini, et pulsi Piceno Francisci Sforiae clarus.' 522

518. Opera, 243.
519. Reumont 1884, 549ff.
521. See infra, Appendix E
522. Opera, 258-259.
For these military successes Eugenius rewarded his Paduan condottiere (a physician by training) successively with the Archbishopric of Florence, the Cardinalate of S. Lorenzo in Damaso, and (in 1439) the Patriarchate of Aquileia. But even the smallest benefice would have been desecrated by this parvenu, whose gluttonous life at S. Lorenzo in Damaso won him the nickname of Cardinal Lucullus. 523

Three further titular residences of the cardinalate are briefly mentioned by Biondo in Book III of the Roma instaurata: that of Pietro Barbo at S. Marco (III. 78), 524 Bessarion at SS. Apostoli (III. 79), 525 and Nicolò di Acciapaccio at S. Marcello (III. 80). 526

But, ironically, the only surviving cardinal's palace of the period to survive, the Palazzo Capranica (now a cinema), is passed over in silence. 527

523. Cf. Gregorovius, VII, 82-83; Davies 1910, 76-78. Of Scarampo's funerary effigy in S. Lorenzo in Damaso, Davies remarks: 'The figure represents a personality at once so repulsive and so attractive that it is difficult to get oneself into the frame of mind in which it can be criticised as a mere work of art.' Its epitaph echoes the achievements attributed to Scarampo by Biondo: 'Lodovico. Patavino. Patriarchae. Aquil Albano. Pont/TT DivL Laurentii in Damaso. Card. S.R.E. Camerario/Quod animi magnitudine et singulari praeditus prudentia cum rem Romanam/multitudine hostium laborantem legatus ab Eug IIII in splendorem pristin~ar.rnis et victoriis vendicasset Nicolaum Piccinum apud Angliarum Florentino/Ecclesiae socios infestantes signis conlatis profligasset agrum Picen~a Francisci Sfortiae dominatu inditionem Romanae ecclesiae recuperasset/(etc.)'

524. Pietro Barbo, nephew of the Pope, became cardinal deacon of S. Maria Nova in 1440, titular cardinal of S. Marco in 1451, and ultimately ascended the papal throne as Paul II in 1464: Gregorovius, VII, 220; Magnuson 1958, 217-218. Biondo makes it clear that Barbo was already resident at S. Marco by 1446. But it was not till 1455 that construction began on the new Palazzo di San Marco, which, in the course of the second half of the century, grew into the present Palazzo Venezia: Magnuson 1958, 24ff.

525. Bessarion was created titular cardinal of SS. Apostoli in 1439. On the palace which he built close to the church, and on his residence there until his death in 1472, see Magnuson 1958, 312-313; only two rooms survive, incorporated into the present Palazzo Colonna.


(c) **Roma antica** and **nova** compared

The encomia of Eugenius IV and his cardinals scattered through the **Roma instaurata** provide an important focus on the renascent city, the glorification of which was coupled, in Biondo's mind, with that of its antique model. Both modes of **instauratio**, the literary one addressed to the city of antiquity, and the bricks-and-mortar one directed at the **Rome** of Eugenius, are inseparably linked in Biondo's prefatory remarks. Out of this jammed-headed vision of **instauratio** arises Biondo's synthesis of **Roma antica** and **sacra** - a synthesis which culminates, towards the end of the treatise, in a fanciful comparison between the two, in which the suggested concordances between the imperial and papal dispensations are demonstrated to be in the latter's favour. For how could Biondo despise the present state of the city, when the 'urbis Romae gloria maiestatis' flourished even more securely under the popes than it had done under the emperors? (III. 84).

To be sure, this **comparatio** is couched in transparent hyperbole. The truth was otherwise. Biondo may not have despised the city he lived and worked in, but, all the same, he could not but be conscious of its deficiencies. In the course of the **Roma instaurata** he draws attention to some of them himself: the desolation of the hills (I. 75, III. 7); the demolition of antiquities (I. 21, II. 101, III. 7); and the degeneration of the great monuments of Roman antiquity into the shabby exhibits of the later Middle Ages - the ancient senate into

528. *Opera*, 222.
529. On Biondo's concordances between the offices of the Roman Empire and those of the Roman Church, see the further amplifications in Book X of the *Roma triumphans*: *Opera*, 117.
Boniface IX's *palazzo* (I. 73), the Asylum into a prostitutes' quarter (II. 58), the Comitium into a pig-market (II. 67), and the ancient *Equusaria* into the Carnival games on Monte Testaccio (III. 76).

Biondo, indeed, was well aware that in its topography, as in its monuments, the city he lived in bore little congruity with imperial Rome, the ruins of which, strewn over the uninhabited hills, were encompassed, in his own day, only by vineyards and pasture. He acknowledges that 'the parts (of the city) that are now thronged with people and their houses have been left almost untouched by me.' (III. 77).

Even the restorations of Eugenius and his cardinals in the densely populated Campo Marzio and Campo dei Fiori must have seemed, at the time, like islands in a sea of desolation. This should be borne in mind in evaluating the claims made on behalf of the resurgent *Roma sacra* of the day. Brief in duration, sporadic in application, and superficial in character, the restauratio of Eugenius IV had no strong roots in a revived economy, or even a stable political situation. At the close of his pontificate Rome remained essentially the 'cow-pasture' it had been on his return to the city in 1443. Guy Le Bouvier, premier Herald of King Charles of France, who visited Rome in 1448, the year after Eugenius' death, was struck by the rustic wilderness within the circuit of the Aurelian walls:

'Celle cité de Romme est la plus grant ville de cristienté, mais il y a de présent plus de masures que de maisonnaiges, pour les grans guerres, qui anciennement y ont esté; et y à plusieurs grans et merveilleux palais fondus, dont on voit encore les apparences, et la plus part d'icelle cité est en vignes, en jardins et en désert...'

---

530. Opera, 270. 
531. Le Bouvier (Guy), Le Livre de la Description des Pays, 84.
8. Discussion

In the midst of the desolation of Rome, beset by the constant depredations of the lime-burners, Biondo set about the primary task of recovering from oblivion the image of the city as it had existed in antiquity. In effecting this rescue-operation, Biondo anticipates the kind of antiquary described by Stendhal: someone '(qui) trouve à faire abstraction de ce qui est et à se figurer tout un édifice tel qu'on le voyait jadis quant il était fréquenté par les hommes portant la toge'. But it was not through fancy that Biondo populated the ruins. His principal witness was afforded by the classical literary sources, in which the monuments are described intact. It was by correlating these with the ruins on the ground that Biondo attempted to 'restore' ancient Rome.

Apologising for omitting to describe the most densely inhabited parts of the city in his own day, Biondo concedes that the omission would be noticed by anyone who wandered about and surveyed the city 'vel mentis, vel oculis' (III. 77). The phrase, in its curious dichotomy, reveals something of Biondo's essentially blinkered approach to topographical investigation. In spite of the few occasions on which he calls on the witness of his own eyes, he remained at heart, in contrast to Poggio, an armchair-antiquarian. Of course, he toured the sites - he did so assiduously - and inspected new finds, but again and again it is the literary sources which interposed themselves between him and the monuments in the field. It is symptomatic that when the

533. Opera, 270.
lawyer Giustino Planca inquired of him about the location of the *sunma Velia*. Biondo should draw his attention, not to the relevant topography, but to the Varronian etymology (III. 73). 534

In its essentially *literary* character, the *Roma instaurata* culminates a humanistic tradition generated by Petrarch a century before. It is in no way the progenitor of the folios of Roman antiquities illustrated with *vedute* or plans of the city, which begin to proliferate in the following century. 535 In this context, the theory that Biondo used a plan of Rome, in particular one based on the same prototype as that made by Alessandro Strozzi in 1474 'as visual documentation for the preparation of his text', 536 seems quite implausible; the analogies of identification, location, and nomenclature that have been adduced between the *Roma instaurata* and the Strozzi plan seem, rather, to reflect a community of ideas circulating in Rome than any cooperative, or derivative, venture. 537 Moreover, it seems virtually certain that Biondo's treatise was originally not furnished with a map or plan of the city. 538 And in general, the cartography of Rome, to which Alberti, a few years later, was significantly to contribute, was quite alien to Biondo's antiquarian interests.

One indication of this is the fact that he gives no attention to the concept of the *forma urbis*, which was central to the methodology

---

536 Scaglia 1964, 154.
537 Cf. Fubini 1966, 548; Weiss 1969, 92; the theory that the nomenclature of the Strozzi prototype might have been derived from the *Roma instaurata* is, in any case, decisively ruled out by the very concordances which Gustina Scaglia 1964, 160-163, publishes to corroborate it; cf. *ibid.*, 141-152.
of Quattrocento urban cartography, and which prompted Alberti to formulate, in the prolegomena to his Descriptio urbis Romae, his method of mapping Rome by plotting the circuit of the Aurelian walls from the circumference of a circle graduated into 48 equal arcs, with the Capitol at its centre. Biondo shows no such aesthetic, or geometric, urge to articulate, even verbally, an ordered plan of the city. On the contrary, a fundamental defect of the Roma instaurata, it may be allowed, is its formlessness. Lacking a coherent organizing principle, it alternates uneasily between topographic and analytic modes of description – a situation which even the Mirabilia, with its clear separation of classified lists of monuments and topographic Periegesis, managed to avoid. Even the four-part scheme which Biondo enunciates in Book II. 39 for classifying monuments of religion, administration, spectacle, and minutiora is by no means rigorously applied.

What the Roma instaurata lacks in form, it makes up for in content. It is by far the most comprehensive survey of Roma antica to date: 'der erste Versuch einer vollständigen Beschreibung Roms'. The various opusculi of earlier humanists, which alone bear comparison (the treatises of Cavallini and Signorili, like the Mirabilia, being full of mythological and legendary material), are restricted in scope. Even Poggio's Descriptio is no exception. While it was conceived as an inventory of the surviving antiquities of Rome, Biondo's wider object was 'not only the description of what existed, but still more the recovery of what was lost'. Poggio's description, besides, was

539. CTR, IV, 209-222.
interpolated into a philosophical dialogue on the vicissitudes of fortune, of which it formed an exemplum, whereas Biondo's work was conceived, and published, as a self-sufficient treatise. It has no real philosophical justification. Its erudition, despite the encomiastic finale and occasional lapses of credulity, has claims - like Biondo's other works - to detachment. It may propagate the worldly aspirations of Eugenius IV, but its ultimate goal is the revival of learning.

In erudition, the Roma instaurata palpably belongs to a different world than that of the naive Mirabilia. But the latter was not eclipsed. Its influence was to persist in the vernacular itineraries of foreign (and culturally retarded) visitors to Rome, such as those of Capgrave (1450-1453) and Mulfel (1452), and its further influence was ensured by the introduction of printing. Its appeal was largely addressed to pilgrims and men of business, of little or no intellectual pretension, who could accommodate its legends and homilies, without dislocation, to a tour of the sacred places. The Roma instaurata, on the other hand, recommended itself principally to those with a grounding in the studia humanitatis. It became a common acquisition in humanists' libraries. Its subsequent influence on

545. CTR, IV, 325-349.
546. CTR, IV, 351-373.
547. Schudt 1930, nos. 563-566.
548. E.g. Giovanni Marcanova's MS copy, with his marginalia, now Venice, Marciana, Lat., Classe X, 21, no. 150 (3523) (the MS. left to S. Giovanni in Verlara in 1467); Pomponio Leto's incunabulum, Biblioteca Angelica di Roma, G., 18. 15 (cf. Zabughin 1909-12, 1, 208); and Pico della Mirandola's copy of the Verona 1481 edition (cf. Kibre 1936, 57, Invent. no. 29).
the genre it initiated - humanistic topographies of Rome - is undeniable: it was almost immediately digested by Giovanni Tortelli, librarian to Nicholas V; it indelibly marks both Albertini's Opusculum of 1510 and Fulvio's Antiquitates of 1527, the latter notwithstanding the strictures which Fulvio felt compelled to level against it. Even after the publication of the 2nd edition of Mariani's Topographia in 1544 - which is generally thought to supersede it - the Roma instaurata remained an authority.

The pioneering achievement of Biondo's description of ancient Rome was speedily recognised. Contemporary humanists applauded it, Vespasiano da Bisticci spoke of the obligation of posterity, and Giovio pronounced it Biondo's chief title to fame. In 1558 Onofrio Panvinio, after commenting on the dearth of antiquarian studies - as of all the liberal arts - in the Middle Ages, hailed it as the first work of its kind. And in the following century the discriminating Montfaucon gave primacy to Biondo for the rediscovery of ancient Rome.

549. The section on Rome in Tortelli's De orthographia, completed in 1449, is almost an epitome of the Roma instaurata, though the material has been slightly reorganized: De orthographia (Venice 1484), ff. p2v - q4r. Cf. Mercati 1920, 228-239; Weiss 1969, 70-72.
550. CTR, IV, 457-546, passim.
552. Ibid.
553. Schudt 1930, no. 605.
555. E.g. it was consulted, and quoted, by Etienne du Pérac in his Disegni de le Ruine di Roma of 1551: Ashby 1916, 77-78, 83.
557. Vespasiano da Bisticci, Vite di Uomini Illustri, 31a: 'E per questo (the Roma instaurata) tutti i presenti, e quegli che verranno pe' tempi, gli sono molto obligati.'
559. Panvinio, Reipublicae Romanae commentariorum libri tres (Venice 1558) (Schudt 1930, no. 706), Praefatio, tracing the emergence of the antiquarian study of Rome from Petrarch to Biondo and beyond.
560. Montfaucon 1702, 279.

a judgement reiterated in more modern times. Yet the full stature of the Roma instaurata has perhaps never been adequately evaluated. It should be visualized not only sui generis, but also within the context of Biondo's total oeuvre, and, therefore, of European historiography as a whole. For Biondo, it should be recalled, was no parochial antiquary. The author of the first synoptic history of the Middle Ages (as of the first chorography of all Italy), his interests, like his reputation, extended far beyond Rome. He himself remarked on the dissemination of the Decades throughout Europe, as befitted the work of a historian of European stature. It is in this context that the Roma instaurata should finally be judged. Far from being (in a pejorative sense) local, peripheral, or intellectually trivial - a kind of Renaissance Baedeker, it stands at the very hub of the humanistic culture, the source of Western rinascita. From 'Roma guasta e deserta' it looks back to, and reconstitutes, the city, where once had assembled 'tutti i degni uomini del mondo'. Its very title proclaims it to be a work of renovation, and its declared intent is connate with the idea of the Renaissance pur sang.

This centrality of purpose gives to the Roma instaurata a sense of seminal importance. It is 'a book of fundamental importance in the history of historical thought', a key-work, it may be contended, both within the confines of its own genre, as well as in the far wider context of the salutary opening-up of historiography in 15th century Italy to

561. Bunsen in Platner et al 1830, XX. And in our own century, Weiss has claimed that Biondo was to archaeology, what Valla was to philology: Weiss 1963, 341; Weiss 1969, 69.
assimilate untapped sources of human enterprise and of environment, such as geography, topography, natural history, ethnography, social history, archaeology, epigraphy, numismatics, applied linguistics, and philology. This process of expanding the horizons of what could be deemed a legitimate field of historical inquiry is one which Biondo's *Roma instaurata* exemplifies. Its recreation, in words, of a vanished world, the Rome of antiquity, is a triumph of a historical intelligence comprehensive enough to perceive, and reassemble, the diversity of phenomena which testified to its greatness.
CONCLUSIONS

It was felt necessary, at the outset of this thesis, to stress that the peculiar toposphilia inspired by the antiquities of Rome was nothing new in the 15th century. Part of the heritage of antiquity, it was perpetuated throughout the Middle Ages. The powerful appeal it exerted on Petrarch in the Trecento was intensified by the deplorable situation of Rome at that time - a situation which even more forcibly underlined the enduring qualities of Roman civilization.

The cumulative shadow of the 'Babylonish Captivity' and the Schism which fell over Rome during the later Middle Ages gave weight and poignancy to the humanist lament which directly linked Petrarch with the antiquaries of the early 15th century. But the removal of this shadow, with the return of Pope Martin V to Rome, opened the way to a new era, which, in the sphere of the study of antiquities, it has been the purpose of this thesis to describe and articulate. The period is a definitive one. It begins on that day, at the end of September 1420, when Martin V ceremoniously re-entered the city. It ends with the death of Eugenius IV, the patron of Flavio Biondo, on 23 February 1447.

Between these two dates it may reasonably be claimed that the foundations of classical archaeology were effectively laid. The re-establishment of papal government in Rome, first under Martin V, and again under Eugenius IV, provided the circumstances under which Rome's intellectual life could revive, and the unrestricted study of its antiquities prosper. It also provided the immediate conditions for archaeological recovery; the recorded discovery of antiquities in Rome in the period after 1420 can, to some degree, be correlated with
the efflorescence of humanistic, and artistic, interest in them.

With Martin V the Curia returned to Rome. And its staffing by humanists, which that Pope encouraged, provided the right circumstances for the intellectual recovery of Rome. It became a lodestar for Italian humanists in the hunt for agreeable employment. We can sense its appeal to the jubilant Poggio, on his return to Rome in 1423, after being precipitated for four years to the further reaches of the humanist diaspora (England). From 1423 to the death of Martin V in 1431 Poggio's intensive study of the antiquities of Rome, in association with Antonio Loschi, Bartolomeo Aragazzi and others, proved to be revolutionary. He, more than Ciriaco d'Ancona, was the progenitor of classical epigraphy. Moreover, in his close study of Roman monuments in the field, he must even more unassailably rank as the founder of empirical archaeology in modern times.

The investigation of the antiquities of Rome during the period 1420-1447 was, then, essentially, a curial enterprise (and even the contribution of Nicolò Signorilli, an employee of the municipality, not of the Curia, was, it has been argued, a derivative of it). In the prooemium to his Roma instaurata, Biondo acknowledged the benefits that had traditionally accrued to Rome from the presence of the Curia in the city.¹ And its advantages to the humanist were celebrated a few years earlier by Lapo da Castiglionchio in his Dialogus of 1438: it offered the man of letters ideal conditions, he contended; it gave him the opportunity to study, and to meet learned men from all parts of the world; it commanded a world audience, and offered a sure road to fame.²

---

¹ Opera, 222: 'Neque enim sola comitantis curiae praesentia, quod semper civitatis opulentiae plurimum profuit, Romanos foveas...'
² Gabel 1964, 22; text in Scholz 1913.
Though these claims were polemically angled, there is undeniably some truth in them. The Curia did comprise a cosmopolitan society. It is difficult to envisage how Flavio Biondo, in particular, could have achieved his European stature other than in the papal secretariat. Any other post would have shortened his historical vision. 'One has only to compare the limited provincial horizons of Petrarch's first literary heir, Coluccio Salutati, who spent thirty years in the Florentine chancellory,' writes Leonardo Olschki, 'with the scope of the younger humanists, such as Leonardo Bruni, Poggio Bracciolini, Lorenzo Valla, and Flavio Biondo, who were employed by the Roman Curia as secretaries, orators, and writers. These men ... were all involved in the great problems, controversies, and movements in which the Church took a leading part as a political power...'

Olschki's list of the curial humanists does not include Leon Battista Alberti. The omission is symptomatic of the extremely shadowy rôle which Alberti played both within the Curia and in the antiquarian culture of his day. Even the year in which he first arrived in Rome remains a matter for speculation. He was almost certainly in the city as a papal abbreviator between 1432 and the flight of Eugenius IV in June 1434. Until recently it was generally assumed (and even still is) that it was during this period that he compiled the oculus consisting of prolegomena and tables of measurements towards a projected plan of the city, known as the Descriptio urbis Romae.

---

But Lehmann-Brockhaus has decisively rejected this traditional chronology of the work, since (inter alia) its topographical landmarks include the church of S. Onofrio al Gianicolo, a church which did not yet exist at this time.\(^7\) Furthermore, the *Descrip\(\)\(\text{tio ur\(\)bis Rom\(\)ae* is unaccounted for in the apparently autobiographical *vita* of Alberti, which refers to events in his life prior to 1437, and which mentions, or alludes to, all his literary works up to this date.\(^8\)

Alberti returned to Rome in September 1443, like Biondo, in the *entourage* of Eugenius IV,\(^9\) and the city was to be his home to the end of his life. The *Descrip\(\)\(\)\(tio ur\(\)bis Rom\(\)ae*, then, certainly post-dates 1443. But an even later date is suggested by the similarities between its cartographic method and the theories advanced in Chapter 16 of the *Ludi mathematici*, the treatise Alberti wrote for Meladusio d'Este probably in 1450.\(^10\) Such a late dating is corroborated by the related surveying technique described in Book X of the *De re aedificatoria*, which was still in progress at the time when the *Ludi mathematici* was presented to Meladusio.\(^11\) In short, there is a convincing body of evidence to show that the most fruitful period in

\(^7\) Lehmann-Brockhaus 1960, 346-347. On the erroneous dating of the foundation of S. Onofrio al Gianicolo to 1419 instead of 1439, see Placcavento 1965, 220, note 34. The church was substantially built in the period 1439-46. See further Lanciani 1902-12, I, 50; Huelser 1927, 541, no. 47; Montenovesi 1937, 261; Urban 1961-62, 79.

\(^8\) Watkins 1957, 106.

\(^9\) Mancini 1911, 255.


\(^11\) Ibid. Alberti, *De re aedificatoria*, X. 7. The surveying technique here described was intended to be used to determine the height of land for hydraulic purposes, but Alberti specifically states that he had already used the method to make plans of towns and provinces: 'Nos circuli istius adminiculo ad urbium provinciarumque descriptionem annotandam atque pingendam, ad cuniculos etiam subterraneos producendos bellissime utimur.' (Alberti, *L'Architettura*, ed. Portoghesi, II, 924).
Alberti's archaeological study of Rome was rather during the early years of the pontificate of Nicholas V (c. 1447-1450): the period, apparently, of the Nemi ship episode, the composition of the greater part of the De re aedificatoria, and the topographic survey embodied in the Descriptio urbis Romae.

Alberti's contribution, then, to the archaeology of Rome can only be felt in the most obscure way during the period 1420-1447. He does not figure among the protagonists of the philosophical dialogues of Poggio and Valla, so vividly descriptive of the atmosphere of intellectual society in the Curia under Martin V. Nor is he known to have had any close dealings with Biondo in the more sober ambience of Eugenius IV's court.

The difference between these two courts also points to the contrast between Poggio and Biondo. As humanists, they were almost antithetical personalities: the one exuberant and derisive; the other, like the Pope he so devotedly served, 'macilento e grave'. The Roma instaurata is correspondingly solemn. It was intended, like the Pope's restauratio, with which it is linked, to 'restore' what was in imminent danger of disappearing for ever. But whereas the Pope's restoration was directed at dilapidated architecture, Biondo's was aimed at degenerate learning. What chiefly impelled him, he explains in his prooemium, was the prevailing ignorance about the ancient monuments of Rome - an ignorance not confined to the unschooled, but exhibited even by those 'qui doctrina cultiores sunt sciantur'. In combating the 'false and barbarous' notions thus put about, Biondo vindicated, with

12. See supra, chap. VIII, note 506, with literature.  
diligence, even with pedantry, the new values of the *studia humanitatis*, based fundamentally on a return to the classical sources. In so doing, he established an orthodoxy of his own, and one which was to persist throughout the Renaissance and beyond.

Poggio and Biondo, for all their differences, had finally this in common. In their different ways, they advanced the revival of learning. Their descriptions of Rome are both monuments of the humanist assault on historical ignorance and incuriosity. Both attempted to revivify a long-lost culture, and thus perpetuate its accomplishment and meaning.
APPENDIX A

The date of Petrarch's *Ep. fam.*, VI. 2

The generally held opinion up to the later 1920's, following such earlier authorities as De Sade 1776, vol. I, 135f, Fracassetti tr., Lettere di Francesco Petrarca, vol. 2, 140, and Tatham 1925-26, vol. I, 342-346, was that *Ep. fam.* VI. 2, refers to Petrarch's first Roman visit in the spring of 1337. Among modern authorities who still accept this view are Billanovich 1958, 129; Weiss 1964, 202; and Weiss 1969, 32. In 1928, however, Arnaldo Foresti advanced the contrary thesis that the letter dates to the year of Petrarch's laureation in Rome, and 'fu invero scritta in cammino per la campagna di Parma il 30 Novembre 1341.' (Foresti 1928, 82). Notable among the adherents of the Foresti thesis has been the doyen of experts on the chronology of the Petrarchan *epistulae*, E. H. Wilkins. E.g. Wilkins 1961, 28-29. For other varying opinions on the subject, cf. Wilkins 1960, 59. For a different interpretation of the superscription of *Ep. fam.* VI. 2 within the context of a 1341 date, see Rizzi 1934, 58, and now Wilkins 1963, who points out that the letter exists in two forms: an early form, addressed 'Ad Anibaldum cardinalem' and dated 'VII Junii', and a later form, addressed 'Ad Iohannem de Columna ordinis predicatumor' and dated 'II Kal. Decembris, ex itinere'. While the former address is due to a scribal confusion with the recipient of *Ep. fam.* VI. 1, Wilkins 1963, 621, rejects the methodological assumption (made by Foresti and others) that 'the unquestionable correctness of the later address carries with it the correctness of the later dating.' On this basis, he re-dates the letter to 'VII Junii' 1341 instead. Wilkins' argument on this score may, in principle, be
conceded, but it is still more plausible to assume that the year of
the letter should be 1337. For the following reasons:

1. That it was on his first visit to Rome in 1337 that Petrarch made
a study of the ancient monuments of the city, as reflected in Ep. fam.,
VI. 2, is suggested by Petrarch's long autobiographical letter of 1367
to Guido Sette (Epistulae rerum senilium, X. 2) (Petrarch, Opera, vol.
II, 959-966), in which he recalls the impression made by the ruins of
Rome on his first visit to the city:

'Inde autem, hoc est à prima Gallicana peregrinatione
reversus, quarto itidem post anno, primum Romam adii,
quae eti, iam tunc, multoque prius, nihil aliud
quasi quam illius Romae veteris argumentum, atque
imago, quaedam esset, ruinisque praesentibus
magnitudinem testaretur, erant tamen adhuc cinere in
illo, generosae alique favillae, nunc extinctus, et
iam gelidus cinis est.' (Petrarca, Opera, vol. II, 963).

The recollection is corroborated by Vergerio's Vita of Petrarch:

'Inde reversus Romam adiit, cuius videndae desiderio ab
infantia usque flagraverat, magnificentiamque eius, et
omnem vetustatem, quae superest, contemplatus.'
(Solerti 1904, 295).

That Petrarch had made some study of the monuments of ancient Rome in
1337 is also corroborated by both Ep. fam., II. 14 and Ep. metr., II,
13. There is no comparable check for the 1341 visit.

2. The mood of leisurely contemplation suggested by Ep. fam., VI. 2
is more in keeping with 1337 than 1341. Of the five visits Petrarch
is known to have made to Rome, the first was evidently the longest,
beginning in February 1337; it is not known when he left, but he had
reached Avignon by July, and Tatham 1925-26, vol. I, 348, was probably
correct in assuming that he stayed in Rome for Easter, which that year
fell on 20 April. The 1341 visit, by contrast, can only have lasted
a few days: Petrarch left Naples for Rome on 2 or 3 April; the
Coronation was held on Easter Day (8 April); by the end of the same month, after an adventurous journey that must have lasted c. 4 days, Petrarch had arrived in Parma. In any case, the 1341 visit was one of public acclaim, not one of solitude and reflection.

3. Another preoccupation of the 1341 visit was arguably political. Petrarch had been accompanied from Avignon to Naples, from Naples to Rome, and from Rome to Pisa by Azzo da Correggio, an unscrupulous nobleman with an interest in Parma (where his father had once ruled). From Pisa Azzo proceeded to Parma, where, sure enough, a popular revolt, instigated and led by Azzo's brothers, broke out on 21 May and succeeding in ousting the incumbent Veronese regime on the following day, when Azzo himself arrived with reinforcements. On the same day, or a day later, Petrarch, too, arrived in Parma. It is clear he was privy to these events, and supported them. Cf. Tatham 1929-26, vol. II, 157-166. In the circumstance, it is difficult to reconcile the political intrigue which Petrarch must have been implicated in during his visit to Rome in 1341 with the antiquarian mood of Ep. fam., VI. 2.

4. It is well-known that in 1337 Petrarch was a guest of the Colonna family in Rome. The recipient of Ep. fam., VI. 2 was a member of that family. Similarly, the recipient of Ep. metr., II. 13, Paolo Annibaldi, adhered to the Colonna faction; on this letter in Latin hexameters, which recalls the joint rambles Petrarch and Annibaldi had undertaken among the ruins of Rome, see supra, chap. II. 2 (a) and notes 71-76, and Tatham 1925-26, vol. I, 341-342. The events recalled by both Ep. metr., II. 13 and Ep. fam., VI. 2 are consistent with the known Colonna associations of Petrarch's first visit to Rome.
5. Though Ex fam., VI. 2 contains no allusion to Petrarch's coronation, Foresti 1923, 81-84, thought that the 'rerum fragor' in the letter (Petrarca, Le Familiari, vol. II, 59, lines 154-155) must allude to the Parma uprising and its aftermath. But the reference is too ambiguous to sustain such an interpretation. In any case, Petrarch was hardly free of cares in 1337, and since no one knows his movements on leaving Rome in that year, the 'rerum fragor' could well be referring to a completely different matter. Why did Petrarch retire to Vaucluse soon after?
APPENDIX B

The date of the S. Maria Maggiore Altarpiece

It is the purpose of this extended note, not to offer a solution to the problem of dating the S. Maria Maggiore altarpiece, still less to consider its wider repercussions on the chronology of Masaccio's and Masolino's oeuvres, or even to review the controversy surrounding it (a task already performed by Davies 1961, 359-361), but merely to clarify certain factors which appear to throw light on when the altarpiece was executed, within the historical context of Martin V's restauratio of Rome as described above: Chapter III. 3.

It is there tentatively suggested, that the altarpiece was initially conceived as an ornament of the Pope's restaurations at S. Maria Maggiore, a basilica with close Colonna associations, at the time he was residing in its papal palace in the early 1420's, before eventually taking up residence in the Colonna palazzo at SS. Apostoli in the summer of 1424. Martin V's residence at S. Maria Maggiore between 1421 and 1424 is testified by the bulls promulgated from there (see supra, chap. III. 3 and note 131), and also by the numerous papal letters and provisions sent to suppliants abroad; e.g. for briefs directed to Great Britain and Ireland from S. Maria Maggiore between July 1421 and Dec. 1424, see CPL, VII, 2-20, 159-408, passim; for provisions to Scottish supplications issued from S. Maria Maggiore between Sept. 1421 and Nov. 1424, see CSSR, I, 258-312, passim, and ibid., II, 27-75, passim. Briefs begin to be issued from SS. Apostoli already in the early summer of 1424.

That the S. Maria Maggiore altarpiece was actually commissioned by the Pope, rather than by some other member of the
Colonna family, is persuasively suggested both by the iconography of the central panel, representing the legendary foundation of the basilica by Pope Liberius, and by the originally flanking portrait of Martin V on the right of the triptych, which has been identified in the Masolino panel of SS. Martin and John the Evangelist now in Philadelphia: Meiss 1964, 176-178; Johnson 1966, 48-50. It was this papal association which prompted Vasari to further identify the figure of Pope Liberius in the Naples Miracle of the Snow as a portrait of Martin V 'di naturale, il quale con una zappa disegna i fondamenti di quella chiesa...' (Le Vite, III, 128).

Vasari, to whom we are indebted for the first description of the altarpiece in his Vita of Masaccio, was also the first to give us any indication of its date. He tells us that Masaccio, tired of Florence, went to Rome 'per imparare e superar gli altri'. There he painted, among other things, a Crucifixion in S. Clemente and the altarpiece in S. Maria Maggiore, before being recalled to Florence to take over Masolino's place in the Brancacci Chapel (Le Vite, III, 128). Though the description of the altarpiece is an interpolation in the second (and generally more speculative) edition of 1568, one may note that, in both editions of his Vita, Vasari testifies to such a visit to Rome which Masaccio made prior to his collaboration on the Brancacci frescoes.

The chronology implicit in Vasari's Vita of Masaccio (in either edition) is quite consistent with the assumption that Martin V commissioned the altarpiece during his residence at S. Maria Maggiore between 1421 and 1424. If we accept the gist of Vasari's account, as far as the inception of the altarpiece is concerned, and combine it with this assumption as to date of the commission, we arrive at roughly this
position: that Masecco, shortly after completing the triptych of S. Giovenale in April 1422 (Berti 1961), went to Rome, where he was commissioned to paint the S. Maria Maggiore altarpiece by Martin V. He completed the London SS. John the Baptist and Jerome (the only panel, which can, with any certainty, be attributed to him), but before he could continue work on the triptych was recalled to Florence to collaborate with Masolino on the Brancacci frescoes 'in that period from the end of 1424 to 1425 when Masolino was faced with the problem of completing all of his commissions before leaving for Hungary.' (Berti 1967, 147, note 178). Masolino's departure for Hungary is dated 1 Sept. 1425 (ibid.).

To be sure, the general lines of this proposition, and variants of it, have incurred considerable criticism, on both historical and stylistic grounds. In one respect, at least, this criticism has been ill-founded. It has been suggested that conditions in Rome were sufficiently hostile as to be inimical to the execution of the S. Maria Maggiore altarpiece during the early 1420's. But Hartt 1959, 163, note 16, is surely correct in casting doubt on Procacci's view of the 'stato gravissimo di discordia' in Rome (cf. Procacci 1953, 54-55). Martin V's restorations at both the Vatican and S. Maria Maggiore date to precisely this period. Moreover, it is known that the painter Arcangelo di Cola went to Rome as early as February 1422 at the invitation of Pope Martin V, who issued the painter with a safe-conduct to facilitate his travels (Vitalini Sacconi 1968, 228; Zampetti 1970, 76; cf. Degenhart and Schmitt 1960, 79; Weiss 1964, 183; Berti 1967, 57 and note 153).

As to the stylistic argument, the existing disagreement between art-historians cannot yet be finally resolved. Kenneth Clark,
who, in his publication of the two missing panels of the S. Maria Maggiore altarpiece, was the first to propose a collaboration between Masaccio and Masolino, considered the SS. John the Baptist and Jerome, on stylistic grounds, to precede the Carmine frescoes (Clark 1951, 343-345); his hypothesis was that Masaccio was commissioned to paint the altarpiece in Rome in 1425-26, that he completed the SS. John the Baptist and Jerome, and began the SS. John the Evangelist and Martin; he was then recalled to Florence, leaving the triptych unfinished; it was, Clark suggested, presumably with the intention of finishing it, and other commissions, that Masaccio returned to Rome in 1428, only to die soon after; on his death the triptych was completed by Masolino.

The general lines of Clark's hypothesis were echoed by Longhi 1952, though it should be pointed out that the alleged Jubilee of 1425, with which he attempted to associate Masaccio's first visit to Rome, has no historical foundation. But Longhi went further in suggesting that Masolino's collaboration on the altarpiece began also in 1425, dating to that year, on stylistic grounds, the Masolino panel of SS. Liberius (?) and Matthias: Longhi 1952, 15-16; cf. Weiss 1964, 188; for other early datings of Masolino's work on the altarpiece, see Krautheimer 1956, 200; Hartt 1959, 163, note 16. Vasari, to be sure, testified to such an early visit by Masolino to Rome: Le Vite, III, 106. But it is difficult to accommodate it within the period 1423-1425, the years of the Bremen Madonna, the frescoes in S. Stefano at Empoli, the Carnesecchi triptych, and at least part of the Brancacci Chapel; cf. Berti 1967, 147, note 176.

There is more widespread agreement that the two central panels of the S. Maria Maggiore altarpiece, the Miracle of the Snow and the Assumption (both now in the Museo di Capodimonte, Naples), are the work
of Masolino alone, and that they belong to the period 1428-1431; their style shows the regularity and the cool refinement of the S. Clemente frescoes, on which Masolino was working in the period 1428-1431, and of the Todi Madonna, probably of 1432. (Meiss 1964, 187). Evidence of Masolino's late style in the panels is reinforced by the inclusion in the Miracle of the Snow of a portrait of the Emperor Sigismund, as is mentioned by Vasari (1568): Le Vite, III, 128. It seems clear that the prominent bearded man with aquiline nose standing just beyond the perimeter of the basilica's further transept is indeed Sigismund; cf. Meiss 1964, 170, note 5. For other portraits of Sigismund, see Szabo 1967, passim; Beck 1968, 315-317 and figs. 11-13; Scaglia 1968, passim and notes 4-5 with bibliography. There is an undeniable resemblance between the Codex Villardi drawing in the Louvre thought to be of Sigismund, usually attributed to Pisanello (cf. Fossi Todorow 1966, no. 265; Sindona 1961, 64, and fig. 34), but given (unconvincingly) by Beck 1968, 317, to Domenico di Bartolo, and the figure in the Miracle of the Snow. For purported portraits of Sigismund as one of the Kings in panels of the Adoration of the Magi by Gentile da Fabriano (the 1423 panel in the Uffizi), Sassetta (Chigi-Saracini Collection, Siena), Stefano da Verona (Verona), and that in the Johnson Collection attributed to Arcangelo di Cola, see now Scaglia 1968, 432-434 and pl. 94, but the likenesses in all these instances may be judged tenuous.

The inclusion of a portrait of Sigismund in the Miracle of the Snow cannot be associated with any visit he made to Rome. Sigismund did not come to Rome for his imperial coronation until 1433 (his first visit), when Eugenius IV was Pope: Aschbach 1838-45, IV, 107-127. Possibly, the portrait is an allusion to Sigismund's status, since 1414, as King of the Romans; it may be noted that a further portrait drawing from the
Rothschild Collection in the Louvre identifies him with the dated subscription 'Sigismund Rex Romanorum 1424': Szabo 1967, pl. 17; Beck 1968, 315 and fig. 11; Scaglia 1968, 429. But it seems much more likely that the inclusion of Sigismund's portrait is connected, in some unspecified manner, with Masolino's journey to Hungary (1425-1427), in the course of which it is conceivable, even probable, that the two met.

If the dating of Masolino's Miracle of the Snow to 1428-31, in this light, assumes greater validity, the inference, drawn by Meiss 1964, 171, that Masaccio's SS. John the Baptist and Jerome implies a knowledge of its design, and thus belongs to the same period, is difficult to accept unreservedly. The reverse seems more plausible: that Masolino accommodated himself to an already existing panel by Masaccio, since the Baptist's gesture, pointing, apparently, to the Christ in the mandorla over the Miracle of the Snow, remains, in spite of Meiss's remarks, rather ambiguous.

If it is assumed that the S. Maria Maggiore altarpiece was commissioned by Pope Martin V between 1422 and 1424, and that parts (at least) of Masolino's contribution to it were still being painted in the period 1428-1431, one is confronted with the problem of interrupted execution. That the altarpiece could have been begun on one occasion and then abandoned, only to be resumed several years later, has been considered implausible by Procacci 1953, 50, and Meiss 1964, 188, but there are wider grounds for suspecting the validity of the assumption. The very revisions in the programme of the altarpiece detected by Meiss 1964, 179ff, coupled with the generally admitted stylistic diversity of the separate panels, constitute a strong argument in its favour. One may wonder, then, why Meiss himself does not more directly confront the
chronological, rather than the historical, implications of these revisions. Instead, he abandons his previous dating of the SS. John the Baptist and Jerome to 1422-23 (Meiss 1952, 24ff), and, with some reservations, follows Procacci 1952, 36-37, and Salmi 1952, 14ff, in assigning the whole of the altarpiece to 1428-1431.

Both the panels in the Johnson Collection, assigned to Masolino, have been shown by Meiss to have been executed in two stages; the alterations undertaken during the second of these stages were such as to involve the displacement of the SS. Liberius and Matthias from the front to the back of the triptych: Meiss 1964, 179-182. Meiss concludes that the altered programme of the altarpiece was devised 'to celebrate the Pope at the height of his power' (ibid., 185) — in other words, during Martin V's last years. But the first programme of the altarpiece belongs, by implication, to a somewhat earlier period. The revisions in question do, indeed, lend support to the postulate made twenty years ago by Clark that the S. Maria Maggiore altarpiece belongs to two periods, intervened by Masaccio's return to Florence and his collaboration on the Brancacci Chapel.
APPENDIX C

Sylloge Barberiniana (Signoriliana): Table

Abbreviations

Ang. - Rome, Biblioteca Angelica,
Cod. Angelicanus D. 4. 18.

Barb. - Rome, Biblioteca Vaticana,
Cod. Barberin. lat. 1952.

Chig. - Rome, Biblioteca Vaticana,
Cod. Chigiano I. VI. 204.

ICUR - De Rossi 1857-88.

R. - De Rossi 1852.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>MSS.</th>
<th>MONUMENT</th>
<th>SYLLOGE POGGIANA</th>
<th>R_ TOUR</th>
<th>C.I.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chig., f. 6'</td>
<td>Pons Aemilius/Arch of Augustus</td>
<td>R. 25</td>
<td>VI, 1, XVI = VI, 878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Barb., f. 170 Chig., f. 6'</td>
<td>Arch of Titus on Sacra Via</td>
<td>Pogg. 43</td>
<td>R. 22</td>
<td>VI, 1, XVI = VI, 945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barb., f. 171 Chig., f. 6'-7</td>
<td>Arch of Septimius Severus</td>
<td>Pogg. 49</td>
<td>R. 20</td>
<td>VI, 1, XVII = VI, 1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Barb., f. 171 Chig., f. 7</td>
<td>Arcus Argentariorum</td>
<td>Pogg. 54</td>
<td>R. 21</td>
<td>VI, 1, XVII = VI, 1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Barb., f. 170 Chig., f. 7'-8</td>
<td>Arch of Constantine</td>
<td>Pogg. 45</td>
<td>R. 23</td>
<td>VI, 1, XVII = VI, 1139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Barb., f. 173 Chig., f. 8</td>
<td>Arch of Gallienus</td>
<td>Pogg. 67</td>
<td>R. 26</td>
<td>VI, 1, XVII = VI, 1106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Barb., f. 170' Chig., f. 8</td>
<td>Inscription of Lentulus and Crispinus on aqueduct arch near S. Maria in Cosmedin</td>
<td>Pogg. 42</td>
<td>R. 24</td>
<td>VI, 1, XVII = VI, 1385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Barb., f. 170 Chig., f. 10</td>
<td>Aqua Claudia over Porta Praenestina</td>
<td>Pogg. 39</td>
<td>R. 1</td>
<td>VI, 1, XVIII = VI, 1256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td>Pogg. 40</td>
<td>R. 2</td>
<td>VI, 1, XVIII = VI, 1257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chig., f. 10'-11</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td>Pogg. 41</td>
<td>R. 3</td>
<td>VI, 1, XVIII = VI, 1258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Barb., f. 170 Chig., f. 11</td>
<td>Arcus Neroniani of Aqua Claudia</td>
<td>Pogg. 58</td>
<td>R. 4</td>
<td>VI, 1, XVIII = VI, 1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Barb., f. 170 Chig., f. 11'-12</td>
<td>Aqua Marcia over Porta Tiburtina</td>
<td>Pogg. 57</td>
<td>R. 5</td>
<td>VI, 1, XVIII = VI, 1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>MSS.</td>
<td>MONUMENT</td>
<td>SYLLOGE FOGGIANA</td>
<td>R. TOUR</td>
<td>C.I.L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Barb., f. 170'&lt;Chig., f. 12</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Pogg. 35</td>
<td>R. 6</td>
<td>VI, 1, XVIII = VI, 1244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Barb., f. 173'&lt;Chig., f. 12</td>
<td>Arcus Claudii of Aqua Virgo</td>
<td>Pogg. 47</td>
<td>R. 7</td>
<td>VI, 1, XIX = VI, 1252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chig., f. 12</td>
<td>Aqua Marcia over Porta Tiburtina</td>
<td>Pogg. 36</td>
<td>R. 8</td>
<td>VI, 1, XIX = VI, 1245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Barb., f. 172'&lt;Chig., f. 12'</td>
<td>Porta Portuensis</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. 9</td>
<td>VI, 1, XIX = VI, 1188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Barb., f. 173'&lt;Chig., f. 12'-13</td>
<td>Pons Neronianus</td>
<td>Pogg. 60</td>
<td>R. 10</td>
<td>VI, 1, XIX = VI, 1240a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Barb., f. 171'&lt;Chig., f. 13.</td>
<td>Aedes Saturnus</td>
<td>Pogg. 23</td>
<td>R. 11</td>
<td>VI, 1, XIX = VI, 937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barb., f. 171'&lt;Chig., f. 13</td>
<td>Porticus Octaviae</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. 12</td>
<td>VI, 1, XIX = VI, 1034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chig., f. 13'</td>
<td>Constantinian statues on Quirinal</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. 13</td>
<td>VI, 1, XX = VI, 1148-1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Barb., f. 171'&lt;Chig., f. 13'</td>
<td>Pantheon</td>
<td>Pogg. 59</td>
<td>R. 14</td>
<td>VI, 1, XX = VI, 896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chig., f. 13'-14</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>R. 15</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Barb., f. 171'&lt;Chig., f. 14</td>
<td>Temple of Antoninus and Faustina</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. 16</td>
<td>VI, 1, XX = VI, 1004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Barb., f. 171'&lt;Chig., f. 14</td>
<td>Temple of Minerva on Forum Nervae</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. 17</td>
<td>VI, 1, XX = VI, 953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Barb., f. 173'&lt;Chig., f. 14</td>
<td>Epitaph of M. Antonius Exocus</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. 18</td>
<td>VI, 1, XX = VI, 10194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>MSS.</td>
<td>MONUMENT</td>
<td>SYLLOGE POGGIANA</td>
<td>R. ICUR</td>
<td>C. I. L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Barb., f. 173'</td>
<td>Epitaph of Castalius Innocentius Audax</td>
<td>R 19</td>
<td>VI, 1, XX = VI, 1663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chig., f. 14'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Barb., f. 172</td>
<td>Pons Fabricius</td>
<td>Pogg. 51</td>
<td>R 27</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXI = VI, 1305a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chig., f. 14'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Barb., f. 172</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>R 28</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXI = VI, 1305d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chig., f. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Barb., f. 172</td>
<td>Pons Cestius</td>
<td>R 29</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXI = VI, 1175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chig., f. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Barb., f. 172</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>R 30</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chig., f. 15'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Chig., f. 15'-16</td>
<td>Pons Salarius</td>
<td>R 31</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXI = VI, 1199b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Barb., f. 171</td>
<td>Column of Trajan</td>
<td>Pogg. 86</td>
<td>R 32</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXI = VI, 960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chig., f. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Barb., f. 172</td>
<td>Mausoleum of Hadrian</td>
<td>Pogg. 48</td>
<td>R 33</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXII = VI, 984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chig., f. 16'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Barb., f. 172</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>R 34</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXII = VI, 986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chig., f. 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Barb., f. 172'</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>R 35</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXII = VI, 992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chig., f. 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>MSS.</td>
<td>MONUMENT</td>
<td>SYLLOGE NO.</td>
<td>R. CUR</td>
<td>G. I. L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Barb., f. 172'</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. 36</td>
<td>VI, l, XXII = VI, 991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Barb., f. 172'</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. 37</td>
<td>VI, l, XXII = VI, 985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Barb., f. 174'</td>
<td>Inscription from Arezzo</td>
<td>Pogg. 73</td>
<td>R. 38</td>
<td>VI, l, XXII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Barb., f. 174'</td>
<td>Inscription from Nepi</td>
<td>Pogg. 76</td>
<td>R. 40</td>
<td>VI, l, XXIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Barb., f. 174'</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. 41</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. 42</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Barb., f. 173'</td>
<td>Claudian inscription on Capitol</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. 43</td>
<td>VI, l, XXIII = VI, 719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-45</td>
<td>Barb., f. 172'-173</td>
<td>Vatican Obelisk</td>
<td>Pogg. 53</td>
<td>R. 44-45</td>
<td>VI, l, XXIII = VI, 882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Chig., f. 19'-20</td>
<td>Epitaph of Tiberius</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. 46</td>
<td>VI, l, XXIII = VI, 885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Barb., f. 173'</td>
<td>Epitaph of Nero</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. 47</td>
<td>VI, l, XXIII = VI, 887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Epitaph of Agrippina</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. 48</td>
<td>VI, l, XXIV = VI, 886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Barb., f. 174</td>
<td>Epitaph of Iunia Silani</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. 49</td>
<td>VI, l, XXIV = VI, 914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>MSS.</td>
<td>MONUMENT</td>
<td>SYLLOGE POGGIANA</td>
<td>R ICUR</td>
<td>C. I. L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Barb. , f. 170' Chig., f. 20'</td>
<td>Mausoleum of C. Cestius</td>
<td>Pogg. 57</td>
<td>R 50</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXIV = VI, 1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Barb. , f. 171 Chig., f. 20'</td>
<td>Tomb of G. Publicius Bibulus on Capitol</td>
<td>Pogg. 55</td>
<td>R 51</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXIV = VI, 1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Barb. , f. 171' Chig., f. 20'-21</td>
<td>Tomb of M. Ovius</td>
<td>R 52</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXIV = VI, 3541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Barb. , f. 173 Chig., f. 21</td>
<td>Consular Statue on Monte Citorio</td>
<td>R 53</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXIV = VI, 895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Barb. , f. 174 Chig., f. 21</td>
<td>Mausoleum of Caecilia Metella</td>
<td>R 54</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXIV = VI, 1274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Barb. , f. 173' Chig., f. 21</td>
<td>Dioscuri</td>
<td>R 55</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Chig., f. 21</td>
<td>Tomb of Cornelius at Porta Latina</td>
<td>R 56</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Barb. , f. 173' Chig., f. 21'</td>
<td>Senatorial inscription on Carcer Tullianum</td>
<td>R 57</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXV = VI, 1539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Barb. , f. 174 Chig., f. 21'</td>
<td>Tomb of Martia Catonis near Lateran</td>
<td>R 58</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Barb. , f. 171' Chig., f. 21'</td>
<td>Tomb of Trebellia</td>
<td>R 59</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Chig., f. 21'</td>
<td>Shrine of Sol Invictus 'prope S. Susanna'</td>
<td>R 60</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXV = VI, 728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Chig., f. 21'-22</td>
<td>Mausoleum of Augustus</td>
<td>R 61</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXV = VI, 884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>MSS.</td>
<td>MONUMENT</td>
<td>SYLLOGE POGGIANA</td>
<td>R. I. C. R.</td>
<td>C. I. L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Chig., f. 22</td>
<td>Inscription from Faras</td>
<td>R. 62</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Barb., f. 173' Chig., f. 22</td>
<td>Greek inscription near S. Stefano de Pinea</td>
<td>R. 63</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXV  = C. I. Gr., 6174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Barb., f. 170' Chig., f. 22</td>
<td>Greek inscription outside Porta S. Paulo</td>
<td>R. 64</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXV  = C. I. Gr., 5900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Barb., f. 174' Chig., f. 30</td>
<td>Greek inscription from Naples</td>
<td>R. 65</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXV  = C. I. Gr., 5791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Chig., f. 30'</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td>R. 66</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greek inscription from Capua</td>
<td>R. 67</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXVI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Barb., f. 174 Chig., f. 22'–23</td>
<td>Greek inscription from S. Sebastiano ad Catacumbas</td>
<td>R. 68</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXVI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Chig., f. 23</td>
<td>Greek inscription in Lateran</td>
<td>R. 69</td>
<td>ICUR, II, 322, no. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Barb., f. 175 Chig., f. 23–25'</td>
<td>Lex Regia</td>
<td>R. 70</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXVI = VI, 930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Chig., f. 25'</td>
<td>Medieval inscription in St. Peter's</td>
<td>R. 71</td>
<td>ICUR, II, 323, no. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>MSS.</td>
<td>MONUMENT</td>
<td>SYLLOGE FOGGIANA</td>
<td>R. ICUR</td>
<td>C. I. L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Chig., f. 25'-26</td>
<td>Medieval inscription on Porta Castelli</td>
<td>R 72</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ang., f. 21'</td>
<td></td>
<td>ICUR, II, 324, no. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Chig., f. 26</td>
<td>Medieval inscription on Porta Viridaria</td>
<td>R 73</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICUR, II, 325, no. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Barb., f. 174</td>
<td>Medieval inscription on Porta S. Paulo</td>
<td>R 74</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chig., f. 26'-27</td>
<td></td>
<td>ICUR, II, 326-327, nos. 8-8a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Chig., f. 27'</td>
<td>Medieval inscription from Capitol</td>
<td>R 75</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Chig., f. 27'</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>R 76</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Chig., f. 28</td>
<td>Consular inscription from Capitol</td>
<td>Pogg. 56</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXVI = VI, 1314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R 77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Medieval inscription from S. Maria Maggiore</td>
<td>R 78</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXVI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICUR, II, 328, no. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Chig., f. 28'-29</td>
<td>Tomb of Antonius Iupus on Via Ostiensis</td>
<td>Pogg. 65</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXVI = VI, 1343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>MSS.</td>
<td>MONUMENT</td>
<td>SYLLOGE POGLIANA</td>
<td>R. ICUR.</td>
<td>C. I. L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Chig., f. 29</td>
<td>Medieval inscription from S. Paolo</td>
<td>(CTR, II, 245, note 2)</td>
<td>R. 80 ICUR, II, 328, no. 10</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81- 82</td>
<td>Chig., f. 30'-31</td>
<td>Arch of Trajan at Ancona</td>
<td>Pogg. 75</td>
<td>R. 80-81</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXVI = IX, 5894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add-</td>
<td>Barb., f. 171</td>
<td>Septizonium</td>
<td>Pogg. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>VI, 1, XXVII = VI, 1032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end. (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Barb., f. 171</td>
<td>'Templi Veneris in Calcarario'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VI, 1, XXVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Barb., f. 174</td>
<td>'In Porta Domus Comitie Fundorum'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Inscription in S. Thomae de Formis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Sylloge Poggiana: Table

Abbreviations

Ang. - Rome, Biblioteca Angelica,
       Cod. Angelicanus D. 4. 18.

Barb. - Sylloge Barberiniana (Signoriliana).

Descrip. - Poggio, De varietate Fortunae, Book I
           (CTR, IV, 230-245).

Eins. - Sylloge Einsidlensis.

ICUR - De Rossi 1857-86.

Parm. - Parma, Biblioteca Palatina,
        Cod. Parmensis 1191.

Vat. - Rome, Biblioteca Vaticana,
      Cod. Vaticanus. lat. 9152.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vat., f. 27</td>
<td>Basilica of St. Peter</td>
<td>Eins. 6</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXIX Iour, II, 20, no. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Arch of Arcadius, Honorius, and Theodosius</td>
<td>Eins. 7</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXIX = VI, 1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Late imperial inscription of Fl. Philippus, Prefect of the City</td>
<td>Eins. 8</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXIX = VI, 1728a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ang., f. 14</td>
<td>Basilica of St. Peter</td>
<td>Eins. 10</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXX Iour, II, 21, no. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Eins. 11</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXX Iour, II, 21, no. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXX Iour, II, 21, no. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vat., f. 27</td>
<td>Late imperial inscription of Petronius Maximus, Prefect of the City</td>
<td>Eins. 12</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXX = VI, 1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ang., f. 13'</td>
<td>Forum of Trajan</td>
<td>Eins. 14</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXX = VI, 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vat., f. 27</td>
<td>Arch of Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius</td>
<td>Eins. 15</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXX = VI, 1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Baths of Diocletian</td>
<td>Eins. 16</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXX = VI, 1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vat., f. 27'</td>
<td>Macellum Liviae</td>
<td>Eins. 20</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXX = VI, 1178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Vat., f. 27</td>
<td>Senatorial inscription of C. Dillius</td>
<td>Eins. 21</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXX = VI, 1402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>S. Anastasia</td>
<td>Eins. 23</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXX = VI, 1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Inscription of Valens and Valentinian from Forum Romanum</td>
<td>Eins. 24</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXX = VI, 1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Vat., f. 27'</td>
<td>S. Sabina</td>
<td>Eins. 25</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXI I.CUR., II, 24, no. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>S. Pancratio</td>
<td>Eins. 26</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXI I.CUR., II, 24, no. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Vat., f. 29</td>
<td>S.P.Q.R. inscription from Via Appia</td>
<td>Eins. 28</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXI = VI, 1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Parm., f. 98'</td>
<td>Arch of Titus in Circus Maximus</td>
<td>Eins. 29</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXI = VI, 944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vat., f. 29</td>
<td>Septizonium</td>
<td>Eins. 30</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXI = VI, 1032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Inscription of M. Camurius Soranus</td>
<td>Eins. 31</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXI I.CUR., II, 25, nos. 33, 33a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>S. Sebastiano</td>
<td>Eins. 32</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXI ICUR, II, 25, no. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Basilica of Constantine</td>
<td>Eins. 33</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXI = VI, 1141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Vat., f. 29'</td>
<td>Aedes Saturnus</td>
<td>Eins. 35 CTR, IV, 235</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXI = VI, 937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Temple of Vespasian</td>
<td>Eins. 35 Barb. 18</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXI = VI, 938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Temple of Concord</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXI = VI, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Arch of Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>Eins. 38</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXII = VI, 1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Inscription of Nerva to Libertas on Capitol</td>
<td>Eins. 39</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXII = VI, 472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Late imperial Senatorial inscription on Capitol</td>
<td>Eins. 40</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXII = VI, 1708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Vat., f. 30</td>
<td>Ara Pietas Augusta</td>
<td>Eins. 41</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXII = VI, 562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Senatorial inscription from Capitol</td>
<td>Eins. 42</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXII = VI, 1472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Claudian inscription from Capitol</td>
<td>Eins. 43</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXII = VI, 916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Inscription of Diocletian and Maximian to Tiberinus</td>
<td>Eins. 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Tomb of Domitius Primigenius and Afrania Burri on Via Salaria</td>
<td>Eins. 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33a</td>
<td>Vat., f. 28</td>
<td>Inscription of M. Aurelius from Via Salaria</td>
<td>Eins. 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Late imperial inscription from the Janiculum</td>
<td>Eins. 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Vat., f. 28, Ang., f. 1</td>
<td>Aqua Marcia over Porta Tiburtina</td>
<td>Barb. 13</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Barb. 15</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Vat., f. 28, Ang., f. 1-2</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Barb. 12</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Vat., f. 29, Ang., f. 2</td>
<td>Porta Tiburtina Epitaph of L. Furius Camillus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Vat., f. 30, Ang., f. 2-3</td>
<td>Aqua Claudia over Porta Tiburtina</td>
<td>Barb. 8</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Vat., f. 30'-31</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Barb. 9</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Vat., f. 30', Ang., f. 3</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Barb. 10</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 42  | Vat., f. 31  
Ang., f. 3' | Inscription of Lentulus and Crispinus on aqueduct arch near S. Maria in Cosmedin | Barb. 7 | CTR, IV, 232 | VI, 1, XXXIV  
= VI, 1385 |
| 43  | Vat., f. 31  
Ang., f. 3' | Arch of Titus on Sacra Via | Eins. 37  
Barb. 2 | CTR, IV, 237 | VI, 1, XXXIV  
= VI, 945 |
| 44  | ibid. | Two inscriptions to Numen and Jupiter of unknown provenance | | | VI, 1, XXXIV  
= VI, 540, 425 |
| 45  | ibid. | Arch of Constantine | Barb. 5 | CTR, IV, 237 | VI, 1, XXXIV  
= VI, 1139 |
| 46  | Vat., f. 31'  
Ang., f. 4' | Inscription of G. Camerius Crescens | | | VI, 1, XXXIV  
= VI, 2183 |
| 47  | Vat., f. 31'  
Ang., f. 4' | Arcus Claudii of Aqua Virgo | Eins. 9  
Barb. 14 | | VI, 1, XXXIV  
= VI, 1252 |
| 48  | ibid. | Mausoleum of Hadrian | Barb. 33 | | VI, 1, XXXV  
= VI, 984 |
| 49  | Vat., f. 32  
Ang., f. 5 | Arch of Septimius Severus | Eins. 34  
Barb. 3 | CTR, IV, 237 | VI, 1, XXXV  
= VI, 1033 |
| 50  | ibid. | Vespasianic inscription from Capitol | | | VI, 1, XXXV  
= VI, 931 |
| 51  | Vat., f. 32  
Ang., f. 5' | Pons Fabricius | Barb. 27 | CTR, IV, 232 | VI, 1, XXXV  
= VI, 1305a |
| 52  | Vat., f. 32'  
Ang., f. 5' | Aedes Saturnus | Eins. 35  
Barb. 18 | CTR, IV, 235 | VI, 1, XXXV  
= VI, 937 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>MSS.</th>
<th>MONUMENT</th>
<th>Eins. Barb.</th>
<th>Descrip.</th>
<th>C. L. L. ICUR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Vatican Obelisk</td>
<td>Eins. 27 Bar. 44-45</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 24,0</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXV = VI, 882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Vat., f. 32'</td>
<td>Arcus Argentiorum</td>
<td>Barb. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXV = VI, 1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Vat., f. 32'</td>
<td>Tomb of Gaius Publicius Bibulus on Capitol</td>
<td>Barb. 51</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 232</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXV = VI, 1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Vat., f. 33'</td>
<td>Consular inscription from Capitol</td>
<td>Barb. 77</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXVI = VI, 1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Mausoleum of C. Cestius</td>
<td>Barb. 50</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 232-233</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXVI = VI, 1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Arcus Neroniani of Aqua Claudia</td>
<td>Barb. 11</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 238</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXVI = VI, 1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Vat., f. 32'</td>
<td>Pantheon</td>
<td>Barb. 22</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 233</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXVI = VI, 896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Vat., f. 33'</td>
<td>Pons Neronianus</td>
<td>Barb. 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXVI = VI, 1240a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Vat., f. 33'</td>
<td>Vespasianic inscription from Capitol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXVI = VI, 934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Vat., f. 34'</td>
<td>Temple of Jupiter Propugnator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXVII = VI, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Vat., f. 34'</td>
<td>Inscription in honour of Honorius and Theodosius in S. Martina</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 242</td>
<td></td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXVII = VI, 1718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Vat., f. 34' Ang., f. 8</td>
<td>Baths of Constantine</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 236</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXVII = VI, 1750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Vat., f. 34' Ang., f. 8'</td>
<td>Tomb of Antonius Antius Lupus on Via Ostiensis</td>
<td>Barb. 79</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 240</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXVII = VI, 1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Vat., f. 35 Ang., f. 8'</td>
<td>Constantinian inscription of unknown provenance</td>
<td>Barb. 6</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 237</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXVIII = VI, 1106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Vat., f. 35 Ang., f. 9</td>
<td>Arch of Gallienus</td>
<td>Barb. 6</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 237</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXVIII = VI, 1106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Late imperial inscription of Betitius Perpetuus Arzygius</td>
<td>Barb. 10</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 1106</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXVIII = VI, 1702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Ang., f. 9'</td>
<td>Epitaph of unknown provenance</td>
<td>Barb. 38</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 1106</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXVIII (falsa?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Barb. 39</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 1106</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Barb. 39</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 1106</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Vat., f. 35' Ang., f. 10</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Barb. 38</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 1106</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Inscription from Arezzo</td>
<td>Barb. 38</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 1106</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Vat., f. 36 Ang., f. 10'</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Barb. 39</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 1106</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Vat., f. 36 Ang., f. 11</td>
<td>Arch of Trajan at Ancona</td>
<td>Barb. 81-82</td>
<td>CTR, IV, 1106</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXIX = IX, 5894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Vat., f. 36'</td>
<td>Inscription from Nepi</td>
<td>Barb. 40</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXIX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ang., f. 11'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td>Inscription from Ravenna</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td>Inscription from Perugia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Ang., f. 11'</td>
<td>Inscription from Interamnae</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Vat., f. 36'</td>
<td>Arch of Trajan at Benevento</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Vat., f. 37</td>
<td>Tomb of Plautius Sulpianus Eleanus near Tivoli</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ang., f. 11'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Vat., f. 37'</td>
<td>Inscription from Ferentino</td>
<td>VI, 1, XXXIX</td>
<td>= X, 5840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ang., f. 12'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td>VI, 1, XL</td>
<td>= X, 5837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Vat., f. 38</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td>VI, 1, XL</td>
<td>= X, 5853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ang., f. 12'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Vat., f. 38'</td>
<td>Epitaph of M. Aurelius Romanus and Antia Chresime</td>
<td>VI, 1, XL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ang., f. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Vat., f. 38'</td>
<td>Column of Trajan</td>
<td>Eins. 13 CTR, IV, 240</td>
<td>VI, 1, XL</td>
<td>= VI, 960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ang., f. 13'</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barb. 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

The date of the Roma instaurata from internal evidence

1. Prooemium

Opera, 222:

'Confirmavit etiam nostrum describendi propositum tuus in ipsam pontificatus tui sedem reditus...'


2. Book I. 57 (Basilica of St. Peter)

Opera, 231:

'Ubi enim Leo donis ecclesiam ornavit, tu illam suppellectile sacrorum ministerio pariter donatam, tecto insuper maior ex parte innovato, novisque sacristiae cameris exaedificatis, reddidisti meliorem'

Cf. Paolo di Lello Petrone, Mesticanza, 1128:

'In questo Anno (1445) il Papa fece racconciare tutte le navi e tetto di Santo Pietro, salvo la nave grande, perché tutte le tegole sono di metallo.'
3. Book I. 58 (Basilica of St. Peter)

_Opera_, 231:

'Sola re una videris a Leone superatus: quod valvas ille argenteas, tu aeneas basilicae dedisti...'

Cf. Paolo di Lello Petrone, _Mesticanza_, 1128:

'Sabbato a di XIV del mese di Agosto furo poste nella porta principale di Santo Pietro le Porte di metallo.'

According to Paolo dello Mastro, _Memoriale_ (XLIV), 93, the month of installation was July:

'Recorda io Pavolo che nelli 1445 dello mese de luglio, avanti cinque die, furono messe le porte de bronzo in S. Pietro, le quali se fare papa Eugenio quarto.'

Cf. Infessura, _Diario_, 30; Mintz 1878-82, I, 41 and note 2.

4. Book II. 15 (Palace of S. Lorenzo in Lucina)

_Opera_, 243:

'Ut consequens etiam sit magnos fornices et amplissima fundamenta super quibus aedificatum est nobile palatium quod Iohannes ex Galliis Picardus, cardinalis Morinensis nunc habitat, Domitian operum partem fuisse. Id palatium ad annum salutis trecentesimum supra millesimum, a cardinali Anglicio in praedictis Domitian operum ruinis aedificatum, Iohannes cardinalis Rothomagensis anno nunc vigesimo multa impensa adauxit, quod superrime Iohannes cardinalis Morinensis, supra dictus, tanto ampliavit ornavitque...'

The inscription commemorating Jean de la Rochetaillé's restoration of the Palace of S. Lorenzo in Lucina is dated 1427: _CBCR_, II, 162 and 165, note 1. Jean de Jeane de Contaz, bishop of St. Jean de Moriane, was made titular cardinal of S. Prassede on 18 December 1439 (Eubel, II, 8), and translated to S. Lorenzo in Lucina presumably in 1441 (Eubel,
On the death of Giovanni Vitelleschi, the Pope's condottiere, in the Castel S. Angelo on 2 April 1440, his estates were immediately seized, and his offices assumed, by the new favourite of Eugenius IV, Ludovico Scarampo, who now became camerarius. Paolo di Lello Petrone, Mesticanza, RIS, XXIV, 1123-1124:

'Domenica a dì IV di Aprile uno, che gia fu Medico, chiamato Mastro Loisi da Padova, al quale il Papa volle molto bene, e fecelo Camerlengo, venne in Rome per la morte del detto Cardinale (i.e. Vitelleschi), e fu fatto Legato di Roma, e del Patrimonio, Campagna, Maritima, Ducato, et altre Terre, di special commissione del Papa.'

Cf. Gregorovius, VII, 80-82. Two months later, allied with the forces of Florence, Scarampo defeated the Visconti condottiere Niccolò Piccinino in the decisive battle of Anghiari (29 June 1440). Cf. Biondo, Decades, IV, 1, Opera, II, 561-578; Giovanni Rucellai, Zibaldone, 50, 151, 154-155; Sozomenus, Chronicon, 34; Leonardo Bruni, Rerum suo tempore gestarum commentarius, 457 (not to mention such later sources as Platina, and the famous Florentine account of the battle in Machiavelli's History of Florence). On 1 July 1440 Scarampo was rewarded for this
victory by being created Cardinal of S. Lorenzo in Damaso (Eubel, II, 8).

Gregorovius, VII, 82; Pastor, I, 302.

Scarampi's victorious campaign against Francesco Sforza in

the Marches, to which Biondo here refers, was fought in 1445.

Sozomenus, Chronicon, 38: 1445:

'Eugenius papa III cum Alfonsi regis Aragonum auxilio, picenum agrum, quem comes Fransciscus Sfortia per eiusdem pontificis concessionem possederat, recepit, fugato dicto comite.'

Cf. Matteo Palmieri, Liber de temporibus, 126: 1445:

'Eugenius pontifex picenum agrum, quem Franciscus, Sfortiae filius, per eiusdem Pontificis concessionem possederat, recepit.'

Cf. Ibid., Annales, 151; Simonetta, Rerum gestarum Francisci Sportiae Commentarii, 157-166; Platina, 326; Treccani degli Alfieri, Storia di Milano, VI, 363.

6. Book III. 65 (Pantheon)

Opera, 268:

'Et cum ipsa insignis ecclesia ceteras facile superans multis ante saeculis celsas quibus attollitur columnas habuisset sordissimis diversorum quaestuum tabernas a quibus obsidebatur occultatas, emundatae nunc in circuitu bases et capita denudatae mirabilis aedificii pulchritudinem ostendunt.'

Cf. Infessura, Diario, 41-42:

'Dell'anno 1442 a dì 15 di decembre furono iustitiati li infrascritti, cioè Gino Albanese capo de squadra, et lo cancellero suo cusino; ... et in tal di foro guaste tutte le tetta di Santa Maria Rotonna, perchè guastavano tutta la piazza, et dopo foro gittati tutti li portichi che stavano allo lato alle colonne dallo ditto porticale et foro le portiche queste: la portica di Tomarosso, la portica di Ioanni Toscanella, de Cola de Manto, et de Iacovo Pucci.'
According to Lanciani 1902-12, I, 51, however, the operation of clearing the booths from the portico of the Pantheon took place rather in 1444; it seems unlikely that it would have preceded the Pope's return to Rome in September 1443.

7. Book III. 78 (S. Marco)

Opere, 270:

'Ea in regione omnium praesentis urbis populo frequentissima, quam Capitolio, Exquiliis, campo Martio et Pantheone videmus clausam, ecclesia est Sancti Marco, quam tuus, Eugeni pontifex, nepos Petrus gente Barba, patritius Venetus et Sanctae Mariae Novae cardinalis inhabitat.'

Pietro Barbo was created cardinal deacon of S. Maria Nova on 1 July 1440 (Ebel, II, 8), and was not translated to S. Marco till 16 June 1451. Biondo, however, makes it clear that he was already resident at S. Marco some years beforehand. Cf. Magnuson 1958, 248 and note 16. Though the date of his arrival there is not recorded, it is hardly likely to have been during the lifetime of the then incumbent cardinal of S. Marco, Angelotto de Foschi, who was murdered on 12 September 1444. Infessura, Diario, 43: 'Dell' anno 1444 a dì 12 de settembre fu occiso Angelotto delli Foschi cardinale di Santo Marco...' Between Foschi's death and Barbo's translation in 1451, no other titular cardinals of S. Marco were created: Ebel, II, 63.
Bessarion was created titular cardinal of SS. Apostoli on 18 December 1439 (Eubel, II, 8). He returned to Rome with Pope Eugenius IV in September 1443. Since the official residence at SS. Apostoli was apparently uninhabitable, Bessarion acquired a property belonging to the church of S. Andrea on the Via Ergatica, close to the basilica at the foot of the Quirinal, and, after papal permission had been granted in a brief of 25 August 1446 (Migne, P.G., 161, col. LXX), began to restore and enlarge it. Cf. Mohler 1923-42, I, 248-249; Magnuson 1958, 312-313. But Bessarion was doubtless already resident on the site before 1446, so that the brief cannot be taken as a *terminus post quem*.

Bessarion's residence at SS. Apostoli, of which, according to Magnuson, only two rooms remain (with his coat of arms displayed on the ceilings), should not be confused with his surviving summer residence, the little villa on the Via S. Sebastiano near S. Cesareo (Mohler *loc. cit.*), which still retains its atmosphere of *rus in urbe*. 
9. Book III. 80 (S. Marcello)

Opera, 270:

'Ecclesiam vero sancti Marcelli, quam Nicolaus patria Surrentinus, et eiusdem ecclesiae tituli cardinalis, appellatione Capuanus, inhabitat...'

Nicolò di Acciapaccio was created titular cardinal of S. Marcello on 18 December 1439 (Eubel, II, 7).
APPENDIX F

Flavio Biondo's use of the Regionaries in the Roma instaurata

The text of the *Curiosum* used in the following table is that transmitted by Valentini and Zucchetti's D, the 10th century Florentine Laurenziana, pluteo 89 sup. 67, since its variants seem to conform more closely to Biondo's quotations from 'Sextus Ruffus' than do the other surviving exemplars. On the status of the textual tradition represented by D, which derives, apparently at an early date, from a contamination between the *Curiosum* and the *Notitia*, see CTR, I, 75-77. The relationship of Biondo's Monte Cassino codex to this tradition was already assumed by Preller 1846, 46, and Jordan, II, 2.
Roma instaurata

I. 18. Opera, 226:
'Aedem virtutis ec anno ad portam Capenam Marcellus dedicavit. Ea vero omnia templum eas aedes in vetusta urbis Romae descriptione, cuius auctorem librariorum incuria suppressum nos in Cassinensis monasterii bibliotheca legimus fuisse Sextum Ruffum consularem virum, positas esse in prima regione porta Capena.'

I. 41. Opera, 229:
'Isidis vero templum in Sexti Ruffi descriptione urbis Romae conicimus fuisse Minervam inter cuius adhuc durat vocabulum, tunc cognomine Chalcidicam, et viam Latam.'

Curiosum

CTR, I, 89:
'Regio I. Porta Capena Continet:
Aedem Honoris et Virtutis.'

Notitia

CTR, I, 164:
CTR, I, 127:
CTR, I, 177:
'Ibid. (Regio IX. Circus Flamineus).
'Isium et Serapium Minervam Calchidicam.'
'Iseum et Serapeum.'
I. 77. Opera, 237:

'Et urbis descriptio, quam Sexti Ruffi fuisse diximus credere, multa ponit publica in eo monte (i.e. the Caelian) aedificia, Macellum magnum, Lupanaria, Antrum Cyclopis, Cohortes quinque Vigilum, Castra Peregrina, Spoliarium et Armamentarium.'

CTR, I, 92-94:

'Regio II.

Celionontium

Continet:

Templum Claudii.

Macellum Magnum.

Lupanarios.

Antrum Cyclopis.

Cohortes V vigilum

Castra Peregrina.

Caput Africae.

Arborem Sanctam.

Domum Philippi.

Victiliana.

Ludum Matutinum et Gallicum

Spoliarium.

Sanarium.

Armamentarium.

Micam Auream.'

CTR, I, 166:

'Regio II.

Caelemontium

Continet:

Templum Claudii.

Macellum Magnum.

Lupanarios.

Antrum Cyclopis.

Cohortem V vigilum.

Castra Peregrina.

Caput Africae.

Arborem Sanctam.

Domum Philippi.

Victiliana.

Ludum Matutinum et Gallicum

Spoliarium.

Sanarium.

Armamentarium.

Micam Auream.'

I. 99. Opera, 240:

'Tiridatis eos regis Armeniorum fuisse, Sex. Ruffi descriptio innuit.'

CTR, I, 111:

(Regio VII. Via Lata)

'Equos Tiridatis regis Armeniorum.'

CTR, I, 173:

(ibid.)

'Equum Tiridatis regis Armeniorum.'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. 7. <em>Opera</em>, 242:</th>
<th>CTR, I, 125-126:</th>
<th>CTR, I, 176:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Quod autem Alexandrinæ fuerint hæ et non aliae colligimus ex descriptione Sex. Ruffi nonae regionis circi Flaminii in qua Pantheonem et binas thermas Agrippinianas et Alexandrinas ponit.' (cf. II. 8).</td>
<td>(Regio IX. Circus Flamineus).</td>
<td>(ibid.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Pantheum.</td>
<td>'Pantheum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thermas</td>
<td>Thermas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandrinas et Agrippinæ.</td>
<td>Alexandrianæ et Agrippianæ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. 76. <em>Opera</em>, 251:</th>
<th>CTR, I, 125:</th>
<th>CTR, I, 176:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Sexti etiam Ruffi urbis descriptio quum duas tantummodo in urbe Roma fuisse coelides columnas dicit, hanc in ara Flaminii regione sitam Antonini Pii appellat.'</td>
<td>(Regio IX. Circus Flamineus).</td>
<td>(ibid.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Tempulm divi Antonini et columnam Coclidem...'</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. 94. Opera, 255:
'... Sex. Ruffus vir consularis, qui Frontino posterior Diocletiani temporibus urbem Romam descripsit, aquas ipsas ad XIX enumerat,
Traianam, Anianam,
Athicam, Martiam, Claudiam,
Ceruleam, Iuliam,
Augustam, Appiam,
Algentiam, Cuminiam,
Sabatinam, Aureliam,
Dammatam, Virgineam,
Tepulam, Severianam,
Antonianam, Alexandrinam ...
'

CTR, I, 154-156:
'Aquae XVIII.
Traiana.
Ania.
Attica.
Marcia.
Claudia.
Herculea.
Caerulea.
Iulia.
Augustea.
Appia.
Algeistina.
Cimina.
(Sabatinae) Aurelia.
Dammata.
Virgo.
Tepula.
Severiana.
Antonianae.
Alexandrina.'

CTR, I, 135-186:
'Aquae XVIII.
Traiana.
Anianae.
(Anianae) altera.
Claudia.
Marcia.
Herculea.
Caerulea.
Iulia.
Augustae.
Appia.
Algeistina.
Cimina.
Aurelia.
Dammata.
Virgo.
Tepula.
Severiana.
Antonianae.
Alexandrina.'

1. An interpolation found in MSS. of the D family:
CTR, I, 255, note 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. 75. Opera, 270:</th>
<th>III. 80. Opera, 271:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Et Sexti Ruffi urbis Romae descriptio habet in regione prima porta Capena fuisse Vicum Vitrariorum.</em></td>
<td><em>Scribit enim Ruffus Isidem prope Minervam Chalcidicam fuisse...</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CTR, I, 90: (Regio I. Porta Capena).</td>
<td>(CTR, I, 127: (Regio IX. Circus Flamineus).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Vicum Vitrariorum.'</td>
<td>'Isium et Serapium Minervam Chalcidicam.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CTR, I, 165: (ibid.)</td>
<td>(CTR, I, 177: (ibid.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Vicum Vitrarium.'</td>
<td>'Iseum et Serapeum.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cf. I. 41 supra).
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