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1. FOUR CENTURIES OF STUDY OF THE JEWISH CATACOMBS OF ROME.

Early-twentieth-century plans of Rome detail an intense period of construction on the southernmost slope of the Monteverde above the Circonvallazione Gianicolense. A small cluster of paths next to deep, concave openings near the bottom of the hillside, however, marked where the last excavated areas of an ancient Jewish cemetery had been seen before its demolition. Leading up to that moment—a devastating landslide on October 14, 1928—were over three hundred years of exploration and spoliation of the site by Rome’s elite. Unlike earlier pillaging of the ancient cemetery by unknown forces, modern visitors, from the seventeenth to twentieth centuries, left conspicuous evidence of their passage, not in the increasingly bare cemetery galleries, but in documents, in studies, and in their collections or displays of unique epitaphs and artifacts that emphasized Jewish elements, something no longer evident on the site following the construction of a new residential area—the “Monteverde Quarter”—for the city.

The pioneering 19th century Talmudic scholar and historian, Abraham Berliner, wrote that he had “traveled the entire Roma Pagana... and Roma Christiana” to follow the history of the Jews in Rome. In the face of the loss of so much physical evidence from the Monteverde cemetery, the same approach must now be taken to write a history of the Jewish catacombs in Rome, for similar, even shared, paths were laid for the Christian and Jewish catacombs’s origins, development, abandonment, and partial preservation. Just as recent work on Jewish artifacts has argued against an “isolated” existence for Rome’s Jewish community in Late Antiquity, so, too, a study of the Jewish catacombs, particularly those on the Monteverde, considered for generations by many, if not all, an “isolated” site among the network of Christian burial places on both sides of the Tiber, requires deep immersion into centuries of scholarship on the Christian catacombs of Rome. So vulnerable to the political and theological issues that permeated the pages of scholarship, this Jewish catacomb—by virtue of its early discovery, extent, and, above all, destruction—should be seen, in a manner of speaking, as the “barometer” to measure the highs and lows of catacomb research, and any one generation’s focus on issues that are in many cases still unresolved today. Even in our own time, the Jewish catacombs risk “isolation” once again from our continued preoccupation with their “Jewishness”—on the administrative as well as scholarly level—and need to be examined in a more critical light for their structure, contents and “storia” as it were, the history of modern studies on these funerary sites.

When we place the Monteverde Jewish catacombs at the center of a discussion on the catacombs in Rome, it should surprise no one that nearly all whose works are under review enjoyed distinguished careers in the study of Christian antiquities. The fortunate moments in time during which these men were most active also brought progress to the study of Jewish antiquities in Rome. Regardless of the lesser attention they dedicated to the Jewish cemeteries, it is their testimonies, their scholarship, along with the artifacts rescued from the site, that provide the primary means by which we can continue today to study a site destroyed nearly a century ago. It is not possible to justify such a loss of our cultural patrimony, nor is the intent here to create some sort of “apology” for witnesses over time to its neglect and destruction. Our account of the discovery and exploration of the Monteverde Jewish catacombs in Rome from the seventeenth through early twentieth centuries should rather be seen as an opportunity to trace the growth of our knowledge on the site and introduce new data to stimulate further investigation into the circumstances surrounding its destruction. To this end, we treat every piece of evidence as precious, with some place, some value, in a broader historical account.
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2. SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY EXPLORATION OF THE MONTEVERDE JEWISH CATACOMBS

Jewish catacombs excavated into the steep slopes of the Monteverde hills above the via Portuense were visited in the early 17th century by explorer Antonio Bosio (1575–1629). On Saturday, December 14, 1602, Bosio, accompanied by Marquis Giovanni Pietro Caffarelli and Giovanni Zaratino Castellini, departed from the Porta Portese gates and proceeded for about a mile outside of Rome before taking the first right onto a smaller country road that climbed a steep hillside where a catacomb was rumored to be found. Penetrating with great difficulty from above into a narrow opening situated at a very dangerous point over open quarries—which may have accidentally brought parts of the unknown cemetery to light—they entered catacomb galleries excavated inside the “Colle Rosato” that overlooked the Tiber River. Although the gallery floors were strewn with rubble from landsides and tombs already desecrated and robbed, Bosio and his companions measured the cemetery “moderate” in size, and still blocked by debris in several areas.

Writing his account sometime in the decade after the visit, Bosio recalled that the catacomb’s appearance was similar to that of other catacombs he had seen in Rome, as it contained at least two cubicula and tombs cut into the walls (loculi) and pavement (formae). A large number of the surviving tombs had been sealed with brick, tile and mortar and painted with Greek letters. Bosio read the expression “Irene” many times, as he had done in Christian catacombs in Rome. But here and there was also the image of the menorah, either painted on or scratched into the mortar sealing the tomb. The repeated use of the menorah image and mention of a synagogue on one funerary epitaph led Bosio to correctly identify the site as a Jewish cemetery.

Zaratino Castellini also recalled the 1602 expedition to the Jewish catacomb in notes he made the same year in the margin of his personal copy of Martin Smetius’s Inscriptiones Antiquarum quae passim per Europam. Even in a far more abbreviated form, Castellini’s observations provide details not mentioned in Bosio’s published account, indicating that scholars were beginning—but just beginning—to put two and two together by identifying other Jewish archaeological remains with those seen on the Monteverde. Locating the Jewish catacomb “iuxta vineam de Panillis ... uno ab Urbe lapide in colle rosato,” (roughly one and a half kilometers outside the old city gates) Castellini found the site “vastum.” He continues: “in quo sepultiu sunt solum Hebraei Graeci,” for although he saw only traces of inscriptions painted in red over tiles covered with plaster, all in a badly deteriorated state, he was able to make out, like Bosio, the word “synagogue,” the repeated image of the seven-branched candelabrum, and a marble plaque with a fragmentary inscription in Greek, later in Bosio’s possession (contradicting Bosio himself, who had written that “non si vede ne’ pure un frammento di marmo, ne’ pittura”—meaning figurative).

Had the two men figured among the avid “corpisantari” of the time (already active in the search for “saintly” remains), they would have judged their expedition “miserabile” in results: the two-hour visit produced only fragmentary examples of epitaphs, a number of clay lamps (all shattered except for one with the menorah image), a badly corroded medallion, and, above all, no evidence of the figurative paintings that would grace so many of the pages of Bosio’s work. One of Bosio’s illustrators, Giovanni Angelo Santini, on his own—perhaps earlier—visit to the site, copied the single example of catacomb painting seen by Bosio: a large red menorah on the back wall at the end of a gallery (JIWE 2.202); he accompanied this with an engraving of the clay lamp with the menorah image at that time in Bosio’s possession.

In addition to souvenir-scavangering, Bosio, Caffarelli and Zaratino Castellini left the customary commemoration of their own passage through the site. Near the conclusion of the exploration, Bosio added a concluding dedication: “Omelia de Anima mea, Deo omnipotente, et animae meae, et animae parentis mei Marii, et animae fratris mei Johannis.”

Figure 1. A. Bosio, Roma Sotteranea (Rome, 1632) p. 143.
Roma Sotteranea, editor Giovanni Severano quotes the distich Zaratino Castellini added to one of the Jewish tombs:

Quid candelabrum prodest sine lumine Christi?
Perpetuis tenebris turba proteruaiaces.17

Sentiment aside, the visit to the Jewish catacomb was published with thirty or so other catacomb explorations made by Bosio before his death in 1629. Its inclusion in the Roma Sotteranea, for centuries the most influential study on the Christian catacombs of Rome, bound these two communities on paper as firmly as the Jews in Bosio’s own time were to the rules and restrictions of the Roman Ghetto. From the start, the Jewish catacomb’s presence was little questioned, for Bosio made no special “detour” from his format to include the site: it is found in Book Two in a topographical context—the last in a series of cemeteries on the left bank of the Tiber; witnesses are named; the appearance and condition of the tombs carefully noted.18 Only Bosio’s choice of words when addressing his readership at the beginning and end of the chapter anticipates some controversy or response—for he awaits, he writes, a “piu’ sano, e migliore giudizio,” in light, perhaps, of his failure to identify known Christian cemeteries along the same route—and he singles out certain details (poor, unembellished tombs; crudely made galleries and cubicula, and prevalence of Greek) to “distinguish” the Jewish site. Especially to this point are the illustrations of the menorah that accompany the text.19

The few common elements that Bosio notes in both Jewish and Christian catacombs are not attributed to contemporary developments in Roman funerary architecture but rather to the Christians’ adherence to Hebrew Scripture and customs that predate the arrival of the Jews in Rome.20 Such reasoning was far less controversial for its time, as it held fast to contemporary teachings on the origins of Christian funerary practices that made catacombs both recognizable and relevant to a devout Catholic of the age.21 As an exemplary “orthodox” approach, in fact, it also points to why many of Bosio’s conclusions—the choice of catacombs as evidence of ancestral burial customs; the topographical relationship of a Jewish catacomb to a synagogue in that area of Rome; even its possible greater antiquity with respect to the Christian sites—remain in vogue today among scholars.22

In the absence of literary source material for Jewish catacombs, Bosio dwells instead on the plight of contemporary Jews to illustrate the scant archaeological remains of a millennium before. Trastevere—the urban quarter nearby—is described as the area most “segregated” in the ancient city, not unlike the modern Ghetto, and thus “given” to the Jews, since it housed “gente bassa e meccanica.”23 Inspired by a brief passage of Martial, which he believed referred to a Jew, Bosio also fast-forwards over centuries to liken Martial’s image of a peddler to that of the Jewish merchants of his own time, voices raised in lament, testament, in Bosio’s terms, to their own “miseria e dannazione.”24 The author finally justifies to readers the inclusion of the Jewish site by reasoning that Rome’s ancient Jews had continued to live according to their own rites and customs: just as the Jews in 17th century Rome were exercising a very old privilege of burial just outside the Portuense Gates, so, too, would the ancient Jews have kept a subterranean burial place separate from those of the Christians.25 To this point, other catacombs in the area—especially the important remains of those of Ponziano—were illustrated in marked contrast as Christian by merit of paintings of Biblical scenes and artifacts containing Christian symbols, features Bosio would also describe in nearly all the thirty or so other cemeteries he explored near Rome.26

The lasting influence of Bosio’s account of the Monteverde Jewish catacomb is all the more remarkable because the site description itself is rather cursory, amidst a “patchwork” of research pieced together by an editor who chose to omit or misrepresent important details such as the discovery of at least one inscription on marble, later in Bosio’s own possession, and Bosio’s commentary on two Jewish funerary epitaphs in marble reused in Trastevere churches (CIL 1/IJWE 2 nn. 507/543 & 503/549) that contained elements similar to those in the Monteverde catacomb (on one, the word “synagogue” and on both the menorah image).27 There was more evidence at hand for a Jewish presence in ancient Rome—and in the catacombs. The conflicting, fragmentary observations published in Bosio’s work are thus in no small part the consequence of Bosio’s premature death before the work was complete and the editing of the finished copy of the Roma Sotteranea by the Oratorian Giovanni Severano.28

Nowhere is this conflict over Jewish evidence more clear than in Book Four, the concluding chapter to the Roma Sotteranea, in which Severano interprets images copied in the catacombs by Bosio’s illustrators, as well as by Bosio himself.29 Here, after describing the significance of various Old Testament, Christian and Pagan figures and symbols, Severano makes explicit reference to the Jewish catacomb in a section titled “Candelabrum.” He writes that the menorah image—the “candelabro a sette braccia” was also found in Christian catacombs—a puzzling comment, given the lack of surviving evidence in the Christian catacombs today.30 Only in rare instances have artifacts with symbols and images associated with Judaism (especially gold glass and terracotta lamps) been documented in the Christian catacombs of Rome.31 Severano may have included commentary on the menorah from patristic sources alone.32 But this would not explain his decision to include, in the same series of “appendices” to Christian art, images such as the crown, four seasons, trees, chairs, houses, and other “indifferent signs”—most likely, these had been found among Bosio’s notes.33 This raises the possibility that the reference is, in
fact, to Jewish cemeteries other than those on the Monteverde that Severano (and perhaps Bosio) assumed to be Christian because of their proximity to Christian cemeteries like those on the Appia, whose limits at that time were unknown, or because structural and decorative elements had made their attribution to Jews, Christians or Pagans impossible to determine.34

Severano’s own lengthy preface and apology for this chapter in a discussion of Christian iconography suggests that the brevity of Bosio’s account was not entirely based on the small surviving section of the Jewish catacomb he himself had visited but rather that such data added little or nothing to the idea of the catacombs as a “visual guide to ancient Christian practice.” 35 Yet in a topographical context, with actual material in hand, Bosio had already made a powerful case for a Jewish cemetery, rightly characterizing the seven-branched candelabrum as “peculiare de’ Giudei che perseverance’ fin ai tempi nostri, come ne facevano testimonianza li titoli levati dal moderno cimitero loro (Ortaccio) per ordine della Sacra Riforma.” 36 Identifying the menorah as a continuous element in Jewish religious practice is consistent with the overall theme of Bosio’s work: that ancient cemeteries held evidence of Christian rites and beliefs.37

3. “DE JUDAIS ITALICIS SPECTAT”: JEWISH ANTIQUITIES IN ROME DURING THE SEVENTEENTH—EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

While Antonio Bosio and his fellow Romans were among the first generations to witness a Jewish Ghetto in Rome (1555), they still associated Rome’s Jewish population with the Trastevere/Portuense area because of that Roman neighborhood’s actual or traditional links to the long history of the Jews in Rome.38 It would seem natural to Bosio—a keen student of Classical and Biblical literature—that a Jewish cemetery would exist close to an urban area populated by the Jews since Classical times.39 He was ignorant, however, of the small number of post-Classical sources that would support his conclusion, although the omission is corrected in a later edition of his work.40 Among this number, surely the most unique is the Itinerarium of the Spanish rabbi, Benjamin of Tudela, which links rabbinical tradition to Rome’s physical remains. Visiting Rome in the mid-twelfth century, the rabbi takes note of caverns on a hillside overlooking the Tiber where ten Jewish martyrs had been laid to rest.41 In a city surrounded by suburban shrines to the Christian martyrs and saints, it is suggestive that the rabbi singles out a site closely resembling that of the Jewish catacombs on the Monteverde. More prosaic Medieval land grants refer to a “fundum ... judeorum” on the via Aurelia (1018), a “contrada Hebraeorum in Pozzo Pantaleo” between the via Aurelia and via Portuense (1491), and a long strip of land by the via Portuense as the “Campo (Cemetery) dei Giudei al pozzo S. Pantaleo” (1123).42 All these would have been located outside of the ancient Porta Portese (rebuilt at another location under Pope Urban VIII in 1643).43

Over the course of the Middle Ages and well into Bosio’s time, agrarian activities and quarrying for volcanic pozzolanic ash brought drastic changes to a landscape once defined by suburban villas, cemeteries and religious shrines.44 Part of a rich but now-desolate Roman Campagna, the site was no doubt known to the many of the locals engaged in the time-honored practice—nowhere executed more than in Rome itself—of removing marble plaques from the ancient cemeteries for re-use in Rome’s churches and secular sites.45 As Medieval land grants imply, a rural settlement in the area of the “Colle Rosato” must have sustained itself on tomb robbing in addition to quarrying for the Monteverde tufa.46 Bosio’s own expert eye showed him that the Jewish catacomb had not been spared these “curiosi e avidi cavatori.”47 Tomb violations on the Monteverde, as in virtually all the catacombs around Rome, continued well into the first decades of the 20th century, with long-sealed graves often destroyed, as has been pointed out, in the course of thoughtless “divertimento.”48

Despite the success of Bosio’s volume, and the now-certain location of the site, the via Portuense Jewish catacombs remained extraordinarily difficult to access. This was not solely the fault of their condition. Bosio, “romano” by adoption and even more so by vocation, may have wandered at will through the catacombs in the company of Rome’s most influential citizens and clerics, but even these men could not refrain from scavenging through the sites for souvenirs.49 Those with fewer scruples seized upon the occasion to profit even more from the Rome-based relics trade.50 Starting in the seventeenth century, and for centuries thereafter, the Church came down hard on the indiscriminate removal of bones from the catacombs (Bosio’s own collaborator, “Toccafondo” was caught in the act). One of the motives expressed by Papal officials was to prevent the “sacriligious” act of passing off as saintly remains the bones of “un ladro, un’ assassino, e forse d’un Ebreo.”51 Two years after Bosio’s Monteverde tour, a papal edict ordered the owners of vineyards and country estates below which the catacombs were found to wall up any entrances to these sites (given Bosio’s continued explorations and the government’s renewed attempts to enforce this order, the edict must have been ignored on a wide scale).52 An unfortunate result was that the landowners themselves were reluctant to report on catacomb discoveries—although now, with Bosio’s precise topographical notes, the presence of catacombs was impossible to deny—and artifacts continued to be reported in a purely unofficial capacity, generally after
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excavators had brought them to noted antiquarians and ecclesiastics for a reward.\textsuperscript{53}

As a consequence, Bosio’s work on the Roman catacombs remained the master key to enter into the scholarly discussion on early Christian antiquities.\textsuperscript{54} But it was no sacred text. In 1651, another member of the Oratory of S. Filippo Neri, Paolo Aringhi, published a long-awaited Latin version, the \textit{Roma Subterranea Novissima} that, as its title suggests, provides an extensive re-working of Bosio’s original text. Few paragraphs in the chapter on the Jewish catacomb bear even a semblance to Bosio’s work (Aringhi, in fact, pointedly omits much of Bosio’s own account of his visit and personal observations about the Jews in Rome in his time).\textsuperscript{55} The revised discussion is padded instead with lengthy quotes from Church fathers and medieval writers to introduce irrelevant speculation on the historical and spiritual place of Jews in a Christian world.\textsuperscript{56} In conclusion, Aringhi finds “confirmation” of Bosio’s discovery in Benjamin of Tudela’s \textit{Itinerarium} which describes what Aringhi cannot refrain from labeling as the tombs of ten “pseudo martyrs” of the “Modern Mosaic Religion”; a term Aringhi deliberately employs to distinguish Biblical customs that influenced Christian practices (“Christianus ritus funeralium ab antiquis Hebraeorum patribus acceperet”) from the Judaism of his day.\textsuperscript{57} Aringhi’s Latin version drew international attention to the catacombs, but succeeded only in diminishing the beauty and originality of Bosio’s work.\textsuperscript{58}

Aringhi’s \textit{Roma Subterranea Novissima} is illuminating in one aspect: that Bosio’s work, however novel and constructive, is both the beginning and the end of an era in the study of Jewish catacombs in Rome.\textsuperscript{59} In the decades following its publication, the focus of the Roman Church shifted from verifying the existence of the cemeteries themselves to identifying “signs of sanctity” on a martyr’s grave. Papal administrations struggled at this time to process the near-overflow of artifacts and discoveries from the catacombs, as well as the corresponding avalanche of requests from the Catholic world for saintly remains. In 1668, by Apostolic Decree, Pope Clement IX established a Pontifical Commission to regulate the extraction of artifacts and other remains from the Christian cemeteries and, shortly thereafter, a new position was created for a “Custodian of the Sacred Cemeteries and Relics,” whose role would be to exercise all caution when identifying and extracting human remains from the tombs.\textsuperscript{60}

Over the next half-century, a \textit{triunvirate} comprised of the Cardinal Vicar, Palace Sacristan and Custodian of the Relics handled all extractions from the catacombs.\textsuperscript{61} Those with an explicit Jewish identity (very few in number) they kept on private display. We find the Cardinal Vicar instrumental to the reforms of 1668, Gaspare di Carpegna, in possession of a fragment of decorated gold-glass with Jewish motifs. The Vatican itself had another, and the Vallicelliana, where Bosio’s manuscripts and collections were housed, displayed a third.\textsuperscript{62}

All are attributed, nonetheless, to the Christian catacombs, where, according to one scholar, they might have “served to mark the grave of individual(s) of Hebrew origin.”\textsuperscript{63} In this manner, Bosio’s colleagues and immediate successors in the study and cataloguing of Classical and Christian antiquities took note of a handful of Jewish artifacts in private or ecclesiastical hands, publishing these in a heavily Christian context that made no explicit reference to the Jewish catacombs of Rome.\textsuperscript{64} The Jewish catacomb itself lay well outside the interests of the Commission, except when it was necessary to reiterate Bosio’s original thesis of the exclusivity of Christian burial. Marc’Antonio Boldetti’s \textit{Osservazioni sopra i cimiteri de’ santi martiri} illustrates very clearly the rapid surveying of sites at this time for signs of Christianity and quick abandonment.
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\textsuperscript{62} The Jewish catacomb itself lay well outside the interests of the Commission, except when it was necessary to reiterate Bosio’s original thesis of the exclusivity of Christian burial. Marc’Antonio Boldetti’s \textit{Osservazioni sopra i cimiteri de’ santi martiri} illustrates very clearly the rapid surveying of sites at this time for signs of Christianity and quick abandonment.
of the smaller catacombs that often lacked them. These cursory inspections may well have neglected the Jewish sites. Access through quarries and other clandestine modes of entry, however, would have subjected these catacombs as well to many ignorant and uncontrolled acts of destruction, exactly as was being done to many ancient ruins in and around the city of Rome at this time.

Boldetti’s work, published in 1720 at the request of Pope Clement XI, is a canonical defense of more than a century’s worth of translations of otherwise unknown “martyrs” from the catacombs of Rome. It is compelling, in its own fashion, for references to documents at Boldetti’s disposal, and the material evidence he himself was able to review in over thirty years’ of explorations in the catacombs of Rome—a great deal of material, indeed, and most undocumented. His statements on the Jewish catacombs are unsurprisingly consistent with the “static” condition of research on the catacombs since Bosio’s time, despite Boldetti’s role as one of the Church-appointed preachers to Rome’s Jews and Scriptor Hebraicæ Linguæ, or reviewer of Hebrew texts.

Boldetti twice reproduces—with little or no comment—illustrations of artifacts with Jewish symbols from the recently published catalogues of Buonarotti and Bartoli, and only does so because they are on the same page as other objects in discussion (the menorah on a clay lamp is thus described, once again, as the “rappresentazione di Cristo medesimo”). Then Boldetti turns to inscriptional evidence to refute all possible claims that the Christian catacombs had been “profaned” by Jewish tombs. At several points in his work, he states that neither he nor his predecessors had found inscriptions in the catacombs “con caratteri ebraici, o Greci con formole sepolcrali ebraiche,” or that identified a Hebrew by name. In reference to Bosio’s earlier discoveries, Boldetti reasons that a people “tenacissimo de’ proprii riti” would have retained the language and customs of Ancient Israel for their burials in Rome. It is an argument similar to Boldetti’s emphatic denial of the catacombs as ever having been “profaned” by pagan tombs. For Boldetti, a Jewish tomb would be as distinctive as a Christian or Pagan tomb, in an environment exclusive to members of that cult. His approach did not consider the context in which an inscription or other piece of evidence was found, and accepted a very limited definition of what could be included in an epitaph to an ancient Jew.

Boldetti’s arguments are weakened by his own admission that Bosio had read Jewish inscriptions composed not in Hebrew, but in Greek. And, while correct to affirm that no Jewish inscriptions had been found in an original funerary setting, he makes no mention of the Jewish inscriptions recently published by the Protestant scholars Jacob Spon and William Fleetwood, or even those in the works of his predecessor, Raffaele Fabretti. He himself may have unknowingly copied Jewish inscriptions (found out of context) or assigned Christian “virtues” to expressions later found in Jewish inscriptions in Rome (as a result, identifying epitaphs and artifacts that may have originally been found in a Jewish context as Christian or pagan). This alone cannot prove, however, that the “Custodians” visited Bosio’s Jewish catacomb, or any other Jewish catacomb in Rome to the date of the publication of the Osservazioni. At any rate, Boldetti’s statements on Jewish artifacts and cemeteries would be eclipsed over the next quarter century by new evidence and approaches to collecting and classifying artifacts from Ancient Rome.

For all its limitations, Boldetti’s Osservazioni is important because it is one of the few printed sources to promote the work of the Jesuit Giovanni Marangoni, the first Roman explorer since Bosio believed to have recorded Jewish epitaphs from the Monteverde catacomb, possibly in situ. Although for many years Boldetti’s assistant and later successor in the role as “Custodian of the Sacred Cemeteries,” Marangoni himself published little after a disastrous house fire in 1737 claimed many of his manuscripts and materials for study. The Jewish inscription Marangoni copies in the Church of S. Maria in Trastevere, “litteris male sculptis” has never been found; two others are known only from his notes, and are assigned with no specific reason to the Monteverde site.

An exception is Marangoni’s spectacular recovery in 1732 of a sarcophagus lid, inscribed in Greek but with the Hebrew acclamation for “Peace,” found on the second mile of the Appian Way where a Jewish catacomb would “officially” come to light in 1859. Significant as the first Jewish inscription from Rome partially written in Hebrew, and first published material evidence for a Jewish tomb or cemetery on the Appia, for which scholars eagerly found confirmation in a passage from Juvenal (cited first by Aringhi), the fragment also attracted attention to its figurative decoration—theatre masks—a standard motif on sarcophagi from the period but in this case a source of confusion for scholars who weighed the Jewish ban on images against the Jewish identification of the deceased. Marangoni himself makes no reference to this piece in his apology for Boldetti’s display of pagan epitaphs in the church of Sta. Maria in Trastevere, although he comments at length in the work on evidence that not all images were forbidden to the Jews, and that it was the Jews of the “present” (i.e. Christian period) who attacked the Catholic Religion’s use of images as idolatrous.

The sarcophagus excited many of Marangoni’s contemporaries, including a young Jesuit scholar, Antonio Maria Lupi, who spent many student days in Rome copying inscriptions from the sites. Lupi publishes the piece with four other Jewish inscriptions (one not recognized as Jewish) in his exposition of a Christian epitaph from the via Salaria (the Jewish epitaphs, therefore, are not discussed as a group).
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vides accurate data on each inscription’s appearance and location seen by “oculis (suis).” He reveals that two of the Jewish inscriptions were now housed in the important collections of the Kircherian and Palazzo Capponi (residence of the Marquis Alessandro Gregorio Capponi, president of the newly founded Capitoline Museums), in marked contrast to those published in the past which had been seen primarily in decorative or architectural settings (i.e. fountains, foundations, and pavements). Yet, in the pedagogical spirit with which he had composed this exercise for Palermo’s youth, Lupi labels the Jewish inscriptions as testaments of a “populi damnati,” the Jews. In a work rich with epigraphical detail and linguistic commentary, this gratuitous anti-Jewish sentiment is a sad testimony to the inability of Roman Catholic scholars to liberate their study of the early Church from theological polemic and political concerns.

Instead of the official “Conservatori dei Sacri Cimiteri,” it was up to antiquarians to record vestiges of the Jewish catacomb still visible in the mid 18th century. The historian Giuseppe Bianchini, in the company of Cardinal Domenico Passionei, reported on the Monteverde catacomb’s continued, but fragile state in a description of the via Portuense in 1747. Perhaps in deference to Severano and Aringhi’s work (Bianchini belonged to their same order), his own account adds little to those of the earlier authors. The accompanying illustration by the engraver Giuseppe Vasi suggests, too, that the artist was simply elaborating upon Santini’s earlier design of a catacomb painting from the Roma Sotterranea—although his depiction of the ancient site emerging from a cliff still obscured by dense vegetation bears an uncanny resemblance to a later image of that same area of the catacomb shortly before its destruction.

Bianchini’s report was well received by the newly appointed head of Rome’s Antiquities Commission (or more revealingly titled “Commissario sopra gli scavi d’antichità, cementi e pozzolana”). This was Ridolfino Venuti (1705–1763), responsible, among other things, for granting licenses to excavate in Rome and brokering the dispersal of antiquities to various collections in Rome and abroad. Perceiving well the interest of antiquarians in “ethnic” items, like those belonging to the Jews, Venuti published two Jewish inscriptions in May of 1748 that had been excavated just days before in the Monteverde “crypta, o catacomba” that “one still sees” although no longer as “ben conservata” as in Bosio’s time. Venuti accepts Bianchini’s account in totum, but colors more suggestive passages with secondary sources that have little or no bearing on the evidence at hand. Jewish burial practices are made quite distinct from those of the Pagans and Christians by comparison to those illustrated in Johann Nicolaü’s De Sepulchris Hebraeorum (1706), and Venuti’s over-reliance on this and other commentaries on rabbinical texts lead him to confuse medieval Hebrew epitaphs with those from Antiquity. He presents with enthusiasm the newly recovered inscriptions from the Monteverde catacomb,
“poor” in appearance, but destined to be a “non piccolo ornamento” of the Pennacchi museum, but spends less time on the new texts than he does illustrating Jewish inscriptions already known in Rome from Lupi’s work. Following the article’s publication in a journal widely circulated among antiquarians in Rome and abroad, Venuti may have facilitated the exportation of Jewish inscriptions to Sicily that are now on display in the Castello Ursino in Catania, as well as others later seen in private collections in Rome and attributed to the Monteverde excavations of 1748.

Venuti’s article inspired in part a remarkable project undertaken during the late 18th century by the Neapolitan priest, lawyer, and poet, Gaetano Migliore, to describe “la condizione degli Antichi Giudei d’Italia.” The project was perfectly suited to a man like Migliore, whose career and records inspire tribute even today as an “ottimo latinista e polemista.” Well-connected to the Neapolitan aristocracy and their Roman cousins, but also vulnerable to political maneuvers that had cost him a promising academic career, Migliore arrived in Rome in the early 1770s and was soon caught up in the rich cultural life the city had to offer to scholars of antiquity. He was inspired, above all, by epigraphical puzzles, and so began a critical study of inscriptions from both Rome and the Kingdom of Naples that he maintained “falsamente attribuiti ai cristiani” and, in fact, Jewish. This statement might have been received very poorly by the Papal Court some years before when the market for relics was at its height, but Migliore, himself no stranger to politics, now had a larger supply of material and more enlightened audience for these arguments whose implications were well kept in the ancient past. Considered by many the actual “Father of Jewish Epigraphy,” Migliore nonetheless remained, in all respects, a capable and secure papal functionary, never calling into question Bosio and Boldetti’s assertions about the Christian catacombs of Rome.

At some point during the course of his research, Migliore gained access to the Monteverde Jewish catacomb (perhaps still visible thirty years after the last-known “sighting”) in order to make a plan and description of the site. Inside, the catacomb’s wretched condition forced Migliore to abandon all his plans to explore. The fruits of his labor are the forty-two inscriptions he classified as Jewish, primarily from content and appearance.

In 1775, Migliore was transferred from Rome to Ferrara, and found less and less time for his studies. The work on Jewish inscriptions was incomplete when he died in 1789, but happily rescued from obscurity by a local scholar, Girolamo Amati, who sent a copy of Migliore’s manuscript to the prefect of the Vatican Archives, Luigi Gaetano Marini (1742–1815). Migliore’s collection of Jewish inscriptions was absorbed into Marini’s “Epitaphia Hebraeorum” and while both syllogies remained in manuscript form, later scholars of Jewish and Christian archaeology in Rome made good use of their labors.
in Rome—even copied, forged, or embellished on occasion, a dubious honor, but testament to their value among collectors.103 There were now “Jewish collections” within larger exhibits of inscriptions, like those of Cardinal Stefano Borgia at Velletri, later in the Naples Museum; the Kircherian at the Collegio Romano; the Vatican and the Cloisters of Saint Paul’s Outside the Walls in Rome.104 Lists of Jewish inscriptions in Rome grew longer and more complete.105 But the Jewish cemeteries themselves, like their Christian counterparts, still inspired little critical inquiry and publication until Bosio’s legacy was revived with lasting success by a Jesuit scholar at the Collegio Romano: Father Giuseppe Marchi, S.J (1795–1860).106

In 1842, as the newly appointed Director of the Kircherian Museum and Conservator of the Sacred Cemeteries in Rome, Marchi acquired a unique, trilingual Jewish inscription recently found during construction on the Ripa Grande in Trastevere.107 In a letter to the Italian neoclassical architect Luigi Poletti, perhaps in some way involved with the find, Marchi reveals his familiarity not only with Bosio’s work but also with the later discoveries of Jewish inscriptions in Rome (the Kircherian itself possessed a number of these).108 The letter itself is a testament to Marchi’s own long-standing ambition to re-discover the lost Jewish catacomb as the “model” for subterranean Christian burial in Rome.109

As keen a topographer as Bosio was in his own time, Marchi found the inscription “ben facile ... per chiunque ne voglia chieder conto all’antica topografia di cotesa regione Trastiberina” and set out almost immediately for the barren vineyards on the Monteverde in the company of technicians and others eager to take up the cause.110 Marchi spent considerable funds and energy on three unsuccessful campaigns to explore the Jewish catacomb in February of 1843, when “non si puo’ nascondere ne’ una piega sola” below the wintry slope.111 But his interviews with landowners and fruitless attempts to liberate crevices and blocked passageways convinced Marchi that the Jewish catacomb remained “interramenti sottratti all’occhio del Ricercatore.”112

This was the same conclusion reached nearly twenty years later by the de Rossi brothers, Giovanni Battista and Michele Stefano, who collaborated on the first volume of the Roma Sotterranea Cristiana. In the years leading up to its publication in 1864, Giovanni Battista de Rossi was asked about the Monteverde catacomb in light of new evidence of Jewish burial in ancient Rome from a second Jewish catacomb on the via Appia, discovered in 1859.113 De Rossi had more or less the coordinates for the Monteverde cemetery, “in una vigna vicina ma non propria nel luogo di Pozzo Pantaleo,” but it was his geologist brother who could confirm the accuracy of Bosio’s observations in a rural area still divided into “strati naturali.”114 Quarries in operation, however, were continuing to undermine the base of the hill slope and the pilings that supported older caves. In addition, the upper slope was being transformed into a series of uniform “terraces” for cultivation. Nothing was seen of the Jewish catacomb, and M. S. de Rossi was not wrong to predict that only a landslide or “dispendiosissima escavazione” would bring it back into the open.115

His older brother, Marchi’s closest disciple, had more complicated issues to consider, and an “evolution” of sorts in his approach to the Jewish catacombs is apparent from publications of the time. Some years previously, de Rossi had written of plans to conclude the Inscriptiones Christianae Urbs Romae with an appendix “inscriptionum veterum Hebraeorum.”116 It appears this would have followed the organization of Jewish epitaphs in works like those of Marini and the Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum (1859) in which nearly all examples carry a specific mention or sign of Judaism. It was a work, too, that de Rossi would have had to compile from written sources and isolated artifacts no longer in the ancient sites.117 But, in 1859, a figurative rather than literal landslide in the Jewish catacombs occurred—and not on the Monteverde. Instead of the rediscovery of a catacomb long thought “unique” among ancient cemeteries in Rome, a “new” Jewish catacomb on the via Appia came to light and quickly became the centerpiece of the mid-19th century revival of a much older controversy about the pagan origins of subterranean burial in Rome.118 This catacomb’s cubicula painted with Classical motifs (which de Rossi considered pagan in origin), and examples of monumental burial (i.e. arcosolia, mausolea, and sarcophagi), indicated not only a chronology of use (according to de Rossi) between the second and fourth centuries CE, but also a near-complete conformity to local burial practices and customs.119 De Rossi had been exploring burial sites for decades in and around Rome. Now, with this new evidence of similar topographical and structural elements in all burial hypogaea—pagan, Jewish and Christian, he recognizes that “le antichita’ giudaiche sono intimamente connesse alle cristiane” and argues for non-Christian evidence as a sign of the “passaggio dal paganesimo al cristianesimo” the reason why “come troviamo cripte cristiane isolate, viceversa troviamo talvolta cimiteri sotteranei non cristiani” placing in this category, the “due spettanti agli Ebrei.”120 The Jewish catacomb on the Appia, de Rossi writes, is “certamente d’eta’ cristiana,” and reinforces this belief several times by citing evidence from the catacomb when describing the Christian cemeteries on the Appia that are his main focus of study.121

The Christian evidence, however, far outnumbers that of a pagan and Jewish presence in these sites, and de Rossi does not waver on two points: the exclusivity of Christian and Jewish burial sites and their unique development into true “catcombs” for large numbers of the faithful.122 But here his arguments are ideological as well as archaeological. Rather
than view, as Marchi had, the Monteverde Jewish catacomb as the “genesis” for Christian and Jewish subterranean burial in Rome, de Rossi finds a more likely prototype for both in the sepulchral caves of Palestine, “modified” thanks to particular qualities found in Rome’s volcanic soil, to the cemeteries now known as catacombs for these communities, “senza che gli uni abbiano dovuto farsi perciò imitatori.” 123 It was, for de Rossi, “lo speciale vincolo di comunità religiosa e nazionale, che strinse fra loro Ebrei... come la fratellanza cristiana” that inspired a purely Roman method of excavating “vie sotteranee... fra cripta e cripta e fiancheggiate anch’esse da sepolcreti.” 124 In sum, while the pagans had initiated the excavation of hypogaeas, their cemeteries appeared limited and “isolated”: while the catacombs, as de Rossi described them, created an “ampia e cattolica necropoli cristiana” (de Rossi’s italics).” 125 This, to de Rossi, is fundamental to understanding the Christian identity of the catacombs, their monumental nature, and unprecedented growth. The Christian community “usata dal seno della sinagoga” had taken with it many riti e costumi del giudaismo,” but in the extensive growth of the catacombs it had, in de Rossi’s view, come into its own.

The Jewish minority in the city, which practiced the same forms of burial, yet without mention in the ancient sources, ultimately had but little presence in his archaeological works. The reasons for this are complex. Certainly de Rossi’s methods described in his introduction to the first volume of the Roma Sotteranea Cristiana are best applied to the identification of monumental crypts and other Christian sites in Rome and its suburbium. 126 The Jewish catacomb on the Appia had not been placed in the control of the Commissione di Archeologia Sacra, the entity through which de Rossi was able to study and preserve the Christian sites. 127 Its publication was in the hands of a scholar de Rossi disliked and resented, Raffaele Garrucci, who was able to get the “scoop” because the catacomb was not Christian and therefore excavated privately, with little supervisory control. 128 Still, de Rossi had a first-hand knowledge of the Jewish site that rivaled even that of Garrucci, and collected every notice of a Jewish inscription in Rome until his death in 1894. 129 Had de Rossi had the time and opportunity to publish all he had seen and recorded on the Appia, perhaps the Jewish presence would not have continued to appear so marginal in his later studies and reports.

Two years after publishing the Roma Sotteranea Cristiana, de Rossi identified a second Jewish catacomb in the Appian region, below the grounds of one Count Giovanni Battista Cimarra. Wrapped up as he was in the second and third volumes of his excavations on the Appia, de Rossi published little on this site. Over the next two decades, however, he encouraged others to study of the Jewish catacombs in Rome (and Garrucci, too, was still active in this area). By coincidence, the three scholars most willing to take up the challenge each represented one of the major religions of Europe at the time: Orazio Marucchi (Roman Catholic), Nicholas Muller (Protestant), and Abraham Berliner (Jewish). 130 Marucchi discovered a Jewish catacomb on the via Labicana in 1882; Muller excavated another he believed Jewish on the via Appia Pignatelli in 1885; and Berliner obtained from de Rossi his notes on the Vigna Cimarra Jewish catacomb to publish in his History of the Jews in Rome in 1893. 131 But these discoveries were seen as of minor importance: many, instead, took note of the situation on the Monteverde as construction began on the Rome-Viterbo railway line and Trastevere Station. 132 Anonymous tombs were discovered inside ancient tufa quarries above the Pozzo Panteone valley in 1885. 133 A small number of possibly Jewish inscriptions came to light in the last decade of the 19th century in the nearby vigena of San Carlo. 134 By the fall of 1904, however, Muller was ready to turn in the final results of twenty years of study of the Jewish catacombs in Rome and Venosa without ever having seen the Monteverde site. 135


In October of 1904, an Italian government vigil for the Portuense area took note of cemetery galleries above the quarries of one Adamo Brunozzi. 136 High up on the cliffs of a large artificial cavity whose base was six meters below ground level, grottoes and galleries with tombs had begun to appear. 137 Although landslides caused by industrial quarrying had exposed these galleries for some time (damaging also a dwelling below), the property owners had made no move to report the discovery. 138 On October 22, 1904, a joint team of inspectors from the Commissione Regionale per le Antichita’ e le Belle Arti and the Commissione di Archeologia Sacra searched the site. 139

The quarry at via di Monteverde no. 5 inside the property of the Marquis Pellegrini Quarantotti was about 100 meters from the road, beyond the second gate into the site. 140 A pier inside had collapsed, bringing down a section of the hillside. As a result, galleries and cubicula emerged, but other parts of the cemetery now lay in the quarry below, over the remnants of over fifty tombs “a cappuccina” dug below the ground level and dated to the early Imperial period. 141

The catacomb itself, at first glance, seemed “anonymous” or, more confusingly, used in “different periods and (by) people of different religions.” 142 A child’s loculus was marked with the sign of the menorah, but the authorities thought other galleries contained tombs “servite evidentemente ai
cristiani.”"\textsuperscript{143} Until a large body of epigraphical evidence proved otherwise, it was thought that the catacomb might connect to the nearby cemetery of Ponziano, or even the catacombs below the Church of S. Pancrazio on the via Aurelia Antica northeast of the site.\textsuperscript{144}

Although much seemed already beyond all hope of repair, the Italian Ministry entrusted the Commissione di Archeologia Sacra (CDAS) “to preserve, whenever possible, the catacomb from further ruin,” noting at this time in 1904 its “grande competenza ... nella conservazione degli antichi cimiteri cristiani del Suburbo.”\textsuperscript{145} CDAS inspector Augusto Bevignani initially despaired of any sort of recovery, but three Jewish epitaphs in the debris and the menorah painted on the end wall of a surviving gallery identified the site as the Jewish catacomb seen by Bosio three centuries before.\textsuperscript{146}

Orazio Marucchi, now a senior member of the CDAS and director of the Lateran’s Christian Museum, experienced much personal satisfaction in this rediscovery of “il piu’ antico dei cimiteri giudaici di Roma” that his father and Marchi had sought but in vain sixty years before.\textsuperscript{147} And Muller, arriving in Rome on November 2, 1904, immediately visited the site in the company of PCAS members Kanzler and Bevignani. As in the past, Muller received the Commission’s full support to study the Jewish site, although relations would later be strained by what Muller termed “ostacoli insormontabili”: the continued quarrying on the property; difficult negotiations with the Marchesi Pellegrini-Quaranotti for workers insurance and financial compensation; deadlines extended for Muller’s prolonged absences to fulfill teaching responsibilities in Germany; and differences between the scholars themselves about the condition and conservation of the site.

Muller funded much of his exploration of the Monteverde catacomb between 1904 and 1906 with grants from the Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums (Society for the Augmentation of the Study of Judaism in Berlin).\textsuperscript{148} The first season of excavations—primarily to recapture objects already damaged and displaced—lasted from November 1904 to January 1905; a second was conducted between March and April of 1906 (the entrance area and stairs, destroyed by a landslide on 12-13 April, 1906); and a third and, as it turned out, final phase from September to October of that year.

In these campaigns, Muller explored most, but not all areas of the Jewish catacomb.\textsuperscript{149} The plan drafted by Palombi in October of 1906, towards the end of Muller’s excavations, shows an area circa 80 x 65 meters with clusters of galleries and a few large chambers destroyed, in part, by the ever-increasing, “crater-like” gorge that had already devoured the original atrium in its entirety.\textsuperscript{150}

Many of the large chambers—also identified as “grottoes”—were found in a concentrated area at the base of a wide stairway (3m/width) leading to an apparent vaulted entrance/atrium, whose characteristics (recycled materials in construction, with a high percentage of mortar rather than brick) led Muller to conclude it had been added at a later phase to the cemetery.\textsuperscript{151} On a second, never-published plan (probably dating to late 1904–1905), a number of these “grottoes” and recesses around the gorge follow an irregular plan—with three or four tiers of loculi on the walls—but then narrow to form more “cemeterial” galleries that go deeper into the hillsides.\textsuperscript{152} This earlier plan also gives a clearer sense of the extent of the damage done to the site, illustrating the extent to which the cemetery had collapsed thus far into the quarry below.

To the southeast, Muller discovered three galleries with perpendicular offshoots, all in a southerly direction except for one that connected to the area destroyed by the gorge; the area southwest of the entrance presented more of a mix of both wide and narrow-cut galleries and cubicula.\textsuperscript{153} In front of the entrance itself, and oriented northeast, were another series of galleries without cubicula.\textsuperscript{154}

To Muller, such differences in excavation indicate several phases of use, extending over centuries, from the first century CE well into the fourth (although today, the artifacts and the evidence collected from Muller’s papers does not date the catacomb significantly earlier than the other Roman catacombs, excavated primarily during the third and fourth centuries CE).\textsuperscript{155} He imagines that the earlier “grottoes”—emphatically termed “unusual” for a subterranean cemetery in Rome—had been used like burial chambers in the Middle East, and that only the later galleries, straighter and more carefully planned, had been constructed in the manner of the catacombs in Rome.\textsuperscript{156} A short flight of steps led to a second, heavily damaged level below the northwest area near the entrance, but most of the accessible areas had originally been excavated into a single level, although possibly deepened in places.\textsuperscript{157} Muller also concludes on the basis of very limited epigraphic evidence that burials on the sub divo level dated later than those in the catacomb.\textsuperscript{158}

The loculus was by far the most common tomb-form, excavated more regularly (with piers for children’s tombs) than the tombs “a fossa.”\textsuperscript{159} True to Bosio’s report, very few, if any, of the tombs had remained intact, and those that were had been sealed either with large tiles or with rubble covered by a layer of plaster.\textsuperscript{160} Only one arcosolium was found on the back wall of a chamber, but around twenty clay sarcophagi were recovered in grottoes near the entrance, and fragments of decorated marble sarcophagi were found scattered throughout the site.\textsuperscript{161} Conspicuous as well, notably in the grottoes and recesses, were the tombs already noted by Bosio that had been excavated into or built over the pavement, and at times partially inserted into recesses in the wall.\textsuperscript{162} The cases covering the floor tombs were in many instances stacked...
on top of each other (in one grotto reaching ceiling), but in other areas the bodies had simply been left on the gallery floor. Evidence for “enchytrismos” style burial in clay jars is seen today as less conclusive.

Muller’s investigations yielded no less than 151 inscriptions on marble or tile, but few in situ (or re-used in later floor burials). A large number of clay lamps were recovered as well from the site. While pottery was abundant, only traces of gold glass and other small trinkets were found pressed into the plaster around the tombs. The CDAS, in its supervisory role, reaped the benefits of these finds. On December 16, 1904, the Pellegrini-Quarantotti conceded to the Lateran Museum “lucerne e molti laterizi bollati.” These were followed, in 1907, by 137 Jewish inscriptions to be displayed in a new “Sala Giudaica” with an inscription crediting Muller with their discovery. The collection, however, was to be hermetically sealed until Muller published his finds.
6. REPORTS AND PUBLICATION

Marucchi issued brief notices on the Monteverde Jewish catacombs in 1904 and 1907, even delaying the publication of the *Nuovo Bollettino* one year while awaiting Muller’s report from the site. In the absence of the latter, he also presented the initial results of the excavations at a meeting of the Pontifical Academy of Archaeology on January 17, 1907. Muller himself delivered his only lecture in Rome on the Monteverde excavations on April 24, 1909. A form of this lecture was published for his German benefactors in the series *Gesellschaft zur Förderung des Wissenschaft des Judentums: Schriften* (1912). Muller died on September 3 of that same year with much work still needing to be done. The CDAS filled some of this lacuna by including Muller’s 1909 lecture in the *Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia* of 1915, followed by the long-awaited publication of the inscriptions in the Lateran by CDAS member, Giorgio Schneider-Graziosi. In 1919, another scholar from Berlin, Nikos Bees, published the same epitaphs from Muller’s notes, with bitter commentary on Marucchi and Schneider-Graziosi’s decision, four years earlier, to anticipate his results. By that point, however, at least two additional catacomb areas (both Jewish) had emerged in neighboring properties, and Muller’s work no longer had a monopoly on the finds.

7. DISCUSSIONS, DELAYS, AND DEMOLITION: 1907–1910

In 1907 and again in 1909, Muller had attempted to resume study of the Monteverde catacomb. The children of the now-deceased Marquis Benedetto Pellegrini-Quarantotti (d. December 11, 1905) were now reluctant to comply. They claimed that the archaeological excavations had made cultivation of the land above the catacombs even more difficult and dangerous, and that the dig itself was now a liability in their plans to sell the land to Adamo Brunori, the quarry operator on the site. The Pellegrini-Quarantotti first appealed to the President of the CDAS. Finding this entity with only an informal role in the process, they then pressured Muller more intensely while applying to the Italian State for compensation. But it was their continued quarrying that finally provoked a response from the Antiquities Commission, which had left matters in the hands of the CDAS since 1904.

When ordered by the State to close these quarries in 1909, the Pellegrini petitioned the Consiglio Superiore delle Antichità e Belle Arti to demolish what remained of the Jewish catacomb, claiming again issues of safety and loss of revenue. The family then presented Muller with new conditions under which he could proceed with his excavations at his own expense: insurance for the workers, percentage of the finds and guarantee that the site could be demolished after the end of the excavations. Lacking the independent means with which to finance conservation work in the catacomb, Muller agreed to the Pellegrini Quarantotti’s demands. He justified this stating that the catacomb was not very extensive, and therefore the greater part of the catacomb had already been documented in his excavations from 1904–1906. The more recent areas of the catacomb, those most closely resembling the Christian catacombs, Muller added, might be conserved because they extended well beyond the reach of the quarries, and could allow, in this manner, a memorial to the ancient Jewish cemetery to remain on the site.

The Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione initially opposed the move, citing the recent revision of the Antiquities laws that encouraged the protection and conservation of all ancient monuments on Italian soil. It then appealed to Muller’s colleagues at the CDAS. The CDAS replied on March 4, 1909 that it would not condone the catacomb’s destruction “sembrando ai Commissari che il concedere ufficialmente la distruzione di un monumento, anche ridotto in
cattivo stato, ripugni assolutamente ad un istituto eretto per la conservazione delle antichità.” But Marucchi himself at one point in 1909 had assured the Pellegrini Quarantotti that the CDAS would not oppose the petition because “ormai gli studi e i rilievi fatti nella migliore maniera possibile assicurarono il cimitero alla scienza ed alla storia.” The Ministry’s Consiglio Superiore per le Antichità e le Belle Arti was now at a loss to provide a “concrete plan for the exploration and conservation” of the cemetery beyond some hope of an expropriation. It considered involving the Jewish community of Rome to provide “moral and material support.”

The situation reached a crisis point in the beginning of 1910, when another landslide in the Cava Brunori caused serious damage to the galleries already explored. A new inspection to verify Pellegrini’s claim that the site was dangerous and impossible to preserve convinced the Consiglio Superiore per le Antichità e le Belle Arti to relax its order to conserve at all costs the archaeological remains, with the feeble plea that this did not facilitate the actual destruction of the site. Following a second landslide in May of 1910, it was clear that the situation “did not permit (the catacomb’s) conservation, or systematic exploration.” Recovery efforts were meager: some photographs of the catacomb and salvage of artifacts from the rubble below. But even with the catacomb’s destruction now certain, the government archeological inspectors were expected to keep close watch over the site.

The Italian Government still was searching for a way to prevent further damage to the Jewish catacombs in Rome. In 1912, during the second term of Ernesto Nathan, Rome’s first Jewish mayor, who had been personally involved with the question of the Jewish catacombs in Rome for well over a decade, the Minister of Public Instruction, Luigi Credaro, drafted a “special convention” to hand over the Jewish catacombs of Rome to the CDAS. This more or less recognized that the CDAS “from its foundation” (in 1852) had been the driving force behind the excavation and study of the Jewish catacombs in Rome. The Ministry’s deal with the Papal commission was ratified in the Concordat between the Italian and Papal governments and 1929 and continued in vigor—rather less in practice—until that treaty’s revision in 1984.

8. TWENTIETH-CENTURY EXCAVATIONS: FOURTH AND FIFTH PHASES (1913 AND 1919)

Quarrying in the Cava Brunori on the Pellegrini-Quarantotti property resumed in 1907. The Jewish catacombs were not the only cemetery areas affected. Other hypogaea emerged in 1913 and 1919. The condition of the galleries discovered at the end of 1913 near the entrance into the Catacomb of Ponziano in a vineyard owned by the Rey family was seen as even more precarious than those found previously on the Pellegrini-Quarantotti properties. The region had its own entrance, but was impossible to excavate in its entirety. On Schneider-Graziosi’s plan, the galleries appear regularly planned; there are 5 cubica, one “nichè,” and one absis tomb (Q). Desecrated by vandals and then stripped of its inscriptions (graffitoes), bricks, and other artifacts (sent by the CDAS inspectors to the “Sala Giudaica” at the Lateran Museum), this cemetery, like the others, was not preserved.

In 1919, the use of dynamite for extracting lithoid tufa from the nearby quarries of the Cooperativa Impiegati del Sarcito broke apart other galleries of the Jewish cemetery. At this point, however, nothing could be done to document and preserve the site. Archaeologist Roberto Paribeni sent the inscriptions rescued from the rubble to the National Roman Museum. One additional Jewish inscription was discovered separately while laying the foundations of the nearby Ospedale della Vittoria in the former Vigna di S. Carlo, testifying to burial activity by Jews well into the Middle Ages in the valley of the “Pozzo Pantaleo.”

In the next decade, the cliffs and craters of the Monteverde tufa quarries gave way to the development of a new residential quarter for the city. In 1928, “probably Jewish” hypogaea came to light during construction on the church of Regina Pacis above the Rome-Viterbo railway in the area where Jewish inscriptions had already been found in 1919. These were small cemeteries excavated close to the surface level containing loculi sealed with tiles. Their location alone suggested some relation to the Jewish cemeteries.

In sum, it was the intense quarrying at the start of the 20th century that led to the Jewish catacomb’s collapse, and unremitting construction work through the late 1920s and early 1930s that sealed its destruction. On June 7, 1929, a treaty between the Italian State and the Holy See effectively gave control of the Jewish catacombs in the Province of Rome to the PCAS (formerly CDAS). Soon thereafter, the geologist Gioacchino De Angelis d’Ossat photographed the remains of six loculi on a gallery wall, the last evidence in situ of the Roman Jewish cemetery. It is he who makes one last plea to the CDAS to collaborate with the Italian Archaeologists and the Jewish community for the preservation of these remains. But, in the end, although quarrying ceased on the lower slopes of the hillside, artificial terraces for apartment buildings and villas on the Circonvallazione Gianicolense and via Vincenzo Monti covered the last traces of the site. Concluding thus the modern history of the catacomb, exceeding that, perhaps, of its ancient use, the cemetery’s disappearance is so recent as to haunt us still, and demands if it could, its own day of reckoning.
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Prof. Olof Brandt, Secretary of the Pontifical Institute of Christian Archaeology in Rome, kindly commented on an earlier draft of this work. I am also indebted, as always, to Sister Maria Francesca Antongiovanni, O.S.B. of Priscilla, for allowing me to accompany her to the Catacombs of Ponziano nearby, as well as her gift of J-B. Frey’s Corpus Inscriptionum Judicarum to accompany me on my visits to the Jewish sites.


2. Frutaz, 1962, n. 230.3, t. 602 (1930); n. 231.21, t. 625 (1934).

3. A. Berlitz, Storia degli ebrei di Roma. Dall’Antichità allo smaltimento del ghetto, trans. A. Audisio, Milan, 1992, introduction, p. 5. Berliner’s work was first published as the Geschichte der Juden in Rom in 1893, eleven years before the rediscovery of the Monteverde Jewish catacombs.

4. L. Rutgers, The Jews of Late Ancient Rome: Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora, Leiden, 1995, concludes, on p. 266: “The materials preserved in the Jewish catacombs of Rome suggest that the Jews buried there were neither assimilated nor isolated, but people who interacted freely with non-Jews.”


6. The last half-century has seen the release of two important monographs on the Jewish catacombs, that of Rutgers (op. cit., n. 5) and an earlier work of H. J. Leon, The Jews of Ancient Rome, Philadelphia, 1960. To borrow a phrase from Rutgers, 1995, p. 5, n. 14, a new “checklist” of sources is necessary, if only to consider more carefully the non-Jewish sources and archaeological and archival material not cited in previous studies on these sites.

7. Recent discussions on Bosio’s discovery of the Monteverde Jewish catacomb in Hirschfeld, 2008, p. 29; S. Fine, “Jewish Art and Biblical Exegesis in the Greco-Roman World,” in Picturing the Bible: The Earliest Christian Art, ed. J. Spier, M-C. Murray, New Haven, 2007, pp. 25–26; and M. Ghilardi, “‘Del cimiterio di gli antichi hebrei’: La catacomba ebraica di Monteverde nel IV centenario della scoperta,” in Studi Romani, 51, 1–2 (2003) pp. 29–30 & n. 60 (identification and bibliography of Bosio’s companions). Bosio undertook this journey after two years of exploration of the via Portuense which had yielded scant results for early Christian cemeteries in the area up to the “Pozzo Pantaleo,” notwithstanding the memory of these preserved in ancient and medieval literary sources familiar to Bosio and his contemporaries. He had already spent roughly a decade visiting catacombs along Rome’s other consular highways, and relied not only on archival research but also information he had gathered from farmers and other rural workers in the countryside around Rome. Bosio explains this latter method in Roma Sotterranea, ed. G. Severano, Rome, 1632, p. 125: “siamo diverse volte usiti dalla Porta Portuense (the original Roman gate, not that later built in another location by Pope Urban VIII), e andati con dilligenza ricercando le campi di essa per scoprir i sacri cimiterij, pero’ ancorche’ per relazioni di vignaroli vecchi e pratici di questi paesi, hàviamo havuta relazione esere tutti quei luoghi vuoti, e con cavi sotto.” In one case, however, a site was not...
“empty”: the Jewish catacomb was found above ancient quarries like those described.

8. M. Armellini describes a “diverticolo antico” (no longer accessible in the late 19th century) from the ancient via Portuense on its original route as far as the Pozzo Pantaleo that divided the vigna di S. Michele from that of the Missione “dove sono imbocchi delle cave di tufo”; M. Armellini, “Cimitero Ebraico della via Portuense,” in Chronachetta Menuale delle più importanti moderne scoperte nelle Scienze naturali del prof. Tito Armellini, e notizie archeologiche raccolte dal suo figlio, Mariano Armellini 2.5 (1879) p. 136. According to Bosio, 1632, p. 142, the actual vineyard on whose outer limits the Jewish catacomb was found was once the property of Alessandro Ruffino (or Ruffini), Bishop of Melfi, but by then in the possession of the children of Mutio (Muzio) Vittozzi, a Roman who had fought in the battle of Lepanto in 1570: P. A. Guglielmotti, Marcanzioni alla Battaglia di Lepanto, Florence, 1862, p. 20. P. Aringhi, Roma Subterranea Novissima 1, Rome, 1651, p. 236, also names a “Victorii” as a former owner of the site.

9. G. Tomassetti, La Campagna Romana Antica, Medievale e Moderna 6: Nomentana, Salaria, Portuense, Tiburtina, ed. L. Chiumenti & F. Bilancia, Florence, 1977, p. 326, traces the toponym “Colle Rosato” (or Rosaro) to the resationes performed in the area’s ancient cemeteries. R. Lanciani, Storia degli Scavi di Roma e Notizie Interno alle Collezioni d’ Antichità 5, ed. L. M. Campesi & M. R. Russo, Rome, 1994, pp. 257–258, quotes a source that ancient tufa quarry were reopened in 1520 “extra Portam Portuensem in loco dico Rosaro,” better known, in the editors’ note, as the “Cave di Monteverde.” According to this document, the name Rosaro derives from a nearby chapel of the Madonna del Rosario at the Pozzo Pantaleone.


14. According to Ferrua, 1960, p. 79, Zaratino Castellini showed more interest in Classical inscriptions than in those from the Roman catacombs, and diverts from his discussion on the Jewish catacomb to make observations on Ascalon, which Ferrua (p. 78) omits from his article as irrelevant.


16. Bosio, p. 143, and Ghidardi, 2003, p. 35, n. 85 and p. 39, n. 108, for Santini’s visit to the Monteverde Jewish catacomb (Ghidardi conjectures that it was Santini, in fact, who alerted Bosio to the site). The charcoal signature of Giovanni Angelo Santini as “Toccafondo” was later discovered on one of the tiles sealing a loculus in the Monteverde catacomb; G. Schneider Graziosi, “La nuova sala giudaica al Museo Lateranense,” NBAC 21 (1915) p. 13, n. 2.

17. Bosio, 1632, Book 4, Chapter 66, p. 652. No later record is made of this seventeenth-century graffito, quoted by Sevano in his commentary on Christian iconography in Book 4 of Bosio’s Roma Sotteranea, published in 1634. The sanctimonious act of Zaratino Castellini clearly places him, in Ferrua’s words, in the company of the “cenacolo Filippino.” He may well have been the first to introduce—to borrow from a recurring theme in the work of M. Ghidardi—the tops in catacomb literature that the Jewish cemeteries were darker, gloomier and poorer than their Christian counterparts in Rome. L. V. Rutgers quotes a much later description of the Jewish catacomb in the Vigna Randanini that places the Jewish catacombs in a similarly negative light in respect to those of the Christians in “Archaeological Evidence for the Interaction of Jews and Non-Jews in Late Antiquity,” American Journal of Archaeology 96 (1992), p. 101.
18. Fine, 2007, p. 25, calls Bosio’s scholarly method “impeccable” given that he was entering “uncharted territory”; but see also Dictfeld, 1995, pp. 178–189; and Rutgers, 1995, pp. 9–10, for trends in Counter-Reformation thought that doubtless influenced the “agenda” for Bosio’s Roma Sotteranea.


20. Bosio notes, for example, on p. 142 that the Greek expression “Irene” (Peace) read several times on inscriptions from the Jewish cemetery is also a Christian expression.


22. Bosio, 1632, p. 141: “una cosa differente dagli altri cimiteri e che per il più‘ vi suddetti monumenti non sono rinchiusi con tegole e marmi ma con muroni intonacati di calce, nelle quali quasi sempre con lettere rozze ... essere stati scritti gli Epitaffi alcuni de quali essendo scolpite anche nella calce ... de quali ne abbiamo trovati multi ... e questi secondo che sono stati aperiti i sepolcri da curiosì ed avidi cavatori, e levar parte de marmi e caliche quest erano scritti.” Bosio, 1632, p. 32, describes the sources for his work; also noted by Ditchfield, 2005, p. 179. V. Fiocchi Nicolai, “Presentazione” of reprint of A. Bosio, Roma Sotteranea, Rome, 1998, p. 11*, terms Bosio a “homo novus” for combing the Roman archives and libraries for ancient sources on catacombs, thus enabling him to identify specific sites, something he could not do for the Jewish cemetery.


24. Bosio, 1632, p. 141; the description of an “ambulator qui pallentia sulphuratata fractis permutat vitreis” is from Martial’s Epigramata 1.41, 3–5. In Cacilium. According to Bosio, “non e’ dubbio che intese qui Marziale i Giudei,” but the peddler thus described has no definite identity aside from that of an ancient Trasteverino; see Berliner, 1992, p. 65. M. Ghilardi, 2003, pp. 22–23, points out that ancient testimonies can hardly apply to the commercial and cultural activities of Jews in sixteenth century Rome. By Bosio’s time, in fact, the Trastevere district was no longer the primary Jewish quarter in Rome; Tomasetti, 1977, p. 324, n. 1, although Bosio (p. 142) uses as validation for his sources the “memoria presso i terri e che per il più vi suddetti monumenti non sono rinchiusi de marmi e caliche quei erano scritti.” Bosio here refers to CIJ 1.503/JIWE 2.549 (although he does not quote the text in full). Then, on f. 279 v.: “In Sancta Caecilia, nell’ Roma di Trastevere, nel pavi- mento ... che sta a mano destra nell’ entrar della chiesa, avanti per la porta dell’oratorio, e bagno di detta santa, vi e’ questo altare ... (e un’ iscrizione) greca con il medesimo segno del candelabro (CIJ 1.507/JIWE 2.543—Noy uses Bosio’s version; also copied by Bosio’s colleagues Zaratino Castellini and Nicola Alemani).” Bosio’s account confirms that the Jewish inscription was seen during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the pavement of the Church of Santa Cecilia, and probably lost around the time of F. Fuga’s early eighteenth century restoration of the church.

25. A’Campus Judaeorum” or Jewish cemetery in Traste- vere, near the church of S. Francesco a Ripa, had existed since the Middle Ages and continued to be used until ca. 1640; a statue of 1363 forbids Jews to bury elsewhere in the city; Tomasetti, 1977, p. 324, n. 1.

26. In addition to the Monteverde Jewish catacomb and the Christian Catacomb of Ponziano (whose plan was later drawn by mathematician Gaspare Berti and architect Francesco Contini), Bosio discovered two other hypogaea in the Pozzo Panteleone valley. One of these hypogaea, close to the intersection of a small country path with the via Portuense below the property of one A. Raby, contained a cubiculum decorated with scenes of the Good Shepherd and Jonah. According to G. N. Verrando, “Il santuario di S. Felice sulla via Portuense,” Melanges de l’Ecole Francaise de Rome 100 (1988) p. 336, the properties of Raby and Bassano adjoined the site of the Jewish catacomb. At the time of the Jewish catacomb’s rediscovery in the early 20th century, the Jacobini and Pellegrini-Quarantotti families owned these properties.

27. In the Roma Sotteranea Cristiana I, Rome, 1864, p. 41, G. B. de Rossi finds that, as a result of Severano’s editing, “entire pages” seen as “superfluous” had been cut, particularly from the chapter on the catacomb “degli ebrei.” Zaratino Castellini (CIG 4, p. 587) notes that Bosio possessed an inscription on marble from the Monteverde catacomb, and Bosio knew of at least two other Jewish inscriptions in Rome. In his manu- script of the Roma Sotteranea, “Del Cimitero di Antichi Hebrei Ritrovato sulla via Portuense,” preserved in the Cod. Vallicel- liana G.31f. 278 r.–279 v., Bosio writes “vedi nella suddetta Chiesa di San Salvatore in Curte in Trastevere un frammento (di marmo) nel quale rimaneva li ... il segno del candelabro in questa guisa.” Bosio here refers to CIJ 1.503/JIWE 2.549—Although he does not quote the text in full). Then, on f. 279 v.: “In Sancta Caecilia, nell’ Roma di Trastevere, nel pavi- mento ... che sta a mano destra nell’ entrar della chiesa, avanti per la porta dell’oratorio, e bagno di detta santa, vi e’ questo altare ... (e un’ iscrizione) greca con il medesimo segno del candelabro (CIJ 1.507/JIWE 2.543—Noy uses Bosio’s version; also copied by Bosio’s colleagues Zaratino Castellini and Nicola Alemani).” Bosio’s account confirms that the Jewish inscription was seen during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the pavement of the Church of Santa Cecilia, and probably lost around the time of F. Fuga’s early eighteenth century restoration of the church.

28. The complex history of the editing and publication of Bosio’s manuscript is illustrated in G. Finocchiaro, “La Roma Sotteranea e la Congregazione del Oratorio: Inediti e lacune del manoscritto G31,” in Messer Filippo Neri Santo: L’apostolo di Roma. Catalogo della mostra, Roma 1995, ed. B. Tellini Santoni, A. Manodori, Rome, 1995, pp. 190–191, and by Fiocchi Nicolai, 1998, p. 12, esp. note 36. According to L. Spigno, “Cosiderazioni sul manoscritto Vallicelliano G.31 e le Roma Sotteranea di Antonio Bosio,” RACr 51 (1975) p. 287, folios 249–312 of the Vallicelliana ms. that include the chapter on the Monteverde Jewish catacomb, are “completely diversi dagli altri contenuti nel G.31 ... nel tipo di carta e nella grafia e resi per altro pressoche’ illegibili a causa del pessimo stato di cons- servazione.” Spigno suggests, given the different numbering of the pages, that these folios were inserted into the ms. G31 from an older version of the Roma Sotteranea, perhaps an earlier draft that Bosio had hoped to include in the final copy.

29. Bosio, 1632, Introduction, 23* (written by Severano); “il quarto (libro) l’ho aggiunto io (Severano) medesimo, ser- vendomi in alcune cose di una sua selva, ed in altre di vari
autori che percio’ ho veduti.” According to Finocchiaro, 1995, p. 192 n. 35, the “selva” must be Bosio’s notes conserved in Ms. Vallicelliani G3 & G4: Acta et vitae sanctorum, antiqua monumenta sacra et prograna itemque adversaria variae eruditionis pro illustrando opera de sacris coemeteriis.


31. For the menorah as a response to Christianity and limited Christian use of the menorah, see S. Fine, Art and Judaism in the Greco–Roman World: Toward a New Jewish Archaeology, Cambridge, 2005, pp. 152–157, and R. Hachlili, “Menorah in Christianity,” in The Menorah, the Ancient, Seven-Armed Candelabrum: Origin, Form, and Significance, Leiden, 2001, pp. 269–274. In her inventory of artifacts with the menorah found in Israel and the Diaspora, Hachlili does not include any from Christian burials in Rome. She characterizes (p. 82) the menorah as “primarily the symbol and identity of the Jewish people.” In the introduction to his Temi di Iconografia Paleo cristiana, Vatican City, 2000, p. 14, F. Bisconti cites numerous examples of the menorah image in Jewish catacombs in Rome, but the entry in the same volume on the “Candelabro” on pp. 141–143 (M. Esposito) makes no mention of the menorah in a Christian context. Well into the 20th century, artifacts from Rome with distinctive Jewish images were generically assigned to the Monteverde Jewish catacomb, even if their actual provenance was unknown. The 1881 discovery of a gold-glass with Jewish images were generically assigned to the Monteverde catacomb by M. Esposito makes no mention of the menorah to symbolize “Christ, the Light of the World”; concluding “vedasi dunque con quanta ragione e convenienzia fosse posto il candelabro nei nostri cimiterij.”

32. Bosio, 1632, pp. 650–652, where Severano quotes Bede, Anselm, Gregory, and other Church Fathers on the significance of the candelabrum to symbolize “Christ, the Light of the World”; concluding “vedasi dunque con quanta ragione e convenienzia fosse posto il candelabro nei nostri cimiterij.”

33. Bosio, 1632, p. 638–655. Finocchiaro, 1995, p. 190, states that Bosio never realized the “libro delle immagini cimiteriali,” although the subject matter was most important to his research, and Bosio referred to the chapter several times in other parts of his work.

34. Even G. Marchi, in his unpublished Pitture: Prefazione, addressing the controversy surrounding tombs for followers of Mithras in the catacomb of “Vibia” first announced by G. Bottari in the eighteenth century, believes that earlier scholars including Severano, Aringhi, Boldetti and Marangoni had studied sites they did not publish, since “se non che riconosciute per cio’ che erano, d’una origine cioe’ e di una natura tutta opposta al fine delle loro ricerche, le trasandarono.” Marchi’s ms. published, in part, by R. Fausti, S.J., “Documenti Inediti sull’Azione Innovatrice del P. Marchi,” in Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia 19 (1942–1943) p. 138.


36. Bosio, 1632, p. 142. The “Campo Giudeo” near the Church of S. Francesco a Ripa and the original Porta Portese was a Jewish cemetery between the thirteenth and seventeenth centuries (builders under orders by Pope Urban VIII used epithets from this site to reconstruct the Porta Portese in a new location). A later Jewish burial site, the “Ortaccio degli ebrei,” was located on the Aventine hill above the Circus Maximus, and used from the mid-seventeenth century—ca. 1640—to the mid-nineteenth century. Ghilardi, 2003, p. 34, notes that Bosio is referring to decrees issued by Pope Urban VIII in 1625 that banned the erecting of Jewish tombstones, and ordered the removal of those earlier mounted in the Trastevere cemetery.


38. Bosio, 1632, pp. 141–143. By Bosio’s time, the Trastevere area was no longer the chief Jewish residential quarter of the city: Tomasetti, 1977, p. 324, n. 1 and Berliner, 1892, p. 79, n. 32.


40. First cited in connection to Monteverde catacomb by Aringhi, 1651, p. 238 (on advice from Lucas Holstein). A Latin translation of Benjamin’s Hebrew text was published in 1633 while Bosio’s text was in press (despite a printed date of 1632, the Roma Sotteranea came out in 1634).

41. Rutgers, 1995, pp. 3–4, and Ghilardi, 2003, p. 32, support F. Gregorovius’s view that Rabbi Benjamin created a
“Jewish version” of the Medieval Itineraries, i.e. *Mirabilia* of the city. In addition to martyrs’ graves above the Tiber, Benjamin states that the Menorah itself had been hidden in a cave near the Palace of Titus—a name frequently given during the Middle Ages to the Palace of Maxentius on the Appian Way, perhaps not coincidentally next to Jewish Catacombs (below the ex-Vigna Randanini) where the image of the menorah is frequently found, a possible source for the legend. For mention of the “palatium Vespasiani” (or Titi) on the Palatine, see L. Spera’s article in the *LTUR: Suburbium 5*, Rome 2008, pp. 249–250, and F. Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages* trans. A. Hamilton, vol. 4, pt. 2, London, 1896, pp. 678–679, note 2. Hirschfeld, 2008, pp. 28, n. 46, adds that Rabbi Benjamin’s account could be read as an example of “rabbinic writing, an important feature of which is the affirmation or validation of the present by association with significant events of antiquity.”

42. Tomassetti, 1977, pp. 324–327, speculates that the “fundum Judaeorum” and “contrada Hebraeorum” mentioned in the Capitoline Index indicate the same site, possibly that of the Monteverde cemetery, given their location extra muros. The “fundum ... qui vocatur Judaeorum” on the via Aurelia is mentioned in private correspondence of Pope Benedict IX to Petrus, Bishop of Silva Candida; Tomassetti, 1977, p. 326. “Campus Judaeorum” was also the name of the Jewish cemetery near S. Francesca a Ripa destroyed in 1640 during construction of new walls for the Portuense and Janiculum (Tomassetti, 1977, pp. 324 n. 1 & 332 n. 1). The location of this “antico cimitero sotto il Gianicolo” was occasionally confused with that of the catacomb of Monteverde. Even R. Lanciani, *New Tales of Old Rome*, London, 1901, p. 247, incorrectly reads a passage in the work of F. Martinelli (*Roma Ricercata*, Rome 1650, p. 20) as describing “crypts seen by Bosio ... (that were) destroyed at the time of Urban VIII when the new line of city walls was raised on the ridge of the Janiculum” (Martinelli, in fact, is clearly describing the “campo” next to the Porta Portese, which, indeed, was “disturbato con la fabbrica del nuovo muro della città”). A possible analogy can be made with the bill of sale in 1264 concerning a “Mons Judaeorum... (or) Campo dei Giudey” outside the Porta Nomentana (Berliner, 1892, pp. 81–82). Jewish catacombs were found in that area in 1919, below the grounds of the Villa Torlonia.


45. Rutgers, 1995, p. 5 cites the renewal of an ordinance by Pope Clement III (1190) that “prohibits, among other things, the spoliation of Jewish cemeteries,” evidently an issue for some time and much decried by rabbis in the following centuries, since this bull “Sicut Judaeis non debet” was renewed many times (Berliner, 1992, p. 79 & p. 97–101). Rutgers notes, however, that it does not necessarily refer to the ancient cemeteries. Professor N. Muller, who excavated the Monteverde catacombs from 1904–1906, believed that the few fragments of sarcophagi found in modern times testified to a thorough spoliation of the cemetery (C. Vismara, “I Cimiteri ebraici di Roma,” in *Societa’ Romana ed Impero Tardoantico* 2, ed. A. Giardina, Rome-Bari, 1986, p. 365). Re-use of sarcophagi was common in the middle ages. A good number of the Jewish inscriptions found in Rome before significant archaeological work was carried out in the Jewish catacombs were on sarcophagi (or sarcophagi fragments) once containing Jewish burials (including, but not limited to: CIJ 1/JIWE 2 nn. 1/556; 283/523; 503/549; n. 504/558; 507/543; 511/554; 523/577).

46. Tomassetti, 1977, p. 326, citing a contract of 1175 between the Church of S. Maria in Trastevere and a tenant that entitled the monastery to half of all marble and metal artifacts found on the site, observes that the discoveries of ancient remains in this area must have been quite frequent.


48. As true for the Christian catacombs as for those that were Jewish, Rutgers, 1995, p. 22, quotes F. Buonarotti's description of an antiquarian’s catacomb tour. Not only members of the upper classes and Church hierarchy behaved in this irresponsible manner: it is no coincidence that the Jewish catacombs were found in areas heavily quarried for pozzolana in modern times.

49. Ghilardi, 2003, pp. 27–28, n. 52, reflects on the singular freedom enjoyed by Bosio in accessing the underground cemeteries, although his idea of a special “lasciapassare” for Bosio is hypothetical.

50. Nowhere is this relentless and largely unregulated tomb-robbing more vividly described than in the unpublished treatise of Fr. A. Landucci, “Practica per estrarre li corpi de’ Santi Martiri da sagri cimiteri di Roma,” in de Rossi-Ferrua, 1944, appendix 2, pp. 120–129.


53. De Rossi, 1864, p. 59, bemoans that “ogni altra memoria dell’antichita’ dell’ ordinario era trasferita ai pubblici e privati musei senza che veruno notasse il sito e le circostanze del trovamento (del) materiale tolta dalle catacombe romane,” citing, in particular, the Carpegna, Capponi, Ficoroni and Kircherian collections, nearly all of which held Jewish materials. A telling—and documented—account is the case of CIJ 1.385/JIWE 2.548, an inscription found in
1745 by workmen in a church in Trastevere and purchased by the Marquis Alessandro Gregorio Capponi for his museum.


55. The chapter on the Jewish Catacomb is in *Roma Subterranea Novissima* 1, p. 372, pp. 390–402. Aringhi’s introduction is far longer than the original, and the succeeding sections are extensively re-worked and lengthened, although Aringhi quotes the same sources as Bosio had in sections 6–10. Aringhi adds sections 11–17 in their entirety. Bosio’s work is then more or less translated in sections 17–19, but section 20 is shortened and re-arranged to focus on the epigraphical evidence. The concluding sections (22–34) concern the use of Greek by the Jews and Benjamin of Tudela’s *Itinerarium*; also written by Aringhi in their entirety.

56. In section 19, Aringhi leaves out the names of Bosio’s companions on the visit to the Jewish catacomb. He also cuts passages from Bosio’s description of Jews in Rome in his own time, for example: “Et appresso da me non e’ dubito alcuno che dovettro comprare tutto quell sito, ch’ hoggie’ vagna per fabricarvi il loro cimitero, e sepolture, poiche’ se bene facevano arti mecaniche, e tal volta da Poeti sono chiamati medichi, ve n’ erano con tutto cio’ delli facoltosi, e ricchi, et usavano fare le collette, con le quali raccoglievan molt’ oro, come si prova de gli allegati luoghi di Tacito, Cicerone, Filone, e Giuseppe Hebreo.” Aringhi’s Section 14, p. 234, polemizes instead on “why the Jews are dispersed throughout the world.”

57. Aringhi, 1651, p. 238; Rutgers, 1995, pp. 16–18, n. 39.

58. Aringhi quoted in Rutgers, 1995, p. 16 n. 38. Ferrua, 1944, p. xvii, succinctly observes that Aringhi “non solo ripete le incertezze del Bosio ma ancora le aggrava, amplificandone il testo come suolo.” Ghilardi 2003, p. 36, when comparing the discovery of the Jewish catacomb to the “gran successo” of that on the via Anapo, feels that the propagandistic value of the former was nil, at a time of scarce interest in Jewish antiquities. Northern European scholars did start to publish studies on ancient and medieval rabbinical texts that would strongly influence later study of the Jewish sites in Rome, but their work was independent from that of Bosio. In their search for a Christianity untainted by later Church practices and teachings, these “Orientalists” examine Hebrew texts on Jewish burial rites and customs, but only rarely consider the evidence from Rome, perhaps to avoid comparison with “Romanized” materials that could compromise a “pure” or “authentic” version of the origins of the Christian faith. Their text-based work (with some recourse to Medieval Jewish epitaphs in Hebrew), particularly that of J. Nicolai, *De Sepulchris Hebraeorum*, Leiden, 1706, nonetheless would be of tremendous value to the first Roman Catholic scholars who dedicated studies to ancient Jewish cemeteries in Rome. They are not to be confused with the historians discussed by Rutgers, 1995 pp. 18–21.

59. Rutgers, 1995, p. 18, states that “(Aringhi’s work) ... resulted in a history of the catacombs in which there was little or no place for Jewish evidence,” an issue still very much at stake in later times.

60. Boldetti, 1720, p. 276.

61. G. B. de Rossi in Ferrua, 1944, pp. 164–165, divides the age of relic-collecting into three distinct periods: from the Middle Ages to the end of the 16th century; from the year 1668 to the election of a Benedict XIVth (1740); and from that point onward to the time of de Rossi’s remarks (1888). Ferrua, p. xx, adds that both the Cardinal Vicar and Sacristan had their own “teams of excavators” in the catacombs. According to a recent study of L. de Maria, late seventeenth-century antiquarians in Rome feared that artifacts that would soon be lost if not immediately removed from the catacombs, and, as a result, diggers and others in this period of “confusion” were able to dispose of a large amount of material from the catacombs, especially that deemed “non-Christian”: L. de Maria, “L’esodo delle iscrizioni cristiane dalle catacombe tra atteggiamenti religiose e collezionismo,” *Raffaele Fabretti, archeologo ed erudito*, ed. D. Mazzoleni, Vatican City, 2006, pp. 15–23.


63. Buonarroti, 1716, p. 19: “Come abbiamo accennato di sopra, essendo questi frammenti serviti a’ primi Cristiani per solo contrassegno de’ Sepolcri, per li quai si servivano anche di cose propri de’ Gentili, non e’ maraviglia che vi abbiano posto anche questo, fatto e servito quando era intero per uso di qualcheduno, che fosse Ebreo di nazione, conforme si ricava da’ tanti simboli in esso, uniti spettanti senza alcun fallo all’Ebraismo.”

64. The engraver P. Sante Bartoli publishes drawing of two “Jewish” lamps in *Le Antiche Lucerne Sepolcrali Figurate raccolte dalle Cave Sotteranee e Grotte di Roma*, Rome, 1691, nn. 32–33. The first lamp is decorated with the image of the menorah, described by Bartoli’s commentator, G. P. Bellori, as a “contrassegno proprio della Gente Ebreo... scolpito nelle sinagoghe, nelle scuole, e nelle memorie de’ loro defonti”; the lamp itself, he adds, is an “uso de’ Gentili.” The second lamp, then in Bellori’s possession, that Bartoli considers Jewish has seven openings for lamps and its traced to the “vecchio
cimitero, o Campo degli Ebrei a Porta Portuense”: possibly the medieval cemetery and not that seen by Bosio (Bellori, 1729, p. 12, fig. 33). Another small find from this period, in Raffaele Fabretti’s possession, is a ring engraved with the name “Rufinus” and the menorah (CIJ 1.523/JIWE 2.599); R. Fabretti, *Inscriptionum antiquarum: quae in aedibus paternis asseruantur explicatio et additamentum vna cum aliquot emendationibus Gruterianis & indice rerum & verborum memorabilium*, Rome, 1699, p. 537, n. 53. In his 1699 commentary on inscriptions, Fabretti discusses for the most part Jewish epitaphs already published or copied, mostly to correct readings and attributions: p. 389 (CIJ 1.503/JIWE 2.549 and inscription in S. Sabina CIJ 1.512/JIWE 2.574); p. Julianus (CIJ 1.504/JIWE 2.558); p. 465 n. 101 (CIJ 1.523/JIWE 2.577). On p. 281, n. 16, Fabretti identifies a name of Hebrew origin on an inscription beginning with the formula *Dis Manibus*, but this inscription has not been included in recent sylllogies of Jewish inscriptions from Rome. Problematic as well is the identity of one “Aurelius Herodes, Archigrammaticus” on pp. 325–326, found by Fabretti among notes in the Chigi Library, and identified by Fabretti as a “praefectus scribarum sacrarum natus Philadephiae” rather than synagogue official. This inscription is listed in both the ICUR n.s. (n. 12841) and CIJ 1 (*22*).

65. It is in Boldetti’s time that oblique mention may be found of three other Jewish catacombs in Rome, in addition to those on the Monteverde. The catacomb “enriched” with Greek inscriptions but with no “signs of martyrdom” seen by Boldetti (along with Canons Binetti and Marangoni, pp. 567–568) in the area of the Aqua Bullicante two miles outside of Porta Maggiore, resembles to some extent the Jewish catacomb later found on the via Labicana, although it has also been identified with another catacomb in the same region by S. Buonaguro, “La cosiddetta catacomba anonica di via Rovigno d’Istria,” *RACR* 77 (2006), pp. 75–102. Already in Boldetti’s time, pozzolana quarrying had all but destroyed the site. De Angelis d’Ossat, 1943, p. 180, suggests that another subterranean cemetery seen by Boldetti on the Appia (p. 562) could have been the Jewish cemetery later found below the grounds of Count Giovanni Battista Cimarra in 1866. Mentioned below, n. 79, is the third example, the discovery of a sarcophagus cover (CIJ 1.283/JIWE 2.535) at the second mile of the via Appia, in which area is found the Jewish catacomb of the Vigna Randanini.

66. See n. 66.


69. Boldetti, 1720, p. 201 pl. VI.15 (CIJ 1/JIWE 2 n. 516/589, from Buonarroti, 1716, t. II.5); and pp. 525–526 (from P. S. Bartoli & G. P. Bellori, 1692, n. 32); Boldetti comments here that “talvolta si veggono i simboli che rappresentano Cristo medesimo, con la figura (del) Candelabro.”

70. Boldetti, 1720, p. 33: “si esclude qualunque dubbio, che potesse mai nascere, che nostri cimiteri possono essere stati profanati in alcun tempo co’ cadaveri d’ Ebbrei”; and, on pp. 473–474: “quanto poi ai nomi ebraici non se n’e’ mai trovato alcuno a mio tempo nei cimiteri e ne pure se ne trovo’ mai dagli autori della Roma Sotterranea, anzi, ne’ meno da altri, che hanno scritto degli antichi monumenti de’ Cristiani, se ne riporta pur uno trovato nelle nostre catacombe. Dal che resta apertamente convinto chiunque pretendesse, che i Cimiteri Cristiani siano stati profanati con Corpi de’ Giudei.”


72. Boldetti, 1720, Ch. XVI (from title) p. 65: “I nostri cimiteri non furono mai contaminati da’ Gentili e loro cadaveri, per l’avverione reciproca, e per la diversita’ de’ sepolcri de’ i Cristiani e de’ gl’ idolatri.”


74. All three scholars publish CIJ 1.503/JIWE 2.543, CIJ 1.504/JIWE 2.558 and CIJ 1.523/JIWE 2.577.

75. Interestingly, the most suggestive instances of this are from the Portuense area (Catacomb of Calepodio). Boldetti, 1720, p. 412, publishes ICUR n.s., n. 4437, an inscription in Greek that follows a similar, though not identical, formula used in many Jewish inscriptions in Greek at Rome. The dedication is to an “αβλαβις” or “innocent, blameless” one, an attribute (which here Boldetti treats as a name) found in CIJ 1.1/JIWE 2.556 (Rutgers, 1995, p. 192, t. 4, distinguishes “αβλαβις” as an epithet used only by the Jews in Rome). On p. 420, Boldetti transcribes another Greek inscription (ICUR n.s., n. 4433) that he clarifies “non fu da me estratta dal cimitero di Calepodio, ma avendola osservata in un’ officina del convento di S. Pancrazio” (apparently from the pavement of the church). This epitaph concludes with the phrase that Boldetti translates as “in pace anima ipsius cum justis anima ipsius,” but the reading is far from certain, and it can be possible to restore the phrase with epithets commonly employed by the Jews of Ancient Rome to commemorate their dead.

76. According to A. Barzazi’s entry for Marangoni in the *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 69 (2007), pp. 418–423, Marangoni provided the summary of latest discoveries in the catacombs in Book 2 of Boldetti’s work (Chapter 18) as well as the cemetery plans in Book III.

77. The Jewish inscriptions from Rome known only from Giovanni Marangoni’s notes are: CIJ 1.284/JIWE 2.547 (pub-

78. Marangoni does not include this text (CIJ 1.283/JIWE 2.533) in his *Acta*, but does publish a Greek inscription (ICUR n.s., n. 12847) found at some point in the 1730s “in coemeterio Praetextati” an area he locates “inter viam Appiam et Ardeatinam.” Although viewed as Christian, the text includes formulae commonly found in the Jewish catacombs of Rome. The Jewish catacombs in the Vigna Randanini are located at a short distance from the catacomb identified today as that of Praetexatus.


81. The Jewish inscriptions are: CIJ 1/JIWE 2 nn. 1/556 (Villa Sinibaldi); 283/535 (Kircherian); 504/558 (“in cavadio Palatii DD. De Naris ad Sca. Clara in fronte sarcophago”); 508/544 (Sta. Cecilia); 509/576 (Palazzo Capponi).

82. CIJ 1.289/JIWE 2.538 had been in Marangoni’s possession before its acquisition by Fr. Contuccio Contucci, S.J. (1688–1768) for the Kircherian Museum in the Collegio Romano. The Florentine Marquis Alessandro Gregorio Capponi (1683–1746) possessed CIJ 1.385/JIWE 2.548 and CIJ 1.509/JIWE 2.576. CIJ 1.282/JIWE 2.534 and CIJ 1.733/g/JIWE 2.620 (Jewish provenance uncertain), first identified in the 20th century, are in a building once owned by the Capponi family (“Palazzo Corsetti olim Capponi”) on via di Monserrato, n. 20 in Rome. It is also possible, however, that they were among the 33 inscriptions Stanislao Corsetti brought to the palace in 1842 from another family residence at Piazza dei Satiri, n. 6, although neither is included (unless as one of the anonymous fragments) in Corsetti’s list to the Antiquities Commission of inscriptions and reliefs to decorate his courtyard and monumental stair: Archivio dello Stato di Roma, Camerlengato. Parte 2. Titolo IV, Antichità e Belle Arti, b. 289, f. 3272 (1842). Corsetti notes that many of these fragments had been used in the courtyard pavement of the building in the Piazza dei Satiri.


84. G. Bianchini, *Delle Magnificenze di Roma Antica e Moderna 1: Delle Porte e Mura di Roma con Illustrazioni*, Rome, 1747, p. 57. Though modern scholars have questioned whether or not this visit took place, it is difficult to imagine Bianchini involving Passionei, a noted scholar and antiquarian, in a fantastical account.

85. The early 20th century image of the same gallery in the Monteverde catacomb is published by N. Muller, 1915, t. XI.


88. Venuti, 1748, p. 147: “vedendosi in alcune grotte fu lasciato il corpo all’uso orientale, situati presso all’atrio, ed in altre il terreno cavato con i suoi loculi l’uno superiormente all’altro, come nel nostro sepolcro o coemeterio.” Venuti, 1748, p. 148 & p. 152, cites in particular Nicolai’s work and the commentaries on rabbinical texts by Gilbert Genebrard. Yet his reliance on medieval and later sources leads him to the erroneous conclusion, based on the evidence of Hebrew inscriptions found in Tivoli, that “wealthier Hebrews” would have been buried elsewhere than the “comune catacomba.”

89. Venuti, 1748, p. 147.

90. K. Korhonen, “Osservazioni sul collezionismo epigrafico siciliano,” *Arctis* 35 (2001), esp. “Da Monteverde a Catania,” pp. 6–10, quotes a footnote in the 1975 ed.of CIJ 1, where Ferrua raises the possibility of a Monteverde provenance for CIJ 1.650a/JIWE 2.146. Korhonen finds “fortissima” the resemblance of this Jewish epitaph to those in Rome, and traces IG 461 and n. 543 to the Jewish catacomb in Rome. According to Korhonen, these inscriptions arrived in Sicily “sporadically” through ties that the Benedictine monk Placido Scammacca had with the Benedictine monastery at Saint Paul’s Outside the Walls, which possessed a small number of Jewish epitaphs from Rome. Jewish inscriptions seen in the Museo Borgiano and attributed much later to the excavations of 1748 are: CIJ 1/JIWE 2: nn. 472/197; 480/198 (Uhden); 368/189 (Raponi). Venuti’s close ties to the Roman marquis and collector Giuseppe Rondinini (or Rondanini), to whom he dedicated *La Favola di Circe rappresentata in un antico greco bassorilievo di marmo*, Rome, 1758, may have facilitated Rondanini’s acquisition of CIJ 1/JIWE 2: 1/556; 502/561, and 510/578 (CIJ 1.733c/JIWE 2.619 not considered Jewish). But Rondanini only rarely allowed access to his private collec-
tions. Gaetano Migliore and Luigi Gaetano Marini are the first to record the Jewish inscriptions in Rondanini’s possession around the year 1780 (CIJ 1.1/JIWE 2.556 also published in J. J. Winkellmann’s *Ville e Palazzi di Roma: 1756*, ed. J. R. Serra, Rome, 2000, p. 200).


93. A copy of Migliore’s manuscript, *Ad Inscriptionem Flaviae Antoniae Commentarius Sive De Antiquis Judaicis Italicis Exercitatio Epigraphica*, is kept in the Vatican Library as Cod. Vat. Lat. 9143 Ch. XI, ff. 113–163. The original work, *Inscriptiones Neapolitanae ad D. Januarii extra moenia ex adversaris Cl. viri Caietani Melioris excerpta quorum major pars ed exercitationem epigraphicam de Judaicis Italicis spectat*, is in the Biblioteca Comunale Arioste di Ferrara, Ms. Classe II 274 (formerly Cod. Ferrar. 269). M. Buonocore, “Notae ad Cod. Vat. Lat. 9143,” in *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticana, Studi e Testi* 33 (1988), p. 15: quotes from a letter by G. Amati to G. Marini of January 12th, 1791 that explains: “s’illustrano in essa le iscrizioni greche e latine appartenente agli ebrei sparsa per l’Italia sotto i primi imperatori e falsamente attribuiti ai Cristiani.” A. Ferrua, in “Epigrafia Ebraica,” *Civilia Cattolica*, 87.3 (1936) p. 462, praises Migliore’s “erudizione letteraria ed epigrafica molto estesa” and judges Migliore’s transcriptions reliable. The Jewish identity of some of these is still in doubt (e.g. CIJ 1.653/JIWE 2.220); others (284/547; 553/JIWE 1.20; 501/568, & 1/556) are first copied or identified as Jewish by Migliore. Nearly all the inscriptions from outside of Rome are from published sources. Two inscriptions previously thought pagan or Christian were CIJ 1.1/JIWE 2.556; and CIJ 1.380/JIWE 2.557. Migliore’s identification of both as Jewish is still accepted today.

94. This was the same Migliore who, when called to arbitrate on a matter concerning Jewish merchants, expressed a favorable opinion of those “personne alieni dalla nostra religione” who “veggano sempre più la dolcezza del suavissimo impero del capo della vera chiesa,” Gardi, 2008, p. 253, n. 53.


96. Migliore himself writes that his visit to Monteverde was “superioribus annis” (i.e. 1770s) Cod. Vat. Lat. 9143 f. 127r.


101. M. Buonocore, 1988, p. 14: the works of Migliore “mai pubblicati... sono stati ampiamente sfruttati nelle sillogi epigrafiche piu’ accreditate (Ferrua, 1936, p. 462, adds often without credit to Migliore (!).”) L. G. Marini (1742–1812), *Iscrizioni cristiane greche*, Cod. Vat. Lat. 9012 and *Epitaphia Hebraeorum*, Cod. Vat. Lat. 9074, Caput XXXI, f. 938 et seq. (37 inscriptions). Leon, 1928, p. 304, credits Marini with the most extensive list to date of Jewish inscriptions; Ferrua, however, disagrees, criticizing Marini’s lack of bibliography and “col- lage” approach; Ferrua, 1936, p. 462 n. 3. Marini did consult many sources, but copied few texts de visu. David Noy points out in JIWE 2, pp. 1–2, that Marini is also responsible for most attributions to the Jewish catacomb on the Monteverde, even for spurious examples later dismissed from syllogies (e.g. fifteenth century forgery CIJ 1*, discussion pp. 527–532).

102. The title of this section is inspired by a passage in T. Rajak, 2000, p. 431.

103. Several inscriptions from this period are not universally recognized as Jewish. The (possibly pagan) inscription in Greek (CIJ 1.1/JIWE 2.556) on a child’s marble sarcophagus may be an original text on a re-worked/modern relief (I credit F. Bisconti with this suggestion); see, most recently, G. Koch, “Judische Sarkophage der Kaiserzeit un der Spatantike,” in “What has Athens to Do with Jerusalem,” ed. L. V. Rutgers, Leuven, 2002, pp. 198–200. The text, however, employs terms found in Jewish inscriptions in Rome and environs (e.g. JIWE 1.12). For the two copies of CIJ 1.380/JIWE 2.557 circulating around Rome at this time, see A. Ferrua, “Addenda et Corrigenda al Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum,” *Epigraphica* 3 (1941) p. 37.

104. Smaller eighteenth-century collections of Jewish and Christian inscriptions in Rome (Capponi, Pennacchi, Rus-
coni) had been acquired by Cardinal Stefano Borgia (in the College of the Propaganda Fidei and in his palace at Velletri); the Marquis Giuseppe Rondanini (Palazzo Rondanini on the via del Corso in Rome); the Vatican (including the collection of A. L. Rusconi, with inscriptions from the Capponi collection); the Jesuit’s Kircherian Museum; and the Abbot Giuseppe Giustino di Costanzo (Saint Paul’s Outside the Walls).


106. A possibly Jewish inscription (ICUR n.s., 2.4535) found on the Pellegrini property was brought to the attention of Antiquities Inspector Carlo Fea in the early 19th century; see A. Ferrua, “Via Portuense,” Archivio della Societa’ Romana di Storia Patria 111 (1988) p. 23, n. 36. The provenance of Jewish inscriptions in the palace of Cardinal Bartolomeo Pacca at Portus is more complicated. Pacca, Secretary of State under Pope Pius VII, added inscriptions to walls of his courtyard in Portus between 1821–1828. In “The Jewish Community of Ancient Portus,” Harvard Theological Review 45 (1952), pp. 173–174, H. J. Leon traces the origin of at least one of these (CIJ 1.535 & 543/JIWE 2.579) to the Monteverde catacomb in Rome (JIWE 2, pp. 460–466, nn. 579–587, includes this and others from the Porto Collection in the section for those of “Unknown Provenance”). A possible occasion for the transferal of Jewish inscriptions from Rome to Portus in the 1820s may have been the modernization of the ancient via Portuense starting from the Pozzo Pantaleo in 1822 (A. Nibby, Della via Portuense e dell’ antica citta’ di Porto, Rome, 1827, p. 10). Nibby notes, in fact, that excavations were carried out on the upper slopes of Monteverde in the Vigna della Missione in 1822 and 1825 (Nibby, p. 19). For evidence of Jews in Portus, however, see Noy, 1995, p. XV, and JIWE 2.16 (excavations by A. Torlonia). The Monteverde catacomb itself languished for a time in relative scholarly obscurity: the studies of J-B, L. G. Seroux d’Agincourt in the early 19th century—that proposed theories questionable to the catacomb scholars of the time, especially Marchi—suggested that the menorah image on tombs at the site could allude to a Roman family’s involve-

107. This is CIJ 1.497/JIWE 2.539. The inscription is trilingual: a Greek text followed by Latin translation and three instances of the Hebrew acclamation “shalom.” Found out of context, it has been given a tentative date of the fifth century CE by Noy (1995 pp. 422–423). It is very unlikely that it was ever in the Rondanini Palace in Rome, as Garrucci wrote (R. Garrucci, “Alcune iscrizioni dei cimiteri giudaici diversi,” in Dissertazioni Archeologiche di Vario Argomento, 2, Rome, 1865, p. 191 n. 13 and Noy, 1995, p. 423).

108. Marchi’s letter, dated December 14th, 1842, is in the Gregorian Archives in Rome: Marchi 30 (XI) III: “Dissertazioni, Discorsi, Orazioni d’argomento archeologico: Intorno una lapide poliglotta trovata a Roma nel scavare la fondamenta delle nuove scale che dalla Ripa Grande scendono al Tevere al sig. Cav. e Prof. Architetto Luigi Poletti.” One of Marchi’s observations, that “vi fu un tempo in cui si opinò’ che le antiche lapidi degli ebrei morti a Roma dovrebbero dalla prima all’ultima esser dettata nel linguaggio dei greci e che non si potrebbe trovare documento bastevole a provare che tra cittadini di Roma l’ebraismo avrebbe mai trovato seguaci. Il fatto favoreva quell’ pregiudizio, perche’ e’ appena un secolo che fu scoperto la lapide di Faustina che e’ nel Museo Kircheriano. Videti quivi per la prima volta il nome di una donna romana addetta a mosaici riti e il nome e il breve contesto di quellla epigrafe e in forme e caratteri tutti greci accompagnanti dal candelabro, al corno, e alla palma, che non si potrebbe trovare documento bastevole a provare che non si potrebbe trovare documento bastevole a provare che tra cittadini di Roma l’ebraismo avrebbe mai trovato seguaci. Il fatto favoreva quell’ pregiudizio, perche’ e’ appena un secolo che fu scoperto la lapide di Faustina che e’ nel Museo Kircheriano. Videti quivi per la prima volta il nome di una donna romana addetta a mosaici riti e il nome e il breve contesto di quellla epigrafe e in forme e caratteri tutti greci accompagnanti dal candelabro, al corno, e alla palma, che non si potrebbe trovare documento bastevole a provare che tra cittadini di Roma l’ebraismo avrebbe mai trovato seguaci. Il fatto favoreva quell’ pregiudizio, perche’ e’ appena un secolo che fu scoperto la lapide di Faustina che e’ nel Museo Kircheriano. Videti quivi per la prima volta il nome di una donna romana addetta a mosaici riti e il nome e il breve contesto di quellla epigrafe e in forme e caratteri tutti greci accompagnanti dal candelabro, al corno, e alla palma, that in the Kircherian’s possession by the mid-19th century after being used to cover a Renaissance tomb (and which had no connection to the Vigna Rondanini); R. Garrucci, Storia dell’ Arte Cristiana nei Primi Otto Secoli della Chiesa 6, Prato, 1881, t. 491, n. 19.


110. In his letter to Poletti, Marchi wanted to dispel the notions of certain “volgari” that the inscription had been in situ when found, and drew upon his experiences in the Christian catacombs when he writes, regarding its location, “come negli edifici vicini (ai) ... sacri cimiteri cristiani non di rado rinvenondosi pietre e tegole che furono tolte dai quei venerati sotteranei ... così’ ... in un nuovo costruito in tanta vicinanza...
di Monteverde sia trovata una lapide ch’era murata prece-
dentemente nella necropolis aperta nelle vicinanze di quella
collina (it is worth noting Marchi’s emphasis on the inscrip-
tions provenance from a necropolis *sub divo*).” Marchi, 1844,
p.20, writes “avendomi in compagni in tre diversi giorni
l’ingenero Temistocle Marucchi, l’architetto Francesco
Fontana, e qual ‘e’ altro di que’ matti che scorgliono esser
messo in cotali esplorazioni.”

111. Marchi, 1844, p. 21.

112. Marchi, 1844, p. 21: the landowner had also found
traces of a cistern two years before. F. Nardini, *Roma Antica* 1,
Rome, 1666, p. 68, had earlier described this area as the
“fratagiture dei colli gianicolensi, che ora sfaldano dol-
cemente, ora toreggiano dirupate e imboscite.”

113. Ms de Rossi in Cod.Vat. Lat. 14241 f. 501 (305); and f.
634, correspondence (in French) dated 19 maggio (1859?)
from J. B. Pentland to G. B. de Rossi. Pentland, a geologist
and editor of the English-language *Murray’s Guides to Rome
and Southern Italy* in the 1860’s, had supported Fr. Garrucci’s
excavations in the Jewish catacombs of the Vigna Randanini
from 1859 to 1863.

114. De Rossi, 1864, p. 125 and M. S. de Rossi, “Analisi geo-
logico ed architettonico delle catacombe romane,” appendix
51.

115. The damage was already being done. G. B. de Rossi
compiled inscriptions from the area “sotto Monteverde” in
Cod. Vat. MS. de Rossi, n. 13176 f. 10554: “Adnotationes de
Coemeteriis ... in vinea gentis Pellegriniae”: also in Cod. Vat.
de Rossi n. 10591 f.89 nn.1–3: the owner himself, a “certo
signore Pellegrini” had approached de Rossi to find out of
inscriptions discovered in his vineyard came from “qualche
sepolcro o altra fabbrica.”


117. Ferrua, 1936, pp. 463–465, reviewing the publication
of de Rossi’s epigraphic notes in the CIJ 1, finds de Rossi’s
consultation of earlier sources quite extensive (in more than
one occasion de Rossi is the correct or unique source for an
inscription in the CIJ), but nonetheless judges his transcrip-
tions incomplete and disorganized (with many inscriptions
 copies more than once, or scattered among the notes on
Christian epitaphs). Ferrua concludes that de Rossi
“possedeva certo i dati, ma non li’ ordino’ nelle sue schede.”

118. This is the catacomb known as that of the “Vigna Ran-
danini,” excavated from 1859 to 1864 by property owner
Giuseppe Randanini and the architect Ignazio del Frate, and
published at that time by Ernst Herzog and Fr. Raffaele Gar-
rucci, S.J.

Rutgers finds contradictory de Rossi’s dating of Jewish cata-
combs to a century or so later than those used by the Chris-
tians in Rome (Rutgers, 1995, p. 38); nonetheless, it is
important to take the following into consideration: 1. de Rossi
acknowledged that the Monteverde catacomb (which he had
never seen) “puo’ risalire a maggior antichita’” (de Rossi,
1864, p. 90); 2. the Christian catacombs dated to the first cen-
tury CE (i.e. “epoca apostolica” are those mentioned in liter-
ary sources, to which de Rossi gives credibility (de Rossi,
1864, p. 184).

120. De Rossi, “Notizie—Maggio,” *Bullentino di Archeologia
Cristiana* 2 (1864) p. 40 & 1864, p. 76 & p. 90.

121. De Rossi, 1864, p. 90 & pp. 93–94; de Rossi, *Roma Sot-
terranea Cristiana* 3 (Rome, 1877), p. 387 & 474. Rutgers, 1995,
pp. 37–38, rightly singles out this accomplishment of de
Rossi’s, only possible after the discovery and continued acces-
sibility of the Jewish catacomb on the Appia discovered in
1859.

122. De Rossi, 1864, pp. 90–91. ICUR n.s., 4.12262, discov-
ered in the area of San Callisto, is dedicated to an “Aron
Chrestianus,” perhaps a converted Jew.

123. De Rossi, 1864 p. 50. Marchi, 1844, p. 29 and Rutgers,
1995, p. 37. De Rossi believed that the Monteverde cata-
combs, like all those on the Portuense, Ostiense, and Flaminia
consular roads, were excavated into hillsides rather than
below ground because of the proximity of these areas to the
Tiber River. In a lecture of February 7th, 1891, de Rossi
observed that “i cimiteri ebraici prossimi al cimitero di
Ponziano sono singolari coincidenza causata forse delle pre-
senze di ebrei e cristiani a Trastevere,” (notes of E. Stevenson,
Cod. Vat. 10054, f. 102). De Rossi lauds an article by M de
Vogue’, “Inscriptions Hebraiques de Jerusalem,” *Revue Arche-
ologique*, n.s. 9 (1864) pp. 200–209, which dates Hebrew accla-
mations on some epitaphs from the Monteverde cemetery to
the 2d century CE, adding: “e facile intendere per quanti lati
si rannodino queste scoperte e queste recherché agli studi
della cristiana antica, ed anche quelli de’ cimiteri di Roma,”
de Rossi, *op. cit.* n. 121, p. 40.

124. De Rossi, 1864, p. 91.

125. De Rossi, 1864, p. 91. For de Rossi’s observations on
the origins of the catacombs and use of non-Christian or “pri-
vate” hypogaea: V. Fiocchi Nicolai, “Giovanni Battista de
Rossi e le Catacombe Romane,” *Acta XIII Congressus Interna-
tionalis Archeologiae Christianae* 1, eds. N. Cambi & E. Marin,

126. Fiocchi Nicolai, *Acta XIII CIAC* 1, pp. 205–222, for de
Rossi’s study of the Roman catacombs.

127. A. Nestori, “Giovanni Battista de Rossi e la Pontificia
Commissione di Archeologia Sacra,” *Acta XIII CIAC* 1, p. 192,
nn. 17–18.

128. V. Saxer mentions the “damnatio memoriae” effected
on Garrucci, the “independent,” for attempting to upstage
de Rossi in the publication of paintings from the Roman cat-
acombs: “Cent ans d’Archeologie Chretienne,” *Acta XIII CIAC*
1, p. 128. Nestori, 1998, pp. 197–190, documents periods of
great tension between the two “disciples” of Marchi during the period when Garrucci was publishing studies on the Jew-


130. De Rossi supplied his notes on epitaphs from the Jew-
ish catacomb of the Vigna Cimarara for publication in A. Berliner’s history of the Jews in Rome; Berliner, 1992, pp. 90–92. Berliner, a frequent visitor to Rome between 1873 and 1893, witnessed the results of excavations in the Jewish catacomb in the Vigna Randanini, although he did not visit in person the Vigna Cimarara and via Labicana sites. His views on the archaeology of the Jewish catacombs does not differ significantly from those expressed by Christian archaeologists of the time, although he rightly questions much of the historical and literary tradition on the Jews in Ancient Rome, Berliner, 1992, pp. 6–8.

131. Cod. Vat. Correspondence de Rossi n. 14289 f. 27 (April 17th, 1888): Berliner acknowledges de Rossi’s “gentilezza, mandando le iscrizioni di Vigna Cimara.” A small catacomb containing kokhim was also seen near the Christian cata-
combs of the “Nunziatella” on the fourth mile of the via Ardeatina south of Rome, in the vigna Cianciarelli: “Con-
combs of the “Nunziatella” on the fourth mile of the via containing mandando le iscrizioni di Vigna Cimarra.” A small catacomb 17th, 1888): Berliner acknowledges de Rossi’s “gentilezza, cal and literary tradition on the Jews in Ancient Rome,

132. Still another of de Rossi’s students, Mariano Armellini, announced in 1878 that a mudslide on the Colle Rosato had revealed the entrance into a small cubiculum, “una di quelle trovate a Monteverde,” in “La catacomba degli presso la via Appia Pignatelli” in Muller’s early work in Rome was excavating, in 1885, a catacomb on the via Appia Pignatelli, whose Jewishness is now in great doubt (N. Muller, “la catacomba degli presso la via Appia Pignatelli” in Römische Mittheilungen, 1 (1886) pp. 49–56). As a scholar at the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut in Rome between


140. Muller, 1915, p. 219. Vismara, 1986, p. 363 provides an accurate summary of area’s geological features analyzed by G. De Angelis D’Ossat. The site’s current address is Circonvallazione Gianicolense, 50.


143. ACS, ACS, Min. Pub. Istr. Gen. AA. BB. AA., vers. 2, pt. 2a, b. 17, fasc. 142: “La parte scoperta (del cimitero) dopo lo sprofondamento e’...” 

144. ACS, Min. Pub. Istr. Gen. AA. BB. AA., vers. 2, pt. 2a, b. 17, fasc. 142: “Gia’ presso la via Portuense sono note alcune catacombe chiamate di Ponziano, ove si scopirono i loculi contenenti i corpi dei SS. Sennon ed Abden. Si suppongono quindi che le catacombe venute in luce potessero essere una continuazione delle altre o anche di quelle che si dipartono dalla Basilica di S. Pancrazio. Questa supposizione e validamente confortata dalla natura del terreno uguale in tutta quella zona.”


147. O. Marucchi, “Ritrovamento del cimitero giudaico della via Portuense,” NBAC 10–11 (1904) pp. 271–272, which Marucchi hoped, in keeping with his own interests in Rome’s Jewish sites, might even date to the “apostolic age.” The extent of collaboration between Muller and the CDAS is made clear by Ferrua, 1988, p. 27 n. 12, who notes not only Marucchi and Bevignani, but also Palombi (who drafted the October 1906 plan published in Muller’s work) as well as Enrico Josi followed the work in the Vigna Pellegrini.


150. Muller, 1915, p. 220. Because of the presence of multiple trences below the catacomb for graves “a cappuccina,” evidenced in a photograph of the period conserved today at Humbolt Univeristy in Berlin, it is unlikely that much of the Jewish catacomb in that area had already been destroyed by mining, as Rurgers has recently proposed (“Neue Recherchen in den jüdischen und frühchristlichen Katakomben Roms: Methode, Deutungsprobleme und historische Implikationen...”)
28 Jessica Dello Russo


151. Muller, 1915, p.222, found no other ancient enrances into the site.


155. Muller (1915, p. 302) had identified CIJ 1.470/JIWE 2.618 as Jewish, dating the Latin inscription to the 1st century CE. Recent studies date the inscription to a slightly later period, however, and place its Jewishness in some doubt (bibliography in JIWE 2, p. 502). Cappelletti, 2006, pp. 149–151; R. Martorell, E. Loreti, 2000, p. 368; and Noy, 1995, pp. 3–5, find scarce evidence of the catacomb’s chronology. Rutgers, however, in “Radiocarbon Dating of Several Ancient Jewish Oil Lamps from Rome,” *Radiocarbon* 49.3 (2007) pp. 1215–1219, and idem, 2009, pp. 22–24, finds that “all this evidence should not be interpreted to mean that the excavator, Nikolaus Muller, was incorrect in designating this site as the “oldest Jewish cemetery in the West.” Rutgers believes that the topographical data indicates only later areas of the catacomb survived into the 20th century. He declares “it is still quite possible that the Monteverde catacomb was the oldest Jewish catacomb in the city (of Rome).”

156. R. Venuti, 1748, p. 147, makes a similar observation. His comment: “vedendosi in alcune grotte fu lasciato il corpo all’ uso orientale, situati presso all’ atrio, ed in altre il terreno cavato con i suoi loculi l’uno superiore all’ altro, come nel nostro sepolcro o coemeterio,” could be taken to mean that at least part of the area explored in 1748 was visible to Muller in 1904–06. Muller, 1915, p. 215, suggests that the typology of the tombs in the Monteverde catacomb indicates that Jewish catacombs did not “imitate” the Christian ones (as originally proposed by Garrucci), but developed independently of the former, with few similarities, including (for Muller) virtually no shared characteristics with the tombs found in the Christian catacombs of Rome. His description of the tombs in the Monteverde site, however, would suggest otherwise, as the most common tomb-forms used at Monteverde, loculi, fossa, sarcophagi in clay or marble, and even stacks of tombs above pavement level are also found in Christian catacombs in Rome.

157. Muller, 1915, p. 226: a small flight of stairs led to this area, excavated, according to Muller, before the peripheral galleries.


159. Muller, 1915, p. 226.

160. Cappelletti, 2006, p. 145, nonetheless believes that “the area seems different from the one described by Bosio.”

161. Muller, 1915 p. 238, takes special note that here the clay sarcophagi were all found on or above ground level, unlike examples of these objects found buried below ground in the catacombs of Domitilla and the Vigna Randanini.

162. Some have read into Bosio’s comment about tombs excavated below the floor level a reference to *kokhim*, but none were found in Muller’s far more detailed exploration of the site, or in areas later seen by Kanzler (1913) and Paribeni (1919). It is possible that Bosio accessed the Monteverde catacomb from an entrance not found in later excavations (Vismara, 1986, p. 362), but it is certain that at least part of the catacomb seen by Bosio and his contemporaries were visible to Muller as well: see figures 3 and 4.

163. Muller, 1915, p. 239. Vismara, 1986, p. 366, points out that a trapezoidal mound of dirt mixed with mortar could have served as a pedestal for a sarcophagus.

164. Martorelli, 2005, p. 235, wonders if this type of burial indicates that, at a certain point, Jews no longer had exclusive use of the cemetery.


166. Muller, 1915, pp. 243–244 & 250, found bone rings and many fragments of glass, including gold glass fragments of architectural motifs, the figure of an orator whose upraised arm was supported by a putto, and what Muller identifies as a bacchic scene. Perhaps the most curious discovery is that of a bronze container containing a piece of *pergumum*, that Muller was unable to decipher.

168. Marucchi’s note in Muller, 1915, p. 240: these Monteverde artifacts “con poche eccezioni” were turned over by the Marquis Pellegrini Quarantotti to the CDAS. The Lateran Palace’s Sala Giudaica was opened shortly after Muller’s death in 1912. The plaque read: “Inscriptiones Veterum Judaeorum et cimiteria viae Portuensis huc allatae A. D. MCMVII ex dono March. Pellegrini Quarantotti—curante Nicolao Muller.”

169. It had been hoped that a report would be ready by the 1906 volume of the Nuovo Bollettino di Archeologia Cristiana.

170. O. Marucchi, Session of January 17th, 1907, in Dibustizzazioni della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia 10.1 (1907), pp. 235–237. Ferrua, 1988, p. 27, locates Marucchi’s manuscript in the archives of the Pontificia Commissione di Archeologia Sacra (“Cimitero Giudaico di Monteverde”). It would be interesting to see if and how much of the information from Monteverde was integrated with the discussion on Jewish catacombs in the revised and, as it turned out, posthumous edition of his Le Catacombe Romane: Opera Postuma, ed. E. Josi, (Rome, 1933).


172. Hirschfeld, 2008, pp. 31–32, nn. 59–60, notes that Muller’s manuscripts after his death were given by his brothers to the University of Berlin. Prof. P. Welten of the Theology Faculty of Humboldt University, Berlin is currently studying this collection. The CDAS and Italian archaeologists (R. Paribeni) responded to Bees’s accusations in kind, expressing anti-German sentiments heighted by by the First World War (in which Schneider-Graziosi, de Rossi’s great-nephew, had lost his life).


174. Muller, 1915, p. 219, and Atti CDAS, 28, (1906–1907): April 15th 1907 draft of a letter from the Secretary of the CDAS to the Pellegrini Quarantotti: “la CDAS d’intesa con il Ministero della Istruzione Pubblica prega i signori eredi del marchese Benedetto Pellegrini di voler permettere al sig. Prof. Nicola Muller della Universita’ di Berlino di completare nell’interessa della scienza il rilievo e gli studi sulle catacombe giudaiche esistenti nella vagna di loro proprieta’ in contrada Monteverde presso la Stazione di Trastevere.”


177. A number of bricks with stamps discovered in the Brunori quarries published in Filippi, 1991, pp. 73-99. Contrary to Muller’s own declarations about the catacomb’s instability, De Angelis d’Ossat, 1943, pp. 22–23, maintains that it was actually the demolition of the geological stratum (lithoid tufa) below the catacombs by means of quarries too wide and close to each other, supported by pilasters too slender to support the weight of the upper strata, that caused the cemetery levels to collapse.


parte più antica e da demolire... Date pero’ la insistenza dei proprietari, i quali d’accordo col Prof. Muller, affermando la esistenza della necropolis constittuisce per essi un grave pericolo, pregò la S. V. di recarsi nel posto ed esaminare accuratamente le condizioni statiche del monumento e referirsi tosto al Ministero se sia veramente il caso di concedere il permesso che esso venga demolita in tutto o in parte.”

180. ACS, Min. Pub. Istr. Dir. Gen. AA. BB. AA., vers. 4, div. 1, (1908–1912) b. 9, fasc. 180: Letter of February 21, 1909 by Prof. N. Muller to the Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione: “Il cimitero giudaico si compone di due parti, una più antica ed importante per le forme architettoniche diverse affatto da quelle gia’ conservate nella Roma Sotteranea, col un altra più recente di forma quasi idonea a quella delle catacombe cristiane. Disgraziatamente pero’ la parte più antica non si puo’ in alcun modo conservare essendosi poi trovato al di sotto una vasta ed antica cava di pietre che e’ divisa della sovrastante catacomba da un piccolo spessore. E’ posto ciò’ facilmente si comprende che se non esiguissero ivi dei lavori di consolidamento assai costosi, e che i proprietari non intendono naturalmente di fare, e che non possono sperarsi da private persone, veramente l’esistenza di quel rovinoso cimitero sarebbe di una continuata pericolo ed anche assai grave per i proprietari. Lo scrivente... esprimere il parere che questo possa, anzi debba demolirsi. Quanto poi all’ altra di minore antichità’ ed importanza, il sottoscrittore, in seguito di alcune frane verificatisi nella vigna dei Marchesi Pellegrini Quarantotti a causa delle mine esplose in una cava sottostante degli stessi proprietari concessa in appalto. I proprietari non diedero denuncia alcuna dello sco strenuo... essendo obbligato di ritornare tra breve al suo insegnamento alla università di Berlino.”


182. ACS, Min. Pub. Istr. Dir. Gen. AA. BB. AA., vers. 4, div. 1, (1908–1912) b. 9: Letter of March 16, 1909 from Minister C. Ricci to N. Muller: “La S. V. desiderando proseguire con i suoi studi sul cimitero giudaico ed avendo diviso necessita’ di eseguire esplorazioni nel cimitero giudaico sulla via Portuense, mi ha informato che i proprietari del luogo non consentono all’esecuzione delle esplorazioni se non a patto che, compiute le ricerche, quella catacomb venga demolita per gravi pericoli che essa presenta. Ai proprieta’ pero’ deve’ essere noto che a forma dell’articolo 11 della vigente legge del 12 giugno 1902 n. 185 per la conservazione dei monumenti e dell’ articolo 129 del relativo regolamento ‘ 17 luglio del 1904 e’ vietato demolire o atterrar gli avanzi ai monumenti esistenti nel loro fondo... Essi debbono chiedere ufficialmente il permesso con domanda motivato alla Soprintendenza dei Monumenti, la quale poi, udito il parere della Commissione Regionale, dovra referire a questo Ministero per le opportune deliberazioni. Da ciò’ la S. V. comprende come non si possa permettere alcuna demolizione del monumento di cui si tratta, senza le prescritte cautele e formalita’ volute della legge in vigore.”


187. Leon, 1928, p. 327, n. 47 and ACS, Min. Pub. Istr. Dir. Gen. AA. BB. AA., vers. 4, div. 1 (1908–1912), b. 9: Letter of November 21st, 1909, for a “possible accordo con ...la Comunità Israelitica di Roma.” A further attempt was noted on January 31st 1910 to “interessare la comunità israelitica di Roma a concorrere moralmente e materialmente nelle esplorazioni sistematiche e rigorosamente scientifiche di quell’ importante cimitero.”


189. ACS, Min. Pub. Istr. Dir. Gen. AA. BB. AA., vers. 4, div. 1, (1908–1912) b. 9: Letter of June 8th, 1910 from the Direttore degli Scavi to the Soprintendente dei Monumenti di Roma ed Aquila, B. Marchetti: “Si sono recati il mattino del 4 febbraio nella località’ Monteverde, sulla destra della via Portuense, nella proprietà del Marchese Pellegrini Quarantotti allo scopo di esaminare lo stato della catacomba giudaica rimasta scoperta da frane smisurate di una sottostante cava di pietra e per studiare possibilmente i mezzi di riparare le frane avvenute e di impedire ulteriori rovine per poter esplorare completamente ogni restante della detta catacomba. Un esame dettagliato, sia dell’ aspetto esteriore dell’ intera collina, si dei profondi cavi artificiali e delle frane antiche ercenti dimostre all’ evidenza che la grande altezza, dai tempi romani ad oggi, fu traforata per ogni verso da latomie altissime e pericolosissime, per l’audacita’ con cui furono aperte e per la poca resistenza ne’ piloni di sostegno le gallerie delle cave del piano della via Portuense permutarono la collina, giungendo fino quasi alla superficie, cio’ fino allo strato di tufo incoerente (cappellaccio) per cui venne a mancare alla galleria stessa il contrasto del materiale solido e risistente, che doveva costruire la volta. Da cio’ un seguito di frane incommensurabile e una commozione generale dell’ altezza, che ormai si rende pericolosa in tutti i punti, perché’ frana di continuo, come abbiamo potuto constatare de visu. Nessun opera sara’ possibile ad arrestare, in qualche parte, lo sprofondamento dell’ altezza. Le suddette frane, le quali danno alla collina l’aspetto di un cratere senza volto, mostrano nelle frattura gli avanzi delle corsie di una catacomba giudaica, le non si fossero manifestate quella frane non sarebbe stata scoperta questa catacomba, ed infatti non si e’ potuto fare nessuna esplorazione di essa, se non dopo lo sprofondamento di una zona di terreno, e ricercarla o meglio cercare le testimonianze, frugando tram mezzo il terreno sconvolto. Questo fu l’opera del Prof. Muller, che perciò in molti luoghi doveva arrestarsi perché evitava gravi pericoli e anche per la difficoltà dell’ immense terrapieno da rimuovere. Esaminando, palmo a palmo, il terreno, scendendo tra le frane non ancora arrestate e recentissime abbiamo potuto convincersi che la catacomba giudaica oggi trovansi interamente sprofondata colle frane e che soltanto il fondo di un corridoi resta visibile in alto tagliata da una frana recente. Soltanto in parte rimangono i brevissimi tratti di corsie esplorate dal perlodato Prof. Muller, ma continuamente in balia delle frane, in modo che non resta possibilita’ alcuna d’impedire la scomparsa. In una parola (e in questo dissentiamo dal parere del Sig Prof. Muller) il cimitero giudaico della Vigna Pellegrini-Quaranotti non era molto esteso e occupava soltanto il lembo meridionale della collina, oggi in parte asportato, e per ogni rimanente sconvolto dalle frane delle enormi cave di pietra. Più verso l’alto della collina, dove il terreno non sembra minato da antiche cave, la frattura delle frane non ha nessun indizio di corsie. Sarebbe quinde inutile, se non impossibile, ogni opera di protezione per salvare quel poco che vedesi trasvolto e sezionato delle frane stesse, e ... sarebbe inutile ogni opera di ricerca di nuove corsie. Potrebbe forse con grave dispendio e pericolo ma con scarso risultato tenersi dietro a parziali indagini mano a mano che si determinano le frane, nel modo stesso che tento’ il predetto Prof. Muller. Secondo quanto abbiamo dichiarato ci sembra inopportune di imporre il veto di ricerche, ed intimare la conservazione del monumento al Sig. Pellegrini Quarantotti secondo il deliberato della prima sessione del Consiglio Superiore e poiche’ dove essi cavavano non appaiano i segni del cimitero, e dove ... il territorio e’ soggetto ad inevitabili sprofondamenti.”

190. ACS, Min. Pub. Istr. Dir. Gen. AA. BB. AA., vers. 4, div. 1, (1908–1912) b. 9: Letter of August 1st, 1910 to N. Muller: “Il Consiglio Superiore per le Antichita’ e le Belle Arti ... propone di affidare all’ ufficio scavi di Roma l’incarico di preparare un progetto per la esplorazione delle catacombe e per la conservazione sin dov’e’ possibile di quell’ insigne monumento. Il ministro fece certo dessare il pericoloso lavoro di escavazione nelle prossime cave di tufo ed affido’ all’ ufficio per gli scavi l’incarico della preparazione dell’ accennato progetto. Ma l’ufficio stesso dovette tosto riconoscere che lo stato del cimitero piu’ non permetteva di pensare provvedimenti per la sua conservazione e nemmeno ad una sistematica ricerca. Si fece quindi soltanto alcune fotografie dei pochi avanzi delle corsie che ancora rimanevano. Nel maggio nel corso, poi, in seguito ad una frana rovinosa’ anche le parte del cimitero che era tuttora visibile e oggi puo’ dirsi purtroppo che nulla resta piu’ di quell’ importante monumento.”

quando furono inviati dal E.V. con una lettera del 24 gennaio, 1910 (il 622) di referire sullo stato di conservazione e sul possibile provvedimento da adottare per l’esplorazione del cimitero suddetto. La relazione presentata da me il 16 febbraio 1910 dimostrava chiaramente che sarebbe stato superiore a forze umane di impedire la graduale rovina della catacomba fin allora rilevato ad un ammasso informe e solo conservate in qualche margine per pochi metri di corsie, che erano gia’ state esplorate dal Prof. Muller anni in dietro. La catacomba giudaica così’ distrutta da tanto tempo oggi non offre campo ad esplorazione.”


193. G. Respighi, “Scavi e lavori della PCAS,” Atti del III Congresso Internazionale di Archeologia Cristiana (Studi di antichità cristiana , 8), Vatican City, 1934, p. 102. Included in this concession were hypogaeae vaguely described as “heretical.” Both Respighi’s account and that of U. M. Fasola, “Consegna della catacomba ebraica di vigna Randanini alla Soprintendenza Archeologica di Roma,” Osservatore Romano, June 13th, 1986, p. 3, make no mention of the CDAS’s official disinvolvment throughout the 19th century with the excavation and tutelede of the Jewish sites, studied by individual members of the CDAS (de Rossi, Marucchi) on their own initiative rather than in an official capacity. The Jewish sites were considered “private” excavations, not subject to restrictions imposed on the excavation of Christian catacombs by the Papal State. See n. 196, below.


195. E. Bormann had first told Marucchi about the discovery (Schneider Graziosi, 1915, p. 54, n. 1 and O. Marucchi, “Resoconto delle adunanze tenute dalla societa per le conferenze d’archeologia cristiana,” NBAC 20 (1914) pp. 79–97, 97). The CDAS Atti of June 4th, 1914 describe the new catacombs on the Rey property as “in condizioni peggiori di quelle di vigna Pellegrini-Quaranottie. L’ingenero impone l’abbandono dopo aver portato al Museo Lateranense quanto e’ possibile asportare. Lo stesso segretario lesse ancora un dispaccio al Ministero del Commercio e dei Lavori Pubblici che si inserita negli atti del 16 anno 8 sessione 5 giovedi 21 luglio 1859.” This is the statement made over fifty years before in the which the CDAS had officially declared Jewish hypogaeae in Rome “not pertaining to the Commission.”

196. The staircase linking this hypogaeum to the surface level was reinforced with walls of opus listatum: Kanzler, 1915, p. 156.

197. Schneider Graziosi, 1915, p. 55: the painted inscription CIJ 1.373/JIWE 2.157 was destroyed by vandals in May–June of 1914. The inscriptions removed from the site were taken to Lateran in June of 1913, including examples of brick stamps and graffiti. R. Kanzler, 1915, pp. 152–157: N. Muller, 1915, pp. 242–252. Filippi, 1991, pp. 85–87 suspects that discrepancies between the inventory of Monteverde material from 1921 and that used for later publications (including the CIJ) suggests that some of the material might have been dispersed after arriving at the Lateran in 1915 and may still be in storage. He proposes a clearer reading of the system of catalogization used to inventory the materials to recover lost pieces and other bits of information about the Sala Giudaica collection.

198. Paribeni, 1919, pp. 60–70.

199. CIJ 1.499/JIWE 2.550.

1200. Discovered in 1921 while digging the foundations of the Ospedale della Vittoria in the “Vigna di S. Carlo,” formerly a property of the Barnabite Order. The inscription dates from a later (early Medieval) period: 5th–6th centuries CE. A similar Latin/Hebrew inscription had been found in the area in 1898: see note 135.

201. Verrando, 1988, p. 365, is of the opinion that these hypogaeae are not connected to the larger Jewish cemetery. Frey (1936, p. LXI n. 5) also identifies as “Jewish” another hypogaeum or hypogaea near the church of S. Maria Regina Pacis (in the former Fiorani property). Perhaps only its proximity suggested to Frey some connection to the now-destroyed Monteverde Jewish site.

202. Frey himself visited only a small area of the Monteverde catacomb in June of 1928: CIJ 1 p. LXI (photograph).

203. De Angelis d’Ossat, 1943, p. 9, p. 23 and p. 36, deduces that “irrational and excessive” quarrying for tufo since ancient times with no concern for the stability of geological materials in upper strata had broken down the stratum right below that of the catacomb, disfiguring and weakening its natural condition so that it could no longer support the weight of the upper slope. Second, the radical altering of the same hillside to construct new streets and houses caused surviving galleries to disappear. De Angelis d’Ossat is certain (contra Muller) that the material in which most of the Jewish catacomb was excavated was not, in fact, of poor quality, but “more favorable than elsewhere.” A landslide on October 14th, 1928, near the catacomb covered much of what remained. Steps were taken after this collapse to make the hillside safer for residential development.

204. Hirschfeld, 2008, p. 34, n. 69 (the Commission was defined as “pontificial” by a motu proprio of Pope Pius IX in 1924).

205. De Angelis d’Ossat, 1943, p. 22–24, fig. 6 & 7.
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that the Monteverde Jewish catacombs had been “distrutte con l’abbatimento della collina che le racchiudevano... i provvedimenti purtroppo imposti da ragioni edilizie a spurnare il quale molto si adoperò ma vanamente la commissione nostra (i.e., PCAS).”

207. Cappelletti 2006, p. 146. No further attempts were made to document the Monteverde site following the frustrated efforts of H. J. Leon, J. B. Frey and G. De Angelis d’Ossat (1920s).

208. Italian newspaper articles over the past five years have cited the remains of the Monteverde catacomb, although with no specifics about its identification and location. Most recently, L. Grassi, “Viaggio nelle catacombe ebraiche, La Repubblica, September 5th, 2010, alludes to a discovery made during excavations for parking spaces on the Monteverde: http://roma.repubblica.it/cronaca/2010/09/05/foto/catacombe_ebraiche_villa_torlonia-6777089/1/?rss.
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