The Jewish catacomb below the Vigna Randanini in Rome underwent a “check-up” in the late spring of 2000 that confirmed the very satisfactory condition of the galleries first explored in the mid-nineteenth century and still accessible today. An equally positive result was that the microclimate was stable and posed no immediate threat to the few frescoed areas of the catacomb. Yet also emerging from this report was that a small number of delicate surface areas inside the site were falling away and could be reinforced to prevent the eventual collapse of larger sections. A glance at the accompanying plan (Figure 1) will show these sensitive areas are found for the most part at the intersections of the galleries where intensive funerary use often weakened a wall’s original stability. Over the course of roughly seventeen centuries, and a century and a half of modern exposure after excavation, the catacomb was showing its age.

In the summer of 2001, architects and officials from the Italian Archaeological Superintendence approved of a project for maintenance work inside the catacomb. (Figure 2) Work began on September 10, 2001, and continued uninterrupted for the next month. This report on the Vigna Randanini catacomb reviews several interesting aspects of the project and its results. The details are not very obvious to the average visitor to the catacomb, and may strengthen or clarify information already published on the site.
PRIOR EXCAVATION AND STUDY OF THE VIGNA RANDANINI CATACOMB

A “catacomb of the Jews” on to the Appian Way was brought to light on May 1, 1859, below the vineyards of the Randanini family on a triangular strip of land roughly two and a half miles outside the ancient Republican city walls of Rome. (Figure 3) Owner Giuseppe Randanini and the architect Ignazio del Frate carried out excavations on the property between 1859 and 1864; Randanini’s son, Ignazio, proceeded with sporadic digging in the catacomb during the 1870s and 1880s, before being forced to auction off the property in December of 1895.2

Funerary monuments in the ancient necropolis of the Vigna Randanini had already been violated by generations of explorers.3 (Figures 4–5) By the time the Randanini began their excavations in the late 1850s, many areas of the catacomb (particularly A-B-D) as well as those of nearby hypogaea and columbaria had been stripped already of most, if not all, their tomb decoration. The catacomb’s damaged galleries were considered “Jewish” nonetheless from the few remaining decorative features and funerary artifacts as well as their topographical relationship to the rest of the catacomb. Jewish patronage of the site was in itself unequivocal from the contents of nearly two hundred inscriptions in Greek and Latin, most copied and published by the Jesuit Raffaele Garrucci between 1862 and 1865.4

Scholars and government officials lost little time in copying and publishing the Jewish inscriptions and fragments of a singular sarcophagus relief decorated with the menorah and other objects relating to Jewish rites.5 (Figures 6–7) On-site, they could also examine the catacomb’s four painted rooms, or cubicula. Two are known together as the “double cubiculum” (area B a–b); there is another monumental room preceded by a long atrium in area D (Da)(Figure 8); and a small cubiculum (Gb) off the long corridor G1, containing a deep arcosolium-trough for multiple burials, but front and side walls so thin as to limit the use of the room for tombs. Only the last-mentioned chamber has decoration explicitly Jewish: the paintings in the two interconnecting rooms in hypogaeum B even caused considerable debate because of their profane subject matter and were not published for nearly two decades.
after their discovery.6 (Figures 9–10) Other cubicula exist, but generally in concentrated areas of the catacomb (B-E-F-G), rather than in isolation.7 The walls and vaults of several of these in one gallery had also been coated with white plaster (Fa, Fc, and cubiculum intercepted by G2).

Garrucci’s articles concentrated on the catacomb’s paintings and inscriptions and revealed very little about the excavation and extent of the site. His map, drafted less than halfway through the excavations of the early 1860s, nonetheless remained the only plan in decades of publications.8 (Figure 11)

An earlier report, published in 1861 by a young German scholar, Ernst Herzog, had used a more topographical approach. Its accuracy was challenged from the start, but a close inspection of those parts of the catacomb visible to Herzog and recorded by two different photographers of the

Figure 6. Sarcophagus with Jewish objects, with new fragment discovered in 2002. (Drawing: J. Dello Russo, after Garrucci)

Figure 7. Fragment of the sarcophagus discovered in October 2002. (Photo: J. Dello Russo)

Figure 8. Atrium (top photo, looking in) and interior (bottom photo, looking out) of cubiculum Da. Photo circa 1920s.
time confirms traces of structural features seen by the German in both the exterior mausoleum and connecting galleries that were later concealed or destroyed.\textsuperscript{10} (Figures 12–15) When and why this was done is unclear. The undocumented works carried out at such an early stage in the modern history of the site may have been the owners’ immediate response to concerns about the catacomb’s structural stability or visual appeal to a growing tourist trade. Herzog’s observations are only just now seen as probably correct.
Excavations carried out by Ignazio Randanini in the decades following his father’s campaigns retrieved very little Jewish material.\textsuperscript{11} No publications of the areas excavated at that time, or those subject to drastic, privately commissioned restorations have ever been released to shed light on this truly “dark age” for the catacomb. The situation was complicated further by a decade-long closure of the site to the public in 1870 after the Italian State filed suit against the Randanini for the illegal sale of inscriptions to a Lord Charles W. Wilshere. Even as a protective measure, the government intervention rekindled debate over an exclusively Jewish use of the site.
Unsuccessful in their countersuits to collect a reward or profit from a sale of the estate, the Randanini found other ways to make money from the site, primarily through visitors’ fees and the additional illegal sales of artifacts. In 1895, however, the family declared bankruptcy and sold its Appia vineyards to a Monsignor Bernardo Nardo, President of the “Postulazione dei Santi Cappuccini” (who rented out the property). A short time later, the site was acquired by its current owners, the Marchesi del Gallo di Roccagiovine. Yet collectors and other speculators continued to descend on the catacomb in droves, nearly provoking, in 1907, a military operation by carabinieri from the nearby barracks at Saint Sebastian’s to prevent the looting of “uno dei più’ importanti ipogei di Roma.” Consequently, many loose artifacts from the ex-Vigna Randanini ended up in the storerooms of the National Museum of Rome. The catacomb, nevertheless, continued to “bleed” its antiquities, even the prized sarcophagus relief decorated with Jewish symbols that was acquired in 1908 by the Staatliches Museum in Berlin (see Figure 6).

During the second half of the nineteenth century, three other hypogaea in Rome were identified as Jewish, two alone in the same area as the Vigna Randanini (Vigna Cimarra in 1866; via Labicana in 1882; via Appia Pignatelli—later discredited as Jewish—in 1885). Very little information was recovered from these sites before they once again became inaccessible. More positive results came from the discovery and partial exploration (regrettably, still not the preservation) of a Jewish catacomb on the Monteverde (excavated 1904–1909, 1913, 1919). The Jewish catacombs found in 1918 below the stables of the Villa Torlonia still survive.

Article 33 of the 1929 Lateran Concordat between the Roman Catholic Church and Italian State took steps to resolve the neglect and spoliation of the Jewish catacombs. An influential Vatican entity, the Pontifical Commission for Sacred Archaeology (PCAS), was given supervisory control over all the Jewish burial hypogaea in Rome. Over the next decade, however, political turmoil and warfare hindered work on these sites. Right after the conclusion of World War II (during which the Randanini catacomb had been used as a bomb shelter), the PCAS began the first of a series of small custodial projects to resolve the most pressing issues caused by decades of casual accessibility to the site. From the 1940s through the early 1980s, commission officials oversaw the restoration of inscriptions, the removal of anti-Semitic graffiti, securing of two entrances into the sites, and reinforcement of masonry walls and vaulting along the main route through the catacomb. It was impossible, however, to carry out new excavations without adequate funding and cooperation from all authorities on the Jewish site.
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In all, there was now ample evidence that the Jewish subterranean cemeteries had been excavated and used very much in the same way as the Christian catacombs of Rome. Many scholars during this period collaborated with the PCAS to include topographical data from the Randanini site in their studies on the Jews of Rome. To this date, they contain many valid observations, but none critically examine all surviving topographical data. The most recent site plan, drafted by the Technical Office of the PCAS in 1984, is likewise incomplete, omitting many partially visible areas and incorrectly representing several others.

As a result of careful reworking of the Lateran Treaty in 1984, the catacomb is now in the care of the Italian Archaeological Superintendence in partnership with the Jewish Community of Rome. Their collaboration has provided much-needed funding for the ongoing preservation of Jewish catacombs in Rome and Venosa, including a photographic archive and multiyear restoration of the Jewish catacombs in the Villa Torlonia in Rome, from which data is only now emerging. Other research, primarily in the field of epigraphy, has made widely available important statistics about Jewish communities in antiquity. At the same time, comprehensive studies of catacomb scholarship, including more critical evaluations of the work of previous generations in the field, have also revealed the interest and activity in these sites throughout the centuries.

Quite recently, a team of Dutch scientists has proposed a new chronology for the Jewish catacombs of Rome based on the results of radiocarbon studies carried out in the Torlonia catacombs by the University of Utrecht in 1997. Comparatively speaking, there is very little hard evidence for the Vigna Randanini catacomb’s chronology from start to finish. The funerary hypogaea appear to date no earlier than the third century CE, with an intense excavation and use of the catacomb by Jews during the third century and fourth centuries CE, and on occasion thereafter. This would make the Randanini catacomb contemporary with virtually all other catacombs in Rome. As seen today, the site has endured centuries of clandestine raids and a thorough “sweeping” by nineteenth-century explorers. There is little archeological material intact. The epitaphs found in the catacomb (nearly all out of place) do not contain consular dates, except for one sarcophagus fragment identifying an early sixth century “deposition,” an expression common for Christian burial. The majority of the inscriptions can be dated only in a very general sense to the third–fourth centuries CE based on execution and content. The paintings in the double cubiculum are assigned on stylistic grounds to the first half of the third century CE. The tiny number of complete or nearly complete sarcophagi used in the catacomb is assigned to workshops of the third and fourth centuries CE. (Figures 19–20) It is certain that uniform projects were undertaken in the cemetery (the series of connected chambers with arcolia in area M; likewise, the kokhim in areas A and D), but regrettably, many areas of the Vigna Randanini catacomb that could better define these features, particularly in relation to the cemetery above, have been altered or sealed up again with debris in modern times.

PRESENTATION OF THE AREAS STUDIED IN FALL 2001

The areas selected for restoration in 2001 are shown in the catacomb’s general plan. (Figure 21) Distinct areas are lettered A to M. Many began as separate projects before joining to other galleries in the catacomb.
Figure 19. Fragment of sarcophagus with clipeus and bust of a male figure. Found while inserting grate into floor of gallery G1 directly underneath lucernarium L3. (Photo: J. Dello Russo)

Figure 20. Greek inscription painted in red on the side of a sarcophagus in the entryway M. (Photo: J. Dello Russo)

Figure 21. Plan of the catacomb of the Vigna Randanini, adapted from the 1994 PCAS plan (J. Dello Russo)
Each region of the so-called “catacomba inferiore” (areas A and B) was accessed from one or more staircases from the grounds above. Subsequently, four steps were constructed to link the levels where gallery A1 breaks into the lower tiers of loculi on the wall of gallery D8 (two of these steps were resurfaced in 2001). (Figure 22)

Other parts of the excavation were reached from an ancient structure on the via Appia Pignatelli (M). The archaeologists of the mid-nineteenth century recognized in this the genesis for burial activity in the catacomb. Its restoration in the succeeding decades unfortunately obliterated many details that had so excited earlier visitors. Its few original features nonetheless still testify to numerous building phases on the site. Here a brief description must suffice.

The subterranean areas were entered through two doorways in a brick wall (later restored in opus vittatum) that lead to short flights of stairs underground. The door at left is tall enough to allow easy passage into the hypogaeum, although its placement is very off-center and connects, in fact, to the far left corner where a thick pier once supported a vaulted concrete roof. The second door, closer to the back wall’s central pier, is lower and neatly lined in travertine, with a thick brick lintel and threshold of solid stone. Narrow rectangular windows flank the upper right hand corners of the two doors; the one at the right was subsequently blocked by a perpendicular wall in tufelli punctured by two (restored as three) rows of arcosolia.

The chamber in front, large sections of which are in opus mixtum, has two shallow apses in the southeast wall and two smaller niches directly opposite. The niches were found still decorated with fragments of plaster, stucco and mosaic. Modern scholars date the original chamber and its elegant architectural motifs to the second century CE, and Garrucci, a key witness to the original excavation, states that no tombs were identified from this phase. It has at various points been identified as a tomb, suburban villa chamber, or nymphaeum at an ancient crossroads; least likely is the “synagogue” first proposed by Garrucci (who later recanted).

The floor of this chamber was covered with a black and white mosaic of “zig-zag” and rectangular patterns. The well-preserved section in front of the decorated niches contains two marble drain covers and gaps (restored in cocciopisto) where the mosaic was removed for a conduit to a well shaft inside the inner vestibule M. A low wall down the middle of the outer chamber connected three brick arches that supported the vaulted ceiling over the site. This low bank, as well as the wall with the two apses, and the entrance wall at southeast was covered, at least in part, with marble.

A later building phase for funerary use dates from the third or, more likely, fourth century CE. A new wall in tufelli blocks with large arcosolia covered the earlier niches on the northwest side of M. The apses opposite, however, were not concealed, probably to retain access through the doorway into the underground site. Directly in front of the first chamber, extending northwest to the modern roadside (via Appia Pignatelli) a series of rectangular sepulchral chambers were constructed in simple rubble masonry and opus vittatum. These chambers contain arcosolia of varying dimensions, stacked two or three to a wall. Several of the intact arcosolia contain traces of plaster, but, according to Garrucci, these would have been sealed with rubble and mortar, with the exception of arcosolia on the pavement level that were constructed over very deep trenches for at least four burials, stacked one upon another with tiles. Similar chambers containing arcosolia are found elsewhere on the via Appia as well as in later tombs added in or beside the entrances into the Christian catacombs in Rome. Several formas burials were excavated into the mosaic pavement of the chamber nearest to the underground area (the first excavators of the catacomb found others inside area m).

The doorways in the brick wall do not lead directly into areas of the catacomb accessible today. The door at left joins to a long inner corridor, today almost entirely lined in brick. The landing above the steps S4 opens at left onto gallery G2 and, despite clear funerary use (loculi and one cubiculum), is now heavily damaged by pozzolana quarrying and its current use as storage for the rubble from the site. (Frey illus-
Trates this area, in fact, as a large cavity behind the two apses in area M.) The smaller door at right leads to a chamber with an irregularly shaped barrel vault carved out of the granular pozzolanella right below the surface level. (Figure 23) The walls of this chamber are reinforced in part in tufelli, and otherwise in opus vittatum, all plastered like the original vault. (Figure 24) The well shaft is nearly at center, its conduit not now visible (although marked on Garrucci’s plan). Two of the four entrances into this chamber are now sealed. The only one open at left, flanked by niches, leads to galleries not used for burials (and which were blocked off in antiquity from gallery G1 just before the series of cubicula) (Figure 25); the doorway opposite accesses the interior atrium described previously that leads to an inner doorway of travertine into the cemetery proper. (Figure 26) The well chamber (m), short, empty galleries, and the later mausolea attached to an earlier structure suggest a small burial grounds turned into a larger cemetery “as the need occurred,” possibly through the acquisition of the site by Jews. (Figure 27) It will take more study and inspiration to follow the sequence of events in this very active site.
Returning to the general plan of the catacomb, gallery F1 and areas D and C are distinguished from the other galleries on the upper level (areas E–G) by their distinctive plans and features.

A cavernous arenarium (area Q—a quarry for pozzolana, never used for burials) joins other tunnels at the extreme southern end of gallery E2 by means of a narrow passageway, already sealed in antiquity. This passageway was excavated, apparently, when the area became a cemetery; although very sparsely used for burial, it nonetheless contains a partially excavated cubiculum on its western wall near the quarry.

A large part of the catacomb is likewise excavated in the manner of a quarry, lacking the secure and rational planning of an extensive subterranean cemetery. The catacomb regions used by Jews, however, were all connected, perhaps to restrict access from funerary monuments above ground (only limited space in nearby hypogaea was “recycled” for Randanini clientele). The burial patterns are as inconsistent as the catacomb’s layout. The principal galleries of areas E-F-G (E1-F1-G1) cover considerable distances, but develop few branch galleries and cubicula. In area A, on the other hand, the original tombs were often lengthened, deepened, or similarly expanded to accommodate multiple burials. Cubicula in areas E, F, and G are used intensely, even doubled in size with the addition of internal chambers, close to galleries whose walls are nearly bare. The cubicula visible in area B are used far more sparsely, with the least amount of effort; rather than excavate new loculi, existing ditches below floor-level arcosolia were deepened instead. The single cubiculum in area D, on the other hand, lost its painted ceiling and part of the decoration on its front walls to additional loculi. (Figure 28)

Area D is problematic for other reasons, as it contains a great variety in gallery dimensions and tomb forms. (Figures 29–30) Area C, directly connected to the long gallery D8, was partially walled up in antiquity, although galleries on both sides of the wall show successive growth even to a lower level. This feature raises the issue once again whether the catacomb had been in the hands of more than one group of “patrons.”

Our brief survey of the excavation and character of the site leads to the discussion of the work completed in 2001. The project to reinforce gallery walls concentrated on three distinct areas of the upper catacomb: areas D-E-G on the accompanying plan. These upper galleries are dug out of a lightweight and friable pozzolana; below which lies a bank of soft yellow-brown tufa terroso. (Figure 31)
The tomb type most frequently used in these galleries is the loculus, a rectangular shelf dug out of the gallery wall and arranged in stacks from ceiling to floor. (Figure 32) Burials were also made in kokhim tombs in areas A-B-C-D (those in D discussed below), in floor tombs (forma and semi-cappuccina) not visible today (Figure 33)44; and arcosolia—including the singular example of a bisome arcosolium in gallery E2. Cubicula contain arcosolia, loculi, or a combination of both. Various measures were employed to close and decorate loculi in the vigna Randanini catacomb (the particular case of the kokhim discussed below). The common tomb-seal of rubble and mortar in some instances was substituted with plaster-coated tiles and/or marble. (Figure 34) Epitaphs commonly were painted in red on plaster or tile (at least one apparently framed by a tabula ansata in area B), but even a single name or simple decoration scratched or drawn into the mortar could mark a tomb. There are also examples of painted epitaphs on marble, but most were incised into the stone. Many graves found intact at the time of discovery were not marked at all. Little care was taken to document and preserve on-site the few intact examples of marking tombs with small objects (e.g., glass or clay phials, coins, and lamps).45
Area D

Area D is concentrated around a series of short galleries arranged on an irregular grid pattern, similar to that for the underground sand-quarries nearby. A missing key detail is the entrance and stairway first used to excavate this area, certainly not that connecting to the lower levels of area A (S3). The closest “exit” from this level of the catacomb is blocked with rubble at the corner of a brick wall in gallery C1. (Figure 35) This, however, is very much on the periphery of the galleries in D.

Direct access to area D from the surface level would most likely be found at some point along the long and only partially visible gallery D1 that leads East past a series of short perpendicular galleries (D2, D3, D4) to what must have been a small skylight or lucernarium over the threshold of the region’s one cubiculum (Da). Ancient excavators prudently narrowed the width of the gallery around this opening and later—following the excavation of several loculi—reinforced the walls with ancient brick and marble fragments, now covered with thick, white deposits of calcium from water seepage from above. (Figures 36–37) The flat concrete ceiling that closes the opening is modern.

Cubiculum Da, created for a limited number of large rectangular loculi on its side and back walls (each carefully lined with plaster), was decorated with brightly painted geometric designs and garden motifs frequently found in Late Roman floor and wall decoration. The original vault was later removed to excavate more loculi at a higher level (traces of the original vault in the chamber’s upper corners); likewise, small infant tombs destroyed much of the painting around the door. The irregular pavement level covers burials laid against the walls in the “semi-cappucina” fashion. (Figure 38) The only evidence for Jewish burial...
is a large, red-painted menorah on the plaster beside one of the loculi in the long antechamber leading into the painted room. A similar menorah was painted beside the doorway of another cubiculum (in F1a), and the practice of marking Jewish tombs with a menorah is found in a vast number of instances in different Jewish catacombs in Rome. **(Figure 39)**

Another red menorah is painted over the partial closure of an extremely singular type of tomb. This is the “kokh,” practiced regularly in other areas of the Roman Empire but rarely in the city of Rome. **(Figure 39)** The form used in the Vigna Randanini catacombs is the rectangular ditch cut perpendicular to the gallery wall and covered by a curved vault that slopes downwards towards the back wall of the grave. **(Figure 39)** The inner troughs of those in area D are marked most often by a deep groove around the edges that would be used to seal the tomb with flat tiles. On occasion, the troughs are also plastered inside, or marked by other such “decorative” features. **(Figure 40)** Garrucci described several intact kokhim with epitaphs painted on or inserted into the wall of rubble and mortar sealing the tomb. In other cases, the epitaph was displayed on the wall above. **(Figures 41–42)** At present, examples of kokhim are seen in areas A, B, C, and D in the Vigna Randanini catacombs. One undisturbed kokh (excavated as an “appendix” to two other kokhim off gallery A2) preserves a complete skeleton, and bone fragments are visible in others, but many appear to contain nothing more than freshly turned earth.

There are distinct differences in the arrangement of kokhim between areas A and D. Curiously, in the place of additional galleries in area A (constructed, essentially, as straight, narrow tunnels that intercept other hypogaea), individual kokhim were developed as multiple tombs. Secondary, smaller kokhim could be attached to the original kokh at gallery level, or the first kokh would be lengthened and deepened. In at least two cases, burial chambers containing more kokhim and fossa tombs were excavated below...
the gallery level. These would have been invisible when and if the original tomb was sealed. These hidden *kokhim* could indicate extreme steps against tomb violation, or the desire of individuals to make the most out of available burial space, as it was no longer possible to expand the original *kokh* once it had been used for burial. At points in area A, however, pre-existing cavities prevented further expansion. *Kokhim* excavated close to the staircase S1 to this zone.
broke into the ceiling of an empty corridor below. (Figure 43) Workmen were able to make this area safe for visitors in 2001 by filling the depressions in front of the kokhim made by earlier excavators and bringing the level of these openings up to that of the gallery floor. (Figure 44)

Only certain galleries in D contain rows of kokhim at floor level. Above these are tiers of large adult loculi, while infant tombs are excavated in the piers between the kokhim. In some areas in D, the flat gallery ceiling is raised to insert additional loculi, but the pattern of kokh-adult tomb and infant tombs between is consistent. Why the kokhim and loculi are arranged in this particular manner still is not clear. Many areas of D, in fact, were not suited to kokhim excavation: in D1, for example, the kokhim are found only on the northern wall, the side not broken by transversal galleries. Galleries D4 and D7 have kokhim on opposite walls, but these are only excavated on one side of the tufa piers that divide D4 from the parallel galleries D3 and D5. Contrary to what has been recently published, the narrow pointed strip of tufa between D4-D5-D7 contains no kokhim. 54 Ancient excavators may have judged the wall’s thickness at this point too shallow for the tomb.

The distribution of kokhim through certain galleries practically “guides” the visitor through area D and down a short flight of steps into the galleries of area A that contain almost exclusively kokhim. On the southern wall of D7, where less wall surface was available, kokhim were still excavated, but with smaller openings and/or interior shafts. An apparent kokh tomb at the far end of gallery D8 (into area C), however, demonstrates that other areas in the upper catacomb that are no longer accessible may contain additional—or, in Vismara’s term—“sporadic” examples of this tomb type. 55

The PCAS reinforced several wall surfaces in this area between 1971 and 1973, in addition to those mentioned above in areas A and B. 56 The more recent work in 2001 simply reconstructed parts of original “piers” of tufa that no longer existed between the short tracts of galleries D2-D4-D5 (walls 1–6). (Figures 45–46) The new walls neither protrude from nor reduce the original wall surface; wherever possible, the modern masonry rests on the still-solid parts of the original tufa pier. The result for each new pier is a regular, straight surface from floor to ceiling, distinguishing, however, with masonry technique, the modern intervention from the ancient wall. Many of the wall surfaces in the short galleries of area D were in a jagged and fragile state because of the way these areas had been originally excavated and then densely used for burial. (Figure 47) Loculi, not kokhim, were used for burial in the corner areas, perhaps out of an ancient concern about the stability of these points. 57 A similar situation is found on the western wall of gallery D4b, where recent plans have placed kokhim, that, in fact, never existed on that particular stretch of wall. 58

© 2010 Roma Subterranea Judaica 1, Publications of the International Catacomb Society
The outlines of lost loculi burials were reconstructed as a pattern in the new retaining walls of modern opus vittatum (brick and small tufa blocks of tufelli). What little remains of the actual tombs rests behind these walls. Their devastated condition at the time of discovery is described by Herzog and Parker, who noted only fragments of marble and brick mixed in with rubble covering the gallery floors.\textsuperscript{59} Considering the techniques used by the Randanini to liberate the catacomb galleries, more should rest below the actual pavement, which is essentially a modern, flat surface to accommodate visitors to the site.

**Upper areas E–G**

A similar reinforcement of wall surfaces was carried out in several central points of areas E–G, already restored in antiquity with brick piers not unlike those constructed in modern times.\textsuperscript{60} These upper regions consist of galleries whose winding “schizophrenic” plan and appearance were conditioned by nearby funerary hypogaea and arenaria (especially in the case of E2). One modern intervention was needed, in fact, at one of the points where two separate excavations meet (wall 7). (Figure 48) This is in E1 just beyond lucernarium 12, which had been created for the extraction of the pozzolana from the galleries. A break had occurred at the corner between the gallery wall and ceiling, showing a large hollow space behind. On inspection, this proved to be a large cubiculum, accessed by a narrow, straight North–South gallery, blocked after several meters by pieces of an ancient brick structure fallen in from above.\textsuperscript{61} The cubiculum and gallery were never used for burial, but a regular distribution of small round holes, very frequent in catacomb galleries, could indicate a cemetery in preparation.
A shallow ditch for the foundations of wall 7 below this cubiculum exposed several intact loculi slightly below the present floor level in gallery E1. (Figure 49) There were no identification signs on the rubble and concrete closing these tombs. These tombs would have been the first covered by debris in gallery E1 until the excavations of May 18, 1862 (this fill is now stored in galleries G1a–b). They were not visible again after the excavations because the original floor level in this area was covered to hide the remains of formae. The pavement level also increased over time from water infiltration, which caused much of the gallery ceiling to crumble away. There is now a considerable difference in height between the galleries where this damage occurred and the cubicula in the same area whose vaults remained intact.

Close by, in cubiculum Gb, most of the floor had been deliberately hacked away, however, in order to steal the gilded and painted reliefs on a sarcophagus originally found intact in 1859 (Figures 50–54).62 Fragments of strigillated reliefs left behind by the vandals were found during the process of raising the floor of the chamber back to its original level. A sidewall of the chamber was also repaired without compromising any of its paintings.63

Other wall surfaces (walls 8 and 9) were reconstructed opposite an earlier PCAS restoration at the intersection of galleries G1a-E1-E2. (Figure 55) The new walls flank the opening of gallery G1 onto the intersection, which is today inaccessible behind a dry wall of tufa blocks and fill. Work on this particular site helped clear up a topographical puzzle. The vault of the gallery is higher than those in galleries E1–E2, and is centered slightly to the left to leave a low back wall above the point where it opens onto the intersection; this later was used for a loculus. That this “adjustment” of the height level was made after the excavation of E1-E2 is confirmed by the discovery of a considerably higher floor level for G1a; behind the dry wall is, in fact, a bank of untouched pozzolana.

The final two support piers were built beside other narrow openings onto gallery G1, which originates just beyond lucernarium L3 (walls 10 and 11). (Figure 56) The inspection of these continued to reveal surprises in the topographical development of regions E-F-G. Here the division of G1 into two galleries is similar to that of G1 and the short gallery G2 before the latter’s “collision” with the back wall of a cubiculum belonging to another hypogaeum or catacomb region.64 The “straight” branch of G1 then starts to deepen to eventually come into contact at an almost perfect right angle with gallery F1; the second part, G1a, splits once again into the gallery that will continue to the intersection of E1-E2, and a shorter branch, G1b. The continuation of G1b is cut off by a later extension of G1 past the mouth of gallery F1, now considerably lower than its original level. The existing upper gallery was “absorbed” into the lower passage.

The impression of Gallery G1b left in the upper vault, and long tufa bank on the original pavement level of the gallery, evidence changes in the excavation plan that lead to the abandonment of these narrower galleries.65 The “bank” may have been retained to support the heightened ceiling level of G1 at this intersection. (Figure 57) Work was carried out before the area was used as a cemetery (i.e., before the excavation of tombs), since the narrow pier
Figure 50. Interior of cubiculum Gb, prior to repairs made to floor and right wall. (Photo: Estelle S. Brettman, ICS photo archive)

Figure 51. New floor level in cubiculum Gb. (Photo: J. Dello Russo)

Figure 52. Restorations to side wall in cubiculum Gb. (Photo: J. Dello Russo)

Figure 53. Strigillated fragment of the “sarcophagus of the Muses” found during repairwork on floor in cubiculum Gb (Photo: J. Dello Russo)

© 2010 Roma Subterranea Judaica 1, Publications of the International Catacomb Society
in gallery G1b at the corner of G1 could only be used for infant *loculi* after the two galleries merged. Put more simply, what can be said at present is that area G had different phases of growth that brought it into contact with several other hypogaea on various levels below the Vigna Randanini grounds.

**THE WORK AHEAD**

This report goes to press one hundred and fifty years after the Jewish catacomb’s discovery. But the excavation and maintenance of the site still await a full realization. This short discussion of features lost or studied for the first time demonstrates that it is still possible, indeed, necessary, to carry out a modern study of the catacomb, or else scholarship risks more effort and debate on incomplete information from the site. The interest and cooperation of diverse parties has contributed to this report, ensuring that the efforts to create and use the catacomb so long ago are not forgotten, or irrelevant to how we look at the catacomb today.
NOTES

The following abbreviations are used:


CIL = Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum


1. An independent assessment of the paintings in cubiculum Ba–b (2001) by E. Laurenzi in “Le volte del cubicolo doppio di Vigna Randanini,” Actes du VIII Colloque de l’AIPMA, p. 373. Laurenzi finds the state of conservation of the frescoes in cubicula Ba–b “more than fair” adding that the “bleeding” of the red paint at the corners of the vaults had been an issue from the start, “ab antiquo.” S. Lombardi in “La Catacomb Ebraica di Vigna Randanini,” Forma Urbis (December 2009): 12–13, cites damage done to the frescoes from water infiltration as well as from visitors who wrote on the walls and vaults until “relatively recently.” Of greater concern is the condition of painted areas in cubiculum Da, much damaged over the course of the twentieth century by water infiltration from the grounds above.

2. The Jewish inscriptions displayed in the Palazzo Randanini (note spelling) during the late eighteenth century have no known connection to the Appia site (CIJ 1/JIWE 2 nn. 1/556; 502/561; 510/578; 733e/619). Unauthorized excavations may have begun in the Vigna Randanini a few years earlier (A. K. Hirschfeld, “The Intellectual History of Catacomb Archaeology,” in Commemorating the Dead: Texts and Artifacts in Context. Studies of Roman, Jewish and Christian Burials, eds. I. Brink and D. Green, Berlin-New York, 2008, p. 30 n. 53), at the same time as excavations in the neighboring “Vigna Grandi”: the provenance of CIJ 1.251/JIWE 2.629i is listed by G. B. de Rossi as “Casa Grandi.” Noy also publishes JIWE 2.553, a Latin titulus dating to the second or third centuries CE, in “the gardens of Gastone del Frate,” possibly a descendent of the original partner in the Randanini excavations. The excavation licenses and other correspondence concerning the site and lawsuit brought against the Randanini are kept in the Archivio dello Stato di Roma, Ministero dei Lavori Pubblici, Industria, Agricoltura, Commercio e Belle Arti, Sezione 5, Titolo 1, articolo 5a, busta 414/18 “Roma—Randanini Ignazio. Sulla Vendita di Sei Iscrizioni appartenenti all’Ipogeo Giudaico” (December 21, 1860–September 12, 1870).


5. Garrucci, Cimitero, 1862, p. 17. The author of this 2001 report identified another piece of the same sarcophagus relief discovered in the atrium area (M-m) on October 23, 2002
(the same general area where the other pieces had been found in 1859). The new section shows the upper part of the central stem of the candelabrum, and some of the ends of side branches that terminate with oil lamps, with flames issuing from their mouths.

6. Garrucci described the paintings in the double cubiculum (without illustrations) in an appendix to his 1862 report on the excavations of May 18, 1862, pp. 65–66. A year later, in 1863 (1865, p. 158), Garrucci responded to charges that the site was pagan by declaring that there was “non alcuna cosa al pagani appartenente.” The English archaeologist John Henry Parker photographed the controversial paintings for his series of Historical Photographs Illustrative of the Archaeology of Rome and Italy Arranged According to Their Subjects, 2 vols. (London, 1873) nn. 561–562, 773–775 (Charles Smeaton photographs, ca. 1864–1865); and nn. 1160–1161 (William Ewing watercolors, ca. 1868–1869). Parker’s photographs of paintings in the Vigna Randanini catacomb are discussed in K.-D. Dorsch and H. Reinhard Seeliger, Romische Katakombenmalerei: im Speigel der Photoarchiv Parker (Munster, 2000), pp. 381–387. Th. Roller used Parker’s copies in Les Catacombes de Rome: histoire de l’art ed des croyances religieuses pendant les premiers siecles du christianisme, vol. 1 (Paris, 1881), pl. 4 (Ewing’s watercolors) and pl. 5 (Smeaton photograph); discussion on pp. 11–13 (catacomb called that of the “Vigna Randanini”). Garrucci, Storia dell’ Arte Cristiana nei primi otto secoli della chiesa, 6 vols. (Prato, 1880), pl. 489a–b, finally publishes drawings of the vaults and isolated motifs from the walls of the first cubiculum (omitting the undefined scene on the back wall of the second); his discussion on p. 156. The scene on the back wall, in a less damaged state at the time of its discovery (1862), was believed to depict “two or perhaps three” horses (Garrucci 1862, p. 66). F. Bisconti, in Temi di Iconografia Paleocristiana, SuisiSì allo Studio delle Antichità Cristiane 13 (Vatican City, 2000), pp. 236–237, reaffirms that this scene is that of Orpheus charming the beasts (U. Utrò, “Davide,” pp. 164–165 in the same volume, even suggests that this “Orpheus” could be a depiction of the Biblical David). What is known of the composition, however, a man placed between two trees and flanked by two or perhaps three animals with long tails, could also suggest a more generic pastoral scene. A recent discussion on these cubicula in area B, particularly the fresco cycles in the vaults, in Laurenzi, 2004, pp. 371–4.

7. Exceptional are the isolated cubicula in areas D (Da) and E1: E1 also intercepts a cubiculum excavated at a higher level, accessed by a separate point of entry, S. Frascati, “Vigna Randanini” in LTURS, 1, p. 108.

8. The plan of the excavations up to March of 1862 is published in Garrucci, 1862, p. 5.


12. O. Marucchi, Le Catacombe Romane (Rome, 1905), p. 234, n. 2. In the meantime, Randanini rented out the property: one tenant, a Sig. Angelo Angelucci, displayed in his house in Velletri a fragment of CIJ 1.99/JIWE 2.255. Marucchi observed in Le Catacombe Romane, p. 234, that before the sale of the vineyard many Jewish inscriptions had been “barbarously” removed and restored to the site in a far lesser number after 1896.

13. The Fine Arts Commission received a notice—marked “urgentissima”—that an unnamed American was negotiating the purchase of many Jewish inscriptions from the site:
Archivio Centrale dello Stato, Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, Antichità e Belle Arti, 1859–1907, 2d versamento, 2a parte, busta 739, fascicolo 20 (1907).


15. A. Konikoff, Sarcophagi from the Jewish Catacombs of Ancient Rome: a catalogue raisonne, 2d ed. (Stuttgart, 1990), p. 20 n. 11.4 and pl. 5 (JIWE 2, p. 179 n. 1). Italian officials had ”heard” of the sale of many inscriptions and other materials by a ”former” owner of the property (the Randanini), but suspicion falls upon Mons. Nardo, described as an ”amante dell’ antichita,” and not ”contrary” to selling off the remaining antiquities in the vineyard: Archivio Centrale dello Stato, Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, Antichità e Belle Arti, 1859–1907, 2d versamento, 2a part, busta 739, fascicolo 1635 (July 30, 1907).

16. The Appia Pignatelli site is still found on some maps of the Jewish catacombs in Rome; most recently: in Lombardi, 2009, p. 6, fig. 2, ”Pianta riassuntiva della dislocazione delle catacombe ebraiche di Roma.”

17. From the start of the twentieth century to 1984, the Pontifical Commission for Sacred Archaeology (PCAS) supervised the maintenance and restoration works in the Jewish catacombs of Rome. The PCAS had had already a long history of involvement with the inspection and study of these Jewish sites since the mid-nineteenth century. A penciled graffito left by a fossore on the reverse of an inscription near cubiculum Da (”Fiorenza, Anglo, 1946”) indicates the measures taken to prevent additional thefts of artifacts from the catacomb after World War II. Ferrua’s notes on displaced inscriptions in his review of the 1975 reissue of the CIL (ed. B. Lifshitz), Revista di Archeologia Cristiana (1975): 361, and Leon’s alarm upon returning to the site in the mid-1950s, confirm that many inscriptions still on-site in the pre-war period were now missing (Leon, 1960, p. 71; statistics in Noy, 1995, p. 173). Leon, p. 61, also mentions new ”reinforcements with brickwork to prevent further collapse” from the early 1950s. A consular inscription, dated to 359 or 390 (CIL 6 n. 15350) was found during work on a staircase (possibly S3) in 1954: it is still unclear if this had been re-used in an ancient or modern context, since the re-use of inscriptions in nineteenth-century restorations is documented elsewhere on-site (Leon, 1960, p. 61, n. 3, fig. 17). The Pontifical Commission’s Giornale di Scavo e Cronaca from 1949 to 1966 note work on the two accessible entrances to the catacomb (M and S3), and a proposal put forth by Fr. U. M. Fasola to excavate the vestibule on the via Appia Pignatelli (PCAS, Giornale di Scavo, 1949–1966, January 4–15, 1962, p. 114). The early 1970s required more work from the Pontifical Commission. The PCAS Giornale di Scavo for the years 1971–1973 contain observations and drawings of the measures taken at that time. Fr. Fasola’s general site inspection of 1972 found the catacomb in good condition, but lacking adequate security at the two entrances (PCAS Giornale di Scavo, 11, February 21, 1972). The steps on stairway S1 to the lower galleries of the catacomb (areas A–B) were realigned to seal off a short gallery parallel to A2 that led to a level below area A and ”zona chiusa,” formerly a wine cellar and storeroom for the gardeners and those on the short flight S3 were refaced with new stone slabs (PCAS Giornale di Scavo 12, February 4, 1973). Piers in modern opus vittatum were constructed to support two brick arches that covered a deep hole in the gallery vault at the intersection of galleries B1–B2 just beyond the entrance into the the double cubiculum, caused by the weight of the foundations of a columbarium above (PCAS Giornale di Scavo 12, February 4, 1973). The Giornale di Scavo for April 1972 records work done at the entrance into the catacomb from the via Appia Pignatelli (M), and the cleaning of the mosaic pavements to reveal two marble drains believed to be from a late phase when the atrium was open to the sky (the ripping up of the original Severan-age mosaic to add the pipes is shown in early photographs—CIJ 1, p. LIX) (PCAS Giornale di Scavo 11, April 5 and April 28, 1972, with diagrams of the pavement and drains). In 1973, anti-Semitic graffiti was removed from the walls of the double cubiculum (PCAS Giornale di Scavo 12, January 17 and 29, 1973); and the upper part of the shaft and mouth of one of the lucernaria was reinforced (PCAS Giornale di Scavo 12, February 5, 1973). Since assuming the role of custodian in the early 1990s, retired PCAS forssore, Sig. Alberto Marcocci, has carried out additional maintenance work on the site, including the reinforcement of lucernarium L2 and raising of the travertine lintel above the inner doorway to gallery G1 (Marcocci testimony).

18. A. Ferrua was able to track down several inscriptions taken from the Vigna Randanini catacomb in the early 1940s, including CIL 202 (now in the Museum of St. Sebastian’s) and another ”pure giudaica” in Ferrua’s view, with the image of an ox branded with an x on its rear. Ferrua is the only

19. The paintings on the walls of cubiculum Ba-b are covered with modern graffiti—the signatures of visitors to the catacomb from the 1890s to 1946, after which point more security measures were in place: see Leon, 1995, pp. 61–62, fig. 15 and p. 206. For a comparison with the paintings’ original condition shortly after discovery in 1862, see Dorsch and Seeliger, 2000, pl. 35, a–b. Further restoration of area M was carried out in the 1930s (plaque). According to A. Ferrua, several inscriptions were stolen from the catacomb during air raids in World War II (JIWE 2, pp. 279–80; p. 283).


21. S. Lombardi publishes a 2007 revision of the PCAS plan, prepared by the Roma Sotterranea Association in Rome (Lombardi, 2009, p. 4, fig. 1). It corrects many of Vitale’s errors in kokhim location and arrangement, and adds more details about the “terminus” points of many partially excavated galleries as well as those in the adjoining quarry (Q). Roma Sotterranea has also prepared a new epigraphical catalogue for the site.


23. Dr. Silvia Dayan compiled an inventory of artifacts in the Jewish catacombs of the Vigna Randanini and Villa Torlonia between 1989 and 1991; her photographs, however, await a proper inventory and catalogue (Palazzo Massimo: “Antichità” Giudaiche di Roma: Giugno, 1991, diapositivi, aspettano un censimento e una classificazione). Photographs taken earlier in the twentieth century are kept in the archives of the Pontifical Commission for Sacred Archaeology, and inventoried in the Catalogo delle fotografie di antichità cristiana (Vatican City, 1973), pp. 124–129 (Vigna Randanini) and pp. 46–48 (Villa Torlonia); Appendix, 2, 1980, pp. 5–6 and 28 (Villa Torlonia); Appendix 3, 1993, pp. 15–16 (Villa Torlonia), and p. 27 (Vigna Randanini). Other photographs and illustrations are kept in the Archives of the
Pontifical Institute of Christian Archaeology (most, if not all, published in the CIJ) and archives of the PCAS (most unpublished). The Villa Torlonia catacombs have been subject to over fifteen years of restoration and study, including an inventory of artifacts and microclimate study; for results, see M. Barbera and M. Magnani Cianetti, “Lo stato attuale delle Catacombe Torlonia,” in I beni culturali ebraici in Italia: situazione attuale, problemi, prospettive, e progetti per il futuro, ed. M. Perani (Ravenna, 2003), pp. 56–70; and L. V. Rutgers, K. van der Borg, A. F. M. de Jong, and I. Poole “Radiocarbon dating from the Jewish catacombs of Rome,” Radiocarbon 44.2 (2002): 541–547, and “Sul problema di come datare le catacombe ebraiche di Roma,” Rabesch 81 (2006): 169–184.


25. A. K. Hirschfeld, 2008, pp. 11–38; L. V. Rutgers, Subter-


27. Rutgers’ suggestion that Jewish catacombs could pre-
date Christian catacombs in Rome by perhaps a century is based on radiocarbon dating from the Villa Torlonia Jewish catacombs: he has not published to date any results of simi-
lar experiments with carbon samples from mortar used in the Randanini catacombs. The scholars who first published the Randanini site (Herzog and Garrucci), used a comparative approach to Christian cemeteries in the area to date the Jewish catacomb to the third and fourth centuries CE (a little later than the traditional dating of the Christian catacombs); see Herzog, 1861, pp. 94–97, and Garrucci, 1862, p. 15, and 1864, p. 95. Frey and Leon, however, largely on the basis of a small number of brick stamps on clay tiles used to close individual tombs, suggest that the Vigna Randanini catacomb could have been used as early as the first century CE; CIJ 1, p. LV and p. CXXIV for dating of paintings in the double cubiculum (that Frey considers pagan); Leon, 1960, pp. 65–66, admits there area “few reliable criteria” for dating the epitaphs and paintings, but believes that the catacomb would have been abandoned for the sub divo cemeteries as early as the fourth century CE. Vismara, 1986, pp. 380–381, dates the few structural features and artifacts to the third–fourth cen-
turies CE. Rutgers, 1995, pp. 52–53 and 1998, pp. 49–71; Spera, 1999, pp. 262–265 (UUTT 444–447), and Frascati, 2001, p. 109, accept the division of the Randanini catacomb into two or three separate hypogaeas, later developed into a single site during the late third and early fourth centuries, with intensified use for burial during the latter.

28. JIWE 2, pp. 173–331, nn. 204–401 dates nearly all the inscriptions from the Vigna Randanini catacomb to the third–fourth centuries CE.


31. An unpublished Greek inscription and possible menorah image painted in red on the short side of a large sarcophagus stored at the entrance M into the catacomb (mentioned without inscrip-
tion in Marucchi, 1884, p. 12) suggest a Jewish burial. The provenance of this sarcophagus is unknown; it may be one of those seen by J. B. Pentland in “a square chamber, in which there are remains of a well, and . . . several graves and sarcophagi sunk into the floor,” J. B. Pentland, A Handbook of Rome and Its Environs, 8th ed. (London, 1867), pp. 347–348.

32. Garrucci, 1864–1865, p. 156; “al principio (areas A and B) non comunicavano fra loro, e neanche con il cimitero superiore, vedendosi il taglio dei comunicazione, dove sono i gradini manifestamente aperto di po.” Garrucci maintained that the controversial double cubiculum in hypogaeum B was decorated by Jews; Roller, Parker, and Marucchi, among oth-
ers, believed the site pagan in origin, see Roller, 1881, p. 13; O. Marucchi, Breve guida del cimitero giudai-co di Vigna Randanini (Rome, 1884), p. 28.

33. Garrucci, 1864–1865, p. 156; “esso (la catacomba inferi-
ore) e poi diviso in due ipogei (areas A and B), con a ciascuno la sua scala esterna, delle quai si vede una ancora interrato.” The staircase S1, excavated from December to January of 1862–1863, is connected to a rectangular room divided into painted partitions with a low bank for seating on all sides, perhaps this is the “cubicolo perforato” heavily restored in the late nineteenth century described by PCAS inspectors (PCAS Giornale di Scavo 11, February 2, 1972). G. De Angelis D’Ossat, La geologia delle catacombe romane (Vatican City, 1943), p. 176, locates this chamber near the highest point in the vineyard (m. 51). At the base of the stairway, at the end of a short
gallery, another irregular stair leads to galleries on a lower level. Stairway S2, visible in 1862, is no longer accessible today.


35. Mazzoleni, 1975, pp. 295–296, describes the room as a pagan site later acquired by the Jews, and Vismara, 1988, p. 155, speculates that the exterior atrium may have been constructed—but never used—by non-Jewish clients. Frascati, 2001, p. 108, believes it could have been part of a villa; and Spera, 1999, pp. 262–263 (UT 444), finds the decorated niches and plan of the inner vestibule characteristic of a *nymphaeum*.


37. Frascati, 2001, p. 108, reiterates that the earlier structure in *opus mixtum* was restored or adapted for additional burials after the second half of the second century CE when the site may have been acquired by Jews.


39. G. B. de Rossi, *Roma Sotteranea Cristiana*, vol. 2 (Rome, 1868) pl. 51–52, 3a (Catacomb of Calixtus); Nuzzo, 2000, p. 234, fig. 147 (Catacomb of Praetextatus); Spera, 2003, p. 276, fig. 5 (via Appia, 6th mile).

40. Garrucci, 1862, p. 7; J. B. Pentland, 1867, p. 344, an early Garrucci patron, documents these burials in his own description of the Vigna Randanini.

41. Herzog, 1861, p. 94; Garrucci, 1862, p. 8; De Rossi, 1865, p. 97. Vismara, 1986–1988, p. 155, finds evidence of a failed or “abortive” burial project before the creation of the catacomb in empty galleries off area m. They are also labeled as those of a “cisterna” in the PCAS *Giornali di Scavo* 11, April 28, 1972, and Spera, 1999, p. 265. Although they contain no loculi burials, the small niches for lighting are seen at intervals in the gallery walls, the upper part of a human skull resting on a gallery floor in this area, and the signs of building foundations above, all lend support to the theory of a hypogaeum “transformed” by later site owners.

42. Frascati, 2001, p. 108, believes that a separate entrance into the catacomb should exist in area C.


44. Garrucci, 1864, p. 90, describes the tombs in the pavement, closed either in the style “a cappuccina,” or “semi-cappuccina.” During the nineteenth century excavations, these were especially noted in gallery G1.

45. Herzog, 1861, pp. 97–98; Garrucci, 1862, p. 9; Marucchi, 1884, p. 12 (clay lamps collected in m).

46. Vitale, 1994, p. 27, believes that the galleries “a graticola” were excavated for an underground cistern, but notes the absence of water-resistant concrete lining necessary for water storage. She is incorrect, however, to assert that there are no “pozzi” (*lucernaria*); *lucernarium* 11 is located in gallery D1. Frascati, 2001, p. 108, observes that while the width of the corridors in this area differs widely, the height more or less remains at 2 meters, perhaps for the presence of “kokhim” excavated into the pavement levels of several corridors in area D.


48. The second example, however, in area E, is not beside a *loculus*, but on the interior wall of a cubicularium next to the entrance, marking possibly a burial “a forma” or, simply, the presence of Jewish tombs nearby. It is unlikely that the oblong design painted on the side walls of the doorway is a mezzuzot: contra Lombardi, 2009, p. 11.

49. Rutgers, 1995, and Cappelletti, 2006, p. 154, are incorrect to limit the practice of excavating *kokhim* (“forno” tombs) in Rome to the Vigna Randanini catacomb; for other examples in catacombs on the via Appia, see Nuzzo, 2000, pp. 168–169 (3.5); Spera, 1999, p. 297, UT 515.

50. Sections of a *kokh* in the Randanini catacomb are illustrated by Nuzzo, 2000, pp. 136–138 (fig. 191).

51. Vismara, 1988, pp. 155–156; for observations on *kokhim* in area D.

52. Garrucci, 1862, p. 65 (appendix for May 18, 1862). One example of an epitaph placed beside the *kokh* tomb is seen in area A.

53. Vismara, 1986–1988, p. 156, describes distinctive features of *kokhim* in this area, including one with a plastered vault and walls; another with a threshold in marble, etc.

54. *Contra* plans of *kokhim* in Vismara, 1986–1988, p. 153, fig. 1, and Vitale, 1994, p. 19 (reprinted in Cappelletti). There are six large loculi cut into this wall, arranged in 2 tiers of three loculi. An infant loculus is visible at one of the upper corners.


57. A tenth *kokh* was planned for gallery D1, just before the opening of L1, but a loculus was eventually excavated on the spot.

58. Garrucci, 1862, p. 66 (excavations of May 18, 1862).

59. Herzog, 1861, p. 97; Parker, 1877, pp. 119–120.

60. Herzog, 1861, p. 93 notes the considerable width of the galleries first excavated in area E, requiring the occasional brick pilaster to sustain the gallery vault. The map published by Garrucci in 1862, p. 5, indicates masonry walls in the galleries immediately beyond the entrances into the
catacomb from area M into G (no burials marked). These walls had been integrated into or replaced by modern walls prior to 2001.

61. The cubiculum, but not the gallery, first drawn in Frey’s 1933 plan; discussion in Vitale, 1994, p. 25 (cubiculum e on plan).

62. The sarcophagus was discovered intact (with lid); but Herzog, 1861, p. 21, notes that there was no inscription, and the faces of some of the figures carved at the corners of the case had been roughly indicated without any finishing details (or inscription) that would identify the deceased.

63. The paintings in cubiculum Gb are done in a far rougher and abbreviated style than those in areas B and D in the same site. Their style and execution is somewhat similar to those in cubiculum a of the Hypogeum “of the phallus” described as “not quite Christian” by A. M. Nieddu, *La Basilica Apostolorum sulla Via Appia e l’area cimiteriale circostante* (Vatican City, 2009), pp. 20–21; 312–321.

64. Illustrated in Garrucci’s plan, 1862, p. 5.

65. Garrucci, 1862a, pp. 11–12, and Parker, 1877, p. 120. The continuation of the vault of gallery G1b over gallery G1 is drawn in Spera’s plan of the catacomb, 1999, p. 266, fig. 194 (without discussion).

**APPENDIX**

Summary of works completed in September–October 2001:

1. Reconstruction of missing wall surfaces in areas D, E, G
2. Reinforcement of dry wall in *tufelli* between G1a and E1
3. Repair of two steps in the staircase connecting A to D
4. Repaving with dirt several depressions in galleries A1–A2
5. Installation of a grate in G1 to collect seepage from lucenatium L3
6. Reconstruction of side wall and floor in cubiculum Gb
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ASR, Camerlangato, 1 parte, titolo 4, busta 165 fascicolo 4391 (1826).
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ASR, Ministero dei Lavori Pubblici, Industria, Agricoltura, Commercio e Belle Arti, Section 5, titolo 1, articolo 5a, busta 414: “Roma – Licenza di Scavo concessa ad Ignazio Randanini in una sua vigna fuori la Porta di San Sebastiano” November 10–December 6, 1870.

Archivio Centrale dello Stato (ACS)
Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, Direzione Generale per le Antichita’ e le Belle Arti 1859–1907
2 versamento, 2 parte: busta 246 fascicolo 43228 (1882); busta 739, fascicolo 1635 (July 30, 1907)
3 versamento, 2 parte: “Roma: Catacomba Ebraica di Vigna Randanini: 1882–1896”, b. 246, fascicolo 43228 (1885); busta 421, fascicolo 4660 (1896); divisione 10, busta 55, fascicolo 70 (1899)
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Pontificia Commissione di Archeologia Sacra (PCAS)
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*Giornale di Scavo e Cronaca*, 1949 to 1966
*Giornale di Scavo* 12 (1972–1973)

Pontificia Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae* (ICUR)
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