CHAPTER THREE

Dissertation I on the Waters and Aqueducts of Ancient Rome

To the distinguished Giovanni Lucio of Trau, Raffaello Fabretti, son of Gaspare, of Urbino, sends greetings.

I. INTRODUCTION

Thanks to your interest in my behalf, the things I wrote to you earlier about the aqueducts I observed around the Anio River do not at all displease me. You have influenced my diligence by your expressions of praise, both in your own name and in the names of your most learned friends (whom you also have in very large number). As a result, I feel that I am much more eager to pursue the investigation set forth on this subject; I would already have completed it had the abundance of waters from heaven not shown itself opposed to my own watery task. But you should not think that I have been completely idle: indeed, although I was not able to approach for a second time the sources of the Marcia and Claudia, at some distance from me, and not able therefore to follow up my ideas by surer reasoning, not uselessly, perhaps, will I show you that I have been engaged in the more immediate neighborhood of that aqueduct introduced by Pope Sixtus and called the Acqua Felice from his own name before his pontifi-
cate, a source of water also brought once before to Rome (as you will hear), though by another route.

2. THE AQUA ALEXANDRINA: COURSE, STATE OF REMAINS, DESCRIPTION, AND ROUTE

I have first classified the construction into a certain order, and I have discovered that all of it, both on arcade and substructure above ground, belongs to one and the same aqueduct. This construction, I have also found, occupies many valleys around the Via Labicana and, last of all, that plain between the Lake of Castiglione and Lake Regillus, in the highest part of which, toward the south, the course of this aqueduct emerges, as well as the sources of the Osa stream. Adrien Aużout of Rouen, a man of refined taste and a very shrewd investigator, no less of physical science than of antiquities, impressed this on me through many exchanges of letters while I was at Urbino and still skeptical about the matter; indeed, the similarity of construction everywhere, the width of the conduit, and its height do not allow me to doubt it. Learn, therefore, the line of the entire conduit attached in the topographic map [fig. 1].

You should not think that we have labored needlessly because Fr. Athanasius Kircher has already displayed of that region “the topography of Latium proper, delineated and measured not so much with the pen as his own steps,” as he announces in his Latium.¹ To confess the truth, Kircher’s map has been spoiled in unhappy ways—either because the man, most distinguished and most skilled in geometric matters, “thought it unworthy to look away from things incorporeal and perceived by reasoning alone to those tangible things that require ample leisure spent in common pursuits,” as Plutarch [Marc. 14.6] hands down from Plato, or because he was betrayed by his lack of interest in physical structures. The result is that all things on his map appear lying this way and that, as if scattered by chance. Among these matters pertaining to our topic (for I pass over the others freely and willingly), in the very place near the town of Colonna from

¹. Kircher, opposite p. 70 (“Tusculani territorii topographia”). Footnotes to the translation give bibliographical references to works cited by Fabretti in the text; however, all citations of ancient authors appear in square brackets within the text itself. In addition, all inscriptions cited from Janus Gruter’s Inscriptiones antiquae (Heidelberg, 1603) are identified in the text by their listings in CIL and ILS when appropriate.
where this aqueduct is derived is said to be the beginning of the Aqua Virgo,² the sources of which are about ten miles distant from here—indeed, on the Via Collatina; at the eighth milestone from the city, according to Frontinus; and near the Anio River, which appears nowhere on Kircher’s map.

Before turning to a fuller description, I will go beyond those things that are noted in general terms on my map [fig. 1]. It occurs to me to wonder at the fickleness of human affairs and the oblivion that threatens accomplishments, however distinguished. Besides the damages of time—which someone might believe that this aqueduct, given the strength of its construction, could scarcely have been able to suffer—the very name of the builder has been lost, along with the purpose of the line. As a result, I do not know whether more truthfully or more elegantly, reference should be made to the summation of our native poet:

So then, if, successfully at one time, famous works
Make war on Time, with slow step
Time brings down both the works and names together.

Indeed, to be sure, huge constructions of this sort, built for the public good, did not deserve the same fate as the useless pyramids; in their case, Pliny [HN 36.79] rightly declares that “the authors of such great vanity have been extinguished by fortune most equitable.” But most unworthily has the fame of this excellent and most useful construction vanished because of the fault of time and the silence of writers. Let us concede that the name of its builder had been surrendered to oblivion for some centuries up to this time. In no way, however, can it be said that this construction has collapsed completely on the ground, for in the very ruins and the tumbledown remains, there is still so much that we may behold as if awestruck. Just as the remains have so long resisted voracious time, they promise a certain everlasting endurance and the admiration of posterity.

The work itself appears everywhere to be of brick-faced concrete, with the outer surface of the sides finished and rows of bricks arranged exactly in a straight line. The squared piers fill a thickness of eight feet. The distance between the piers, or the opening of the arches, is everywhere twelve feet, except in the most distant valley in the direction of the

². Kircher, opposite p. 70.
Fig. 1. Topographical map of Latium from Rome to Labicum showing the course of the Aqua Alexandrina and other aqueducts

1. Final substructure of this aqueduct in the direction of Rome in the vineyard of the Chartusians
2. Fifty-two arches in the valley of the Acqua Bollicante
3. Substructure after the intersection of the Via Labicana
4. Ninety-two arches, the highest of all, in the valley of the Casa Rossa
5. Seven arches of moderate height in the small valley following
6. Twenty-three arches in another valley
7. Eighteen arches in another
8. Branch line from the main conduit to the left, below the Casa Calda
9. One hundred two arches, which occupy two successive valleys
10. Twenty-eight arches in the valley of the Marrana
11. Twenty-two arches in the following valley, arranged in a curve
12. Fifty arches, likewise in a curve
13. Branch line from the main conduit to the right
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14. Single arch in the middle of a substructure of twelve paces
15. Twenty-eight arches, below the Casale di Tor Angela, closer to the Via Praenestina
16. Four arches, lower and almost buried
17. Single arch of rough Gabine stone, above this streambed
18. Five wellheads and evidence of another three, described separately
19. Another wellhead, like those cited already
20. New appearance of substructure after a long underground conduit, below the Casale di S. Antonio
21. Sixty-eight arches behind a stable, commonly called Pocoio de Pantano
22. Sixty-two arches in the middle of the plain
23. Forty-five arches, the first of this aqueduct
24. Settling tank, described separately
25. Remains of a conduit carrying a portion of the Anio Vetus, we believe
26. Ruins of a temple at the fourth milestone of the Via Latina, perhaps that of Fortuna Muliebris
27. Settling tank of the Marcia, we believe
28. Other settling tanks of the Aqua Julia and Aqua Tepula
sources, where it is ten and a half feet. Where the arches are lower, they are formed from a single series of two-foot bricks, but there is a double series in the higher spans. To add a greater solidity to the construction, the higher of these arches have another curved span below, by which the piers are joined between themselves, so that they are not split apart with a huge gap. The two plans that we add show better the dimensions of the channel, the reworkings, ornamentation, mutules, and other more detailed elements. The first [fig. 2] depicts the line closer to the city; the second [fig. 3], the arches in the furthest and marshy area called the Valle di Pantano.

To them, we have added a third plan [fig. 4], of the settling tank at number 24 [in fig. 1], in which the water was received and cast off its mud, as if the course of its conduit were taking its breath, so to speak—this is the particular function of a settling tank, according to Frontinus [Aq. 19.1]. Indeed, from conduit A, the water entering tank C through mouth B and there purified, again unburdening itself through D into E, continued its course toward Rome.

From the same things, the original state of the construction has been set before our eyes, today changed to a very great extent, with arches damaged here and reworked there, not all at one time. In some places, you might see arches propped up with brick-faced reinforcement and piers encased. Elsewhere (and in most places), there are restorations crammed with unworked tufa, from which the ignorance of skill, the limited resources of the restorers, and their purposes betray themselves. That part of the aqueduct that was closer to the city has so felt the damage of attacks and devastation that it appears that the first substructure and first arches running to the right of the Via Labicana [fig. 1, nos. 1–2], have been reconstructed from the ground up, for there is nothing in that remaining structure that knows the elegance or the proportion of the rest. There is also to be noted a recent use, or abuse, of this aqueduct, where, over the same arches [at no. 2], where there is no conduit but a channel dug out in the remains, there is carried today a portion of the Aqua Crabra in the opposite direction, taken off toward the east:

So much of time can long decay change.

[Verg. Aen. 3.415]

Both the variety of the reworkings already cited and the scarcely believable thickness of the incrustation demonstrate that this conduit has
Fig. 2. Aqua Alexandrina: double arcade close to the city

A. Conduit, two and a half feet wide, four and a half feet high up to the curvature of the arch. The arch itself is one foot four inches. The sides are uniformly two feet three inches thick.
Fig. 3. Aqua Alexandrina: single arcade in the Valle di Pantano

A. Conduit, two feet eight inches wide. The sides are of the same thickness.
B. Airholes of two and half square feet appear at various intervals.
C. Brick cornice around the sides of the arches
D. Representation of wellheads for the excavation of earth and an airhole for the excavators of the aqueduct, with side openings arranged for climbing. Their construction is of alternating tufa and brick.

Fig. 4. Aqua Alexandrina: settling tank near the aqueduct intake
survived for a very long time. The deposit is to be found not so much in the channel itself, almost blocked and quite often reduced to three-quarters of its space, but along the exterior walls of the conduit, where we see that moisture issuing from the same place has hardened into huge masses that resemble a wagon loaded with hay. This is a fault the aqueduct has in common with those of the region of Tivoli; even the Marcia itself—

Which shines so bright, so clear
That you would suspect no water at all there

and would believe that pure Lydian marble is gleaming, as Martial [6.42.19–21] has sung about it; “bestowed on the city by a gift of the gods,” as Pliny says [HN 31.41]—has hardened into a deposit far thicker than this that we are describing and more densely formed. The incrustation of this aqueduct is indeed darker and more muddy but is at the same time thinner and more brittle.

However, it greatly escaped me for a long time what reasoning influenced the architect—after scorning a direct route that, although higher, would have required less construction on arches—to plan the course of the aqueduct through lower and sunken places. As a result, on account of the great curvature of the line from the corner near the Via Praenestina [fig. 1, no. 15], I judged that the aqueduct went straight toward Tivoli from that corner, because it looks back in that direction. Finally, from repeated and more frequent inspection of the area and the advice of my friend [Auzout], as I have said, I thought, when the rest of the line had been found, that I had discovered the cause of the matter and could explain the foresight of those times. Indeed, I believe that building on firm terrain would have been the goal, although at the cost of winding along a longer course, which is not found as equally on a straight path as are the low-lying places. That region, the more closely it approaches the Anio, consists of much more solid earth and is full of quarries of the red Collatine stone celebrated by Strabo [5.3.11]. Not only was it right that the foundations lie in a stable place, but since the aqueduct itself, as excellent as it is very great, is constructed entirely of concrete (if you exclude its brick-faced exterior as a shell), it was important for the long life of the construction to seek fill as solid as possible for the concrete, not at a distance, but collected near the construction area. I would add, too, even though an argument for it might be lacking, that the appearance of magnificence
could have also been sought through the display of its very high arches, by which the line is raised in many places to the height of seventy feet.

3. PROOF THAT ALEXANDER SEVERUS BUILT THIS AQUEDUCT

Now that the construction has been described, it remains that we seek the builder of this aqueduct and set forth for the judgment of scholars a matter to this time either untouched or despaired of by students of antiquity. Indeed, Aldus Manutius the Younger seems to have attempted this in his treatise with the impressive and all-inclusive title On the Ancient Aqueducts Once Flowing into Rome. But though his introduction stimulated my appetite and held promise of a sumptuous dinner, I found with disgust nothing except the barest summary of Frontinus—full of mistakes besides—and certain other sweepings from Pliny. Therefore, I will pave my own way for my inferences, although no one is assisting. I state the following as a premise: this aqueduct cannot be numbered among the nine that Frontinus described, a point that is obviously proved by review of the lines themselves.

Indeed, this was not the Appia; that aqueduct took its beginning between the seventh and eighth milestone of the Via Praenestina to the left and came to the city entirely underground (with the exception of sixty paces next to the Porta Capena), according to Frontinus [Aq. 5.5]. This aqueduct comes out of the ground to the right of the Via Praenestina, quite close to the Via Labicana, in the area of the fourteenth milestone (there are more than three miles beyond, which run from the source and the intakes; their beginning is at the Via Labicana itself, up to the point of emergence cited). There is a good deal of construction carried both above ground and conspicuous on arcade, as we have set forth in particulars on the map.

In this and other citations of Frontinus, we follow the edition of Benedetto Millini, already disseminated through all the books of the city, as the most careful and fullest. (If, by chance, this is not at hand, readers should know that the second book of Frontinus begins at chapter 49, pro-
ceeds through the listing of quinariae [pipe capacities] of each individual aqueduct to chapter 74, and takes its end with chapter 105.)

[This is] not the Anio Vetus, since its source, according to Frontinus [Aq. 6.5], is above Tivoli. The source of our aqueduct, beneath the town of Colonna—where we, with Holste, believe Labicum to have been—excludes every confusion. There is therefore no need to examine the difference in substructure above ground. In the Anio, it is 702 paces; in this aqueduct, however, 4,250 paces. The Anio Vetus also totally lacks construction on arcade; in this aqueduct, it runs for 2,325 paces. Likewise, its construction is more recent than that of the Anio Vetus. We know from Frontinus [Aq. 6.1] that the Anio Vetus was built in the flourishing times of the republic, in the 481st year from the founding of the city [272 B.C.]. A brick found with the pottery stamp “AVG.N.” [fig. 5 = CIL XV, 211.14], commemorating “Augustum Nostrum,” indicates that this line was introduced after the empire; indeed, the brick was built in the original arches, so that we need not be uncertain whether it was introduced on the occasion of repairs.

[It is] not the Virgo, the sources of which are even now conspicuous at the eighth milestone on the Via Collatina, where Frontinus [Aq. 10.5] describes them.

[It is] not the Marcia, the Claudia, or the Anio Novus, all aqueducts that have their origin on the Via Valeria or Via Sublacensis, according to the same Frontinus [Aq. 7.6, 14.1, 15.1].

[It is] not the Julia or the Tepula, which, tapped to the right of the Via Latina, were received onto the same arches, those of the Aqua Marcia, as is clear from Frontinus [Aq. 19.3].

Finally, [it is] not the Alsietina, which was sought from the lake of this name in Etruria, on the Via Claudia at the fourteenth milestone, on a side road to the right at sixty-five hundred paces, according to Frontinus [Aq. 11.3]. This aqueduct originated in the middle of Latium.

With all these aqueducts of Frontinus excluded and since we know as a fact that Severus Alexander Augustus introduced an aqueduct, I argue that this aqueduct cannot be attributed to another emperor; no other line can be attributed to this builder. Clearly, it follows that Alexander was the builder of this construction.

Spartianus reveals to us in his Life that Alexander introduced an aque-
duct: “He restored works of the old emperors and himself established new ones; among them were baths in his name, built next to those that were the Neronian baths, after he introduced an aqueduct that is now called the Alexandrina” [SHA Alex. Sev. 25].

A coin of Alexander himself shows this as well, with his baths and a fountain, by which it was customary to indicate an aqueduct; in the collection of Alessandro Rondinini, it is of very fine appearance and notable for its state of preservation (as those knowledgeable in numismatics put it). Angeloni has illustrated an example of it in the coinage of this emperor;⁵ Oisel, however, believes that the bay of Baiae and a ship are indicated.⁶ Publius Victor⁷ and the Notitia Imperii [VZ, 1:256; Jordan, 2:570] also cite this Aqua Alexandrina.

5. Angeloni, 276–77, table 282.3.
Finally, it is evident that neither can another aqueduct be attributed to this emperor nor another builder to this aqueduct (indeed, these two points already follow each other in turn). Aside from the aqueducts cited by Frontinus, later generations have recognized only two in this city: the one that is the subject of our discussion and that of the Aqua Traiana across the Tiber. As we shall prove, the Traiana, brought along the Via Aurelia for almost two miles, enters the city through the gate that is either the Aurelia or the Pancratiana, as it was called from the times of Procopius, and displays itself at the top of the Janiculum.

4. REVIEW OF OTHER AQUEDUCT CONDUITS IN ROME

Our purpose here is to review the other arcades and water conduits that have been scattered throughout the city—on this occasion with the pen, as we have done so many times with our eyes—so that we may rule out the possibility that they received water from this aqueduct or another with the name of Alexander.

a. Aqueducts at Porta Maggiore

Those aqueducts, highest of all from the eastern corner of the city, that come along the city walls down to the Porta Maggiore carried the Aqua Claudia and Aqua Anio Novus, as Frontinus has reported [Aq. 18.4] and as the following four-line inscription on each side demonstrates.

Tiberius Claudius, the son of Drusus, Caesar Augustus Germanicus, pontifex maximus, in the twelfth year of tribunician power, consul five times, imperator twenty-seven times, father of his country, provided for the introduction of the Aqua Claudia from sources that were called the Caeruleus and Curtius from the twenty-fifth milestone and likewise of the Anio Novus from the sixty-second milestone, at his own expense. [CIL VI, 1256]

Next to these, on the right for those coming to Rome, were other arcades that carried the conduits of the Aqua Marcia, Aqua Tepula, and Aqua Julia; scarcely a trace of them is left, since their remains yielded to the arcade of Sixtus V. Where they still remain intact, at a distance from the city in a farmhouse of the property called Settebassi, at the fifth mile-
stone of the Via Latina, I found them built to most exact form and greatest solidity [fig. 6]. As a result, it was rightly said by Propertius [3.22.24], “eternal work, the water of the Marcia”; and truly Plutarch [Cor. 1.1] called this “the greatest and most beautiful aqueduct,” since its elegance was also sought from the different hues of its stone construction.

There is no doubt that these aqueducts came into the city, joined and in the ascending order set forth already, as evidenced by Frontinus: “from the settling tanks they are received onto the same arches, the highest of them that of the Julia; below, that of the Tepula; and then that of the Marcia” [Aq. 19.3]; “The highest is the Anio Novus, next is the Claudia, the Julia holds third place, the fourth the Tepula, then the Marcia” [18.4]; “The Anio Vetus holds sixth place in elevation,” and so on [18.6]; “The Virgo follows the elevation of this line, then the Appia” [18.7]. All of these statements correspond excellently to the cross section of each conduit that we set forth, the Claudia and the Anio Novus at the Porta Maggiore [fig. 7]. Outside of this, for those entering on the right, the channels of the Aqua Julia, Aqua Tepula, and Aqua Marcia (not, indeed, that of the Claudia, as Fabricius has wrongly surmised)⁸ present themselves, as you see here [fig. 7].

These conduits then reappear at the modern Porta S. Lorenzo, with the name of the Marcia inscribed on the following inscriptions of Titus and Caracalla (so that no hesitation remains about them).

The emperor Titus Caesar Augustus, son of a god, Vespasianus Augustus, pontifex maximus, in the ninth year of tribunician power, nine times imperator, fifteen times censor and consul, eight times consul-designate, rebuilt the channel of the Aqua Marcia, collapsed from old age, and brought back its water, which had ceased to be in use. [CIL VI, 1246]

The emperor Caesar M. Aurelius Antoninus Pius Felix Augustus Parthicus Maximus Britannicus Maximus, pontifex maximus, saw to the introduction into his sacred city of the Aqua Marcia, blocked by various mishaps, with its source cleaned out and mountains tunneled and cut through, the conduit having been restored, and a new source, the Antoninian, having been acquired. [CIL VI, 1245]

---

⁸. Fabricius, 201 (= Graevius, 3:527B).
b. The Arcus Caelimontani

The arches that run from the Porta Maggiore to the left, over the Caelian, were called Neronian and carried part of the Aqua Claudia, as we are taught by Frontinus [Aq. 20.2–4]: “Their arches [those of the Claudia and Anio Novus] end behind the estate of Pallas, from where they are distributed in pipes to supply the city’s needs. The Claudia, however, transfers part of itself beforehand at Spes Vetus to the so-called Neronian Arches. This arcade runs over the Caelian Hill and terminates next to the Temple of the Divine Claudius.”

From these words, it is obvious that the distribution of the Aqua Claudia that Fabricius (cited earlier) has set forth, as if “one branch were
Fig. 7. Cross section of aqueduct arcades entering the city at Spes Vetus: Aqua Anio Novus, Aqua Claudia, Aqua Julia, Aqua Tepula, Aqua Marcia

A. Conduit of the Anio Novus
B. Conduit of the Claudia
C. Conduit of the Julia
D. Conduit of the Tepula
E. Conduit of the Marcia
F. Location of the inscription of Tiberius Claudius Caesar, set forth already
G. Location of the inscription of Vespasian Caesar, set up on the reconstruction of these aqueducts
H. Location of the inscription of Titus Caesar, set up on the same occasion
I. Height of the convex arch of the Acqua Felice on the outside, six feet below the base of the Claudia, eight feet above the base of the Julia
extending from the Caelian onto the Capitoline, the other onto the Aventine,”9 is incorrect and reduced. In contradiction to Frontinus, Fabricius announced his subdistribution of the line as the first and highest distribution of it. There still remained the water of that portion that was transferred over the Neronian Arches; and the other portion, which, as we have seen, “was distributed in pipes behind the estate of Pallas to supply the city’s needs,” was disregarded.

The following inscription shows that the arches were also named Caelimontani.

Although this inscription is said to exist in the region of the Arenula, it was “once affixed on this aqueduct in front of the hospital of S. Giovanni,” as stated in an old manuscript that the most distinguished Marcello Severoli keeps in his most well appointed library, himself even more well appointed in every kind of literature.

I do not understand what Nardini means by the following observation: “The Neronian Arches appear today of brick construction, but the other arches constructed of large stones, which are outside the walls, give indi-
cation that these arches were of no less magnificence, where that which is seen today was a facing given them perhaps in less happy times,” and so on.10 Indeed, I do not know why Nardini demands the same stone structure in this part of the Aqua Claudia—constructed as a branch by Nero and running in a different direction from the main conduit—as in the main aqueduct as a whole, with the result that he has doubts about the reworking of these arches and the brick facing alone. Where is there even a slight trace of stone construction on this whole course? How would Nardini find an excuse for those brick piers, which he has judged faulty from their excessive thinness and the width of their arches, unless the reason was to overshadow as little as possible the urban structures adjacent to the line? I ask, could a greater and almost double construction of other stones have been supported on those piers, only eight feet long and seven feet wide? We may understand this from a comparison of each conduit, which we show on this occasion [fig. 8].

All these arches, however, show reconstruction by Severus and Caracalla, about which the inscription speaks. They fall short of the simplicity and gracefulness of the arches that we have described, and we believe that Nardini observed only these reworked arches when it pleased him to call a most careful work “a facing given . . . in less happy times.” Indeed, just because Nero used brick to construct his arches (in other respects, quite elegant and most worthy of their builder), you would not judge them less splendid or useful. Vitruvius [2.8.16] especially approves this material, when he recounts the considerable number of works, public or regal, built in brick throughout the whole world, finally ending with these words: “Since, therefore, kings with such great power, for whom it would have been permitted through taxes and booty quite often to have buildings not only in concrete or squared stone but also in marble, have not scorned structures of brick walls, I do not think it right to disapprove of buildings constructed with brick facing, provided they have been brought to completion correctly.”

c. The Claudia Branch to the “Trophies of Marius”

Other arches, which from the same Porta Maggiore to the right terminate at the castellum, or emissarium, as Gruter calls it,11 near the Arch of Gal-

11. Gruter, ccxxiv.5.
lienus, are indeed at the same elevation as the Neronian Arches already discussed. From this, it is certain that they carried the remaining part of the Aqua Claudia (as Gruter correctly observes at that place) or also the Anio Novus superimposed on it. These two waters were mixed before the time of Frontinus, as he himself states \[Aq. 72.6\], and this is the same place, behind the estate of Pallas, from where, according to a passage just cited \[Aq. 20.2\], when the arcades of the conduits had ended, the immense supply of water, displayed through five openings (as we shall state), used to be distributed in pipes for the use of the city. Indeed, no other aqueduct (since these were the highest of all) could climb to so great an elevation.

The theory of a modern writer therefore remains colder than the Anio itself or the chilly Simbruvium: from this “castellum of the Aqua Marcia”
(as he labels it), supposedly erected by Trajan when that emperor restored that line and increased its capacity or extended it onto the Aventine—this, however, I remember having read as never cited from Frontinus himself but only in Angeloni, more than once and in an especially pompous manner with respect to one of his Trajanic coins—he assigns the “Trophies” once standing there to Trajan. The Aqua Marcia, the exact and very nearby elevation of which we have in the channel of the same aqueduct already discussed at the Porta Maggiore, remains at a level twenty-five feet and more below the elevation of the Claudia, as it appears in the cross section set forth earlier, and the elevation of those five aqueducts [fig. 7]. It could not, therefore, have reached the height of this castellum.

This established fact, tested by mathematical demonstrations, destroys Nardini’s altogether shaky conjecture “And perhaps in the castellum, which still remains under the Trophies of Marius, near S. Eusebio, the three openings that are seen there at equal level distributed water of the same three aqueducts individually (understand the Julia, the Tepula, and the Marcia)” and, indeed, his confident assertion “There can be no doubt that a castellum of the Aqua Marcia stands there, seeing the clear division into three intakes.” I say that this is shaky because to those three openings seen by Nardini, another two would have to be added at its sides (that emissarium, indeed, shows so many). All five (so that Nardini not have the task to bring in still two more other aqueducts) were supplied by one conduit, distributed as you see here [fig. 9].

This distribution is made through a delivery system that no one (as far as I know) has noticed up to this time. Fabricius was about half wrong; he states that the same conduit he recognized between the Porta Maggiore and the “Trophies of Marius” was that of the Aqua Julia, higher than the other two. He also is too little concerned about elevation but, like others, belches forth what comes into his mouth.

d. The “Arco di Druso” Aqueduct and Specus Octavianus

It will be more important (as a result of the common delusion of antiquarians, as you yourself will judge) to determine to which of the ancient aqueducts

---

15. Fabricius, 202 (= Graevius, 3:527C).
ducts the following conduit pertains—the one that, proceeding almost three stades along the Via Latina on the left (for those coming toward Rome), enters the city in a corner of the walls further to the south, crosses the Via Appia above an arch next to the Porta S. Sebastiano, and continues toward the areas of Region XII and the Piscina Publica. Indeed, up to this point, some have asserted fearlessly that that very arch is the Porta Capena, damp (from the Aqua Appia falling above it) and dripping, as the poets describe it. First, we must first fight and overcome that common mistake and demonstrate that the Aqua Appia did not reach this point and that the Porta Capena stood not in this place but, rather, far back from it, toward the city.

Does the aqueduct we are discussing here have anything to do with the Aqua Appia? The matter is so absurd that it is a wonder that first Luca Peto, in his treatise On the Reconstruction of the Aqua Virgo, and then

---

other noted and distinguished men have been so unmindful of Frontinus. They thought that the Appia, which was the lowest of all the aqueducts (the Alsietina across the Tiber excluded), according to his ranking already cited [Aq. 18], climbed to the top of this hill. The Virgo itself is found to be far below it, as measurement demonstrates. No less an argument against it is the shortness of the Appia’s substructure and the sixty paces in total of its arcade above ground, which Frontinus [Aq. 5.5] attributed to the Appia “next to the Porta Capena.” Approximately 450 paces of substructure by which the conduit in question comes down from the Via Latina to the Via Appia are evident.

Concerning the location of the ancient Porta Capena, the matter is even more clear, by the authority of Strabo [5.3.9], who in these words demonstrates that the Via Latina branched from the Appia outside the city and therefore beyond the Porta Capena: “The Via Latina begins from the Appia, deviating from it to the left near Rome; passes over the Tusculan Mount, between the town of Tusculum and the Alban Mount; and descends to the town of Algidus and Pictae Tabernae.” Strabo’s words are so clear that they do not permit different readings of critics and forced interpretations. It should also be added that since Pliny [HN 3.67] and Dionysius [Ant. Rom. 9.68.2–4] bounded the circumference of the city by the slopes of the hills, the agger [rampart] of Tarquinius, and the river, the location of the Porta Capena cannot more conveniently be conceived than in a line drawn from the rock of the Caelian Hill, below the Orti Mattei, toward the spur of the Aventine, beneath the Church of S. Maria in Navicella and the fortification of Pope Paul III.

Since this is the special claim of truth, that all things agree with it, the result is that all the statements of authors speaking on this subject, which have drawn others in different directions, present themselves, in our opinion, altogether obvious and easy. What is more appropriate—indeed, more necessary—than that at this spot, we should allow a passage for the Aqua Appia, the lowest of all the aqueducts this side of the Tiber, “next to the Porta Capena,” and bring it back from high onto level ground? Where could the substructure and arcaded construction of the Aqua Appia, not greater than sixty paces, more fittingly have shown itself than in the spot indicated by us—indeed, through the jaws of the Caelian (if I put it this way) and its slope turned toward the Aventine from the south, on which the Church of S. Balbina was built?

What overcomes every argument and agrees with this opinion in a
A marvelous way is, in actuality, the site where we most recently, while writing this study, discovered the channel of the Aqua Appia, unrecognized over several centuries (concerning which I shall speak shortly). Moreover, Sextus Pompeius Festus [p. 102L] spoke in this fashion; according to him, “The Lemonian Tribe has been named from the Pagus Lemonius, which is beyond the Porta Capena on the Via Latina” (written as it befitted a famous grammarian). Festus will also not submit to correction by Holste, who, in his note, thus moves that pagus and, with it, Ortelius, arguing, “Therefore the Pagus Lemonius was between the Via Appia and the Latina, for the Via Appia begins from the Porta Capena, but the Via Latina from the gate of the same name.”17 Rather, I say, with Festus, that the Pagus Lemonius could be approached on the Via Latina itself and not in any other way except from the Porta Capena. Certainly, it was not approached from the Porta Latina, of which there is neither physical evidence nor a name before the extension of the city by Aurelian’s walls.

Finally, the position of our Porta Capena is exactly consistent with the spot where the column of the first milestone of the Via Appia [CIL X, 6812] was found and from which it was afterward transferred to the Capitolium: precisely, in the Naro vineyard, which is the first on the right for those leaving from the modern Porta S. Sebastiano. Going back from here to the Porta Capena, a thousand paces are completed in a line drawn by us. Someone will say that the column, perhaps set up somewhere else, could have been moved to the spot in later centuries; however, he would use natural possibility (as the schools say) for attacking according to whim. We will be content to sustain our position by moral probability also supported by other arguments.

What blindness, then, has seized minds so that Strabo, speaking so clearly [5.3.9], has escaped the keen sight of so many philologists? From just the ancient testimony of the scholiast on Juvenal’s line [Sat. 3.11], “He stood at the ancient arches and the damp Capena,” we might seem to be able to draw the conclusion that at Juvenal’s time, the name of the Porta Capena had been transferred elsewhere, but the original place was still known. The scholiast writes as follows: “Damp, for the reason that an aqueduct is above it, which they now call the dripping arch [arcus stillans]; indeed, first, there had been also gates in the very same place, which used to be called the Porta Capena.” There existed, therefore, that “dripping
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arch,” the conduit of the Aqua Marcia, which constituted the “damp Capena” (by fault of its great antiquity at the time of Juvenal) or, as Martial [3.47.1] describes it, was “dripping with great drops.”

Why, indeed, do scholars distort the passage of Frontinus [Aq. 5.5] that indicates the substructure of the Aqua Appia and its arcade as “next to the Porta Capena”? They do violence to his very words and, at the same time, to the nature of the place when they bring the Aqua Appia not “next to,” as Frontinus intended, but “on top of” the Porta Capena. They have overlooked and ignored the account of the same Frontinus about the Aqua Marcia: “The Marcia, however, behind the estate of Pallas, casts off part of its volume onto the Caelian into a channel that is called the Rivus Herculanus. The (portion? a word seems to be lacking here) of the conduit itself, supplying no needs of the hill because of its low level, is fixed above the Porta Capena.”

These statements of Frontinus [Aq. 19.8–9] and, in addition to his authority, the very nature of the spot, as I have said, and the most authentic conduit of the Aqua Appia, recognized by me, as I shall show later, make it impossible that the Appia ran atop the Porta Capena. Although its level would indeed permit the height of approximately eight paces needed for mounting the arch (no higher than the arch at the modern Porta S. Sebastiano), the remaining part of the construction would have occupied the entire width of the valley, and neither four times nor five times sixty paces, which Frontinus assigns to the crossing of the Appia, would have sufficed.

We will therefore permit the Aqua Appia (after we have installed the Marcia atop the Porta Capena) to be carried on the “old arches” at the bottom, crossing the valley on that short substructure, below the gate that rose on the side of the Caelian at a fairly high level, as we believe. The result is that there are two different structures, although quite close in their location: the “old arches” of the Aqua Appia (for none preceded them in age) near the Porta Capena and the Porta Capena itself, with the conduit of the Marcia atop it. After these arguments in support of this (in my opinion) new identification, I shall not omit another to answer those opposing me (although it can already be regarded as superfluous, given the great evidence of the matter); the modern arch at the Porta S. Sebastiano, which they have foolishly substituted, shows itself even today impenetrable to moisture, by its own mass and the very strong incrustation of the conduit that it supports.
A second inscription excavated in the same vineyard and carrying the statement

The Senate and Roman people saw to the reworking of the Clivus of Mars into level ground at public expense [CIL VI, 1270] shows that that clivus [slope], reworked into level ground (not precisely level, to be sure, but lightly sloping, as we see) by the work of excavation that is seen at the Porta S. Sebastiano, was once called the Clivus of Mars; indeed, it was so named from the Temple of Mars next to the Porta Capena. The temple was built near the gate, as Servius testifies [at Aen. 1.292]: “There are two temples of this god in the city: one of Quirinus within the city, as it were, of Mars the Guardian, and of Mars the Peaceful; the second on the Via Appia outside the city near the gate, as it were, of Mars the Warrior or Gradivus.” It was also in sight of the gate, on the right, as Ovid [Fast. 6.191–92] has written: “The same day is a festival for Mars, whom the Porta Capena looks upon, set outside next to the road on the right.” We therefore believe that the temple was situated at the bottom of the valley, before the clivus had risen significantly, from the evidence of a letter of Cicero. Writing to his brother and reviewing the lowest places of the city damaged by flooding, Cicero [Q Fr. 3.5.8] says that the temple itself or the level ground beneath it was washed by an extraordinary flood.

We cite all ancient authorities as witnesses of our earlier argument that absolutely no mention of the Porta Latina is found before the times of Aurelian. Indeed, whatever modern writers treating ancient lore have made mention of this gate at a time when it did not yet exist have spoken through prolepsis. I say they have spoken through prolepsis since the appearance of the site has been changed from that time when our ancient sources had written to explain more clearly its actual location, at that time on the Via Latina outside the Porta Capena. We must especially understand in this way the account of the immersion of S. Giovanni into a caldron of boiling oil in front of the Porta Latina included in the ancient martyrrology on May 6th and any other witness of this miraculous occurrence—even more for the reason that generally executions were carried out outside the gates and along the more heavily traveled roads. Indeed,

Prochorus, a contemporary of S. Giovanni, by whose authority (with Fr. Aringhi making approving reference) is told “the passion of S. Giovanni before the gate and the dedication of the church by the faithful who were there in that place,” was one of seven deacons who collected the deeds of the martyrs into a whole. As is noted in the alphabetical index of authors of the *Maxima bibliotheca veterum patrum* [Most Comprehensive Library of the Church Fathers], according to the judgment of Giovanni Brisichella, the head of the holy apostolic palace, “That history, however, and the *Life* of S. Giovanni are falsely ascribed to Prochorus, for the *Life* is indeed apocryphal and the stuff of fable.” Cardinal Bellarmine (whom Lipsius appropriately calls the champion and teacher of the church) has branded similar censure on this book. Bellarmine was especially disturbed since, he says, “it seems incredible that the church would have been built in his [Giovanni’s] honor by the faithful who were there in that place; for who would dare that under the eyes of the raging Domitian?” As a result, I am amazed that Aringhi cites the authority of an apocryphal writer to posit the existence of a Porta Latina at the time of S. Giovanni, whom he believes contemporary with the emperor Domitian, and corrupts through anachronism what others, using anticipation of chronology, have handed down correctly.

Now that the Porta Capena has been pushed back inside the intersection of the Via Latina, along with both the substructure of the Aqua Appia and its course on arcade, a greater task still awaits us: that of establishing the name of the aqueduct and the arch at the modern Porta S. Sebastiano. In matters of this sort, uncertain and obscure because of their very antiquity, it has always seemed easier to attack other people’s positions than to prove one’s own. That conduit was, by more than one indication, I think, that same one that is called Octavianus by Frontinus [*Aq. 21*] and that received part of the Anio Vetus, as is understood by these words: “The Anio Vetus this side of the fourth milestone . . . of the . . . Via, where one passes from the Via Latina to the Via Labicana, crosses on arches and has itself a settling tank. From here, this side of the second milestone, it delivers part of its volume into a conduit that is called the Octavianus and

---
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reaches the region of the Via Nova and the Asinian Gardens, from where its volume is distributed throughout that district. The main conduit, however, coming behind Spes Vetus, is distributed inside the Porta Esquilina into deep channels throughout the city.”

There are indeed many facts in agreement to confirm this opinion. The first and most important evidence is the ranking of elevation, especially appropriate to the Anio Vetus, sixth place in height, between the Marcia and the Virgo, as Frontinus ([Aq. 18.6] cited earlier) has revealed. The second, not insignificant, is furnished by the branch line and the course of this conduit, similar to that described in Frontinus. This Specus Octavianus was indeed found around the second milestone from the city, to the left of the Via Latina for those leaving Rome, in the place indicated [fig. 1, no. 25]. In its deviation from this spot again to the left, toward the Via Labicana, on which it was looking back, and toward the Monument of Alexander—near it there exist traces of the side road from the Via Latina to the Via Labicana, which Frontinus cites—the branch was able to show straight and intact the channel from which it had diverged. The higher aqueducts, the Claudia and the Anio Novus placed on top of it, which were brought on a downward course to this first region over the Arcus Caelimontani, according to Frontinus [Aq. 86], would not indeed have required so greatly circuitous a route. To this region, the Marcia, or that part of it which Frontinus [Aq. 19.8–9] calls the Rivus Herculaneus, also “used to distribute itself over the Caelian,” as we just saw. Likewise, the presence of the Via Nova and the Asinian Gardens in the twelfth region, where are located the Thermæ Antoniniæ, which the conduit seems to seek as its destination, shows that this was the Specus Octavianus, from the same terminus that Frontinus assigns to the distribution of the Aqua Anio Vetus carried by it.

Finally, we compared the deposit from it (so that we might leave no type of proof unexplored) with another that was taken from the conduit of the Anio Novus. As the waters of each Anio line were tapped from the very same river, according to Frontinus [Aq. 73.6], so, in proportion to the distance from which they were carried, we found this one like that, and we brought the matter for testing to the Experimental Academy (so they call it) that the most honorable Giovanni Ciampini has opened in his house in a courageous and certainly praiseworthy enterprise, so that our conjectures might also be supported by proofs of the alchemist’s art. It was certainly surprising and at the same time very pleasing to have found in this com-
parison a variety of incrustation in one and the same conduit of the Anio Novus. That older deposit attached to the opus signinum [waterproof concrete lining] from the time when the water used to be drawn unmodified from the river itself, was of turbid color, “as the river itself, although flowing from a very clear lake, nevertheless because of its crumbling banks carries away something by which it is muddied” (so Frontinus [Aq. 90]). However, the water that was added last of all to the conduit, “after Nerva Caesar saw that the shortcomings of the Anio Novus could be eliminated and ordered that its water be drawn from the lake, where it is very clear, with the river bypassed” [Frontin. Aq. 93.1–2], has produced a newer and cleaner deposit and a whiter one. As a result, the truth of Frontinus’s account is shown to be confirmed.

The reckoning of the distance, as I touched on it in passing, of twenty-two miles between the beginning of each conduit—the Anio Vetus was brought from the twenty-second milestone, according to Frontinus [Aq. 6.8]; the Anio Novus from the forty-second milestone, according to the same author [Aq. 15.1]—was the reason that the deposit of the one seems the same as the other but indeed darker, inasmuch as it was necessary for the water tapped far below to have arrived more muddy “because of the greater number of cultivated areas lying beside it.”

Certainly, that conduit that we saw recently uncovered by diggers in the stone quarry of the vineyard of Benedetto Santori could not have been anything except an extension of this Specus Octavianus. The conduit lies at the corner of the road that runs from the seating of the Circus to the Porta Ostiensis, with another thoroughfare by which there is a route to the left to the Church of S. Balbina the martyr. In addition, the course of the Marcia, which we have shown from the evidence of Frontinus to have crossed above the Porta Capena, intersects here with the Specus Octavianus, at a level of about six feet above it [fig. 10].

e. The Aqua Appia

Under these two conduits—as here a meeting of aqueducts occurred in the way as at Spes Vetus or in the vicinity of the modern Porta Maggiore, where we saw that the Marcia, before “it cast itself down over the Caelian,” met with four other higher lines—a certain excavator most recently showed me another conduit lying very deeply hidden and, with difficulty, brought me crawling to it along the ground. When I had seen it,
the freshness of an object long sought drove all weariness and fear of the 
place from my body and mind. That this is the conduit of the Aqua Appia,
the first fruit of Roman foresight and greatness, I certainly convinced 
myself and will be eager to prove to you.

Its level and depth, as Frontinus calls it [Aq. 65.7], do not at all rule out
the identification, since of all the aqueducts this side of the Tiber, I found
this one to be the lowest (as Frontinus [Aq. 18.7] describes it), from a com-
parison with the conduits of the Marcia and the Anio very close by. It was
running twenty-eight whole feet below the Anio Vetus, to the extent that
I could measure it because of the narrowness of the place, through levels
taken several times in the tunnel. Likewise, by its downward course to this
spot, the place we have assigned to the Porta Capena, it, along with the
Marcia, seems to indicate “ancient arches” near the gate. In cavelike fash-
ion, however, it turns toward the Aventine, and after about fifty paces, it

Fig. 10. Aqua Anio Vetus and Aqua Marcia: plan of conduits underground near Porta Capena

AB. Conduit of the Anio Vetus, from direction A (the Arch of Drusus) through the east
twelve paces toward the west; from direction B, the east side of the Aventine looking
crossways.

CD. The conduit of the Marcia, from direction C, the southern cliff of the Caelian, and the
place that we have assigned to the Porta Capena, through the south eight paces toward
the east; from D, the middle of the Aventine (where again, from the region of the
Church of S. Prisca, it is seen underground) looking crossways.
bends again to the right; from its appearance, it indicates the place where it emerged, according to Frontinus, namely, the Salinae and the Porta Trigemina [Aq. 5.9] or the Clivus Publicii [Aq. 22.3].

Not lacking is the most significant evidence, the same dimension of width and height Frontinus describes for the Appia [Aq. 65]. Although that conduit is for the most part different in form from the others, since the walls widen themselves gradually—I have noted this in no other aqueduct, and I think it happened when Agrippa was restoring this and the others that had “almost collapsed,” as Frontinus indicates [Aq. 9.9]—when, nevertheless, you advance about seventy paces further, you will find walls straight and parallel, a foot and three-quarters distant between themselves, according to Frontinus, and a height of five and a half feet, excluding the layer of opus signinum. This is the distance of the very five feet of Frontinus above the signinum, which is commonly accustomed to have a thickness of half a foot at the bottom of conduits. Besides all these things, the majesty of the work, built with simplicity and, at the same time, combining graceful and natural strength, demonstrates clearly the age of Appius and the already increasing splendor of public construction and magnificence. To judge the construction as quite old from its very appearance, there is, in addition, the very thick accumulation of blackish deposit everywhere, stony and solid within, but on the surface, somewhat porous and smoothed. It is generally of the appearance of that stone brought from Tiburtine territory to Rome, which, most frequently for the sake of ornamentation, more sophisticated people are accustomed to use in urban gardens to imitate rustic fountains. But learn the thing better through drawing and explanation [fig. 11].

f. The “Arco di Druso” Itself

Our ignorance of the builder of our Specus Octavianus, which we almost seemed to have forgotten, and of the arch below it at the Via Appia and the Clivus of Mars detracts not at all from the discussion we have presented. Nevertheless, the more we search, the more it seems to favor the opinion set forth, if we argue that this is the arch that Augustus by decree of the Senate set up in honor of his stepson (or rather his son?) Drusus, according to Suetonius [Claud. 1.3]. Ligorio certainly, in his own manner, protests that this is not a triumphal arch but a distribution tank of an aqueduct; with that license, in the same treatise, he called the arch at the Porta
S. Lorenzo a distribution tank (which, according to Roman law [Dig. 43.20.38], is the same as a reservoir). At the Porta S. Lorenzo, there are in like manner single conduits of three aqueducts and no more than here the ghost of a distribution tank. Nevertheless, we scorn Ligorio’s credibility as well as his judgment and, though he barks in the way, proceed to an investigation of the evidence.

The very great similarity between the coin of this Arch of Drusus and the remains of the arch itself furnishes the first support for our identification, as you can compare from the diagram of each set forth [fig. 12].
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Moreover, does not the name Specus Octavianus, by which we identified the conduit placed above this arch, seem derived from Octavius Augustus? That emperor, when he “rebuilt the channels of all the aqueducts” (as expressed in the inscription at the arch of the Aqua Marcia, or the modern Porta S. Lorenzo, which we will show shortly later) or, as in his Res Gestae [20.2], “rebuilt the channels of the aqueducts collapsing from old age in many places,” could have rebuilt this one also, broken off in the valley of the Clivus of Mars, and could have left his own name on it. The words clivos and planitia smell of this time. Vitruvius, twice in the same chapter [9.7.2], uses this form of the second word to his contemporary Augustus, and often on the coins of Augustus, you will read the inscription “DIVOS IVLIVS,” with similar license. It is indeed more than probable that where the conduit was blocking the way, the slope had been smoothed so that the triumphal arch could be erected under the channel itself, and of the three arches along the Via Appia—those of Drusus, Tra-
jan, and Lucius Verus, as many as Victor and the Notitia list—Augustus, who preceded the others, chose for his the higher position.

Indeed, even though its parts are half destroyed and buried by earth, this arch shows some special characteristics through which it may be best distinguished from the others. First, its tympanum and pediment are extended a bit beyond the breadth of the gate; in this, it indicates the times of Augustus and the same man as its builder. Augustus affixed architectural features by no means different to his own arch at Rimini, with the same narrowness of pediment, which a later age, or Vitruvius coming on the scene, corrected.

The appearance of the Arch of Augustus at Rimini is seen here [fig. 13] just as today, although it is buried in great part. This arch was erected in the rebuilding of the Via Flaminia, “which Augustus undertook while he instructed that the remaining roads be rebuilt by certain senators, at their own expense”—by a most certain conjecture (as the fragment of its inscription shows [CIL XI, 365]), at the time of his seventh consulship and the designation of his eighth. Dio [53.22.2] reports that this was done at this very time. In addition, in this year, he was honored with the name Augustus by the Senate and Roman people; we lack this name, perhaps originally displayed on this monument, and an intact inscription (“What has ruinous time not diminished?” [Hor. Carm. 3.6.45]).

I would have argued that neither of these arches was designed by Vitruvius, since each falls short of his prescribed standards. On the arch at Rome, indeed, the cornice rests immediately above the epistyle, although Vitruvius [3.5.10] establishes a carved frieze in the middle between these two parts. The arch at Rimini, however, has dentils under its mutules, not only on its cornice, but also in its pediment, whereas Vitruvius [4.2.5–6] decided that the cornice ought to be pure, by example of the Greeks and reasons sought from nature itself. Last of all, the pediment of each, especially that of the arch at Rimini, is raised far above the measure of the arch itself. Indeed, Vitruvius [3.5.12] assigns to a tympanum such a height that would be the ninth part of the length of the cornice from the farthest cymatia; here, the tympanum has in its height a length of the whole fourth part of the cornice. Although this proportion of the tympanum seemed too compressed to Philandrier (in his splendid commentary on Vitruvius, in a place noted by us, where he corrected it very easily), it is certainly not

---

disregarded in a very good example cited earlier, the arch of the modern Porta S. Lorenzo, once situated on the Via Collatina. To demonstrate this in particular, we present it here [fig. 14], just as it appears above the ground.

We point out, however, that the pediment and cornice have indeed been smoothed, so that they might open a space for the later inscription of Caracalla, yet in such a way that there have remained very sure traces of
Fig. 14. Porta Tiburtina (Porta S. Lorenzo)

A. Cross sections of the piers of this arch
B. Very similar corners, less than a right angle, precisely of seventy-seven degrees
C. Other corners, greater than a right angle, of 103 degrees, conforming to the slanting course of the Via Collatina
D. Channel of the Aqua Julia
E. Channel of the Tepula, lower than elsewhere, but its capacity supplemented by widening along its breadth
F. Channel of the Marcia
G. Location of the inscription of Antoninus Caracalla, inscribed on smoothed blocks, set forth earlier [I.4a]
H. Location of the inscription of Titus Caesar, set forth above in the same place [I.4a]
the smoothed blocks. Indeed, although Titus Vespasianus earlier inscribed the bands under the cornice, to avoid disturbing the ornamentation, Caracalla occupied and inserted himself in the remaining space in the middle, although resulting in damage to the arch.

Side windows, traces of which are seen on side D, with the same crown E running back around it [fig. 12], also distinguish this triumphal Arch of Drusus from others and make it similar to our coin. This fact perhaps deceived Enea Vico and Ottavio de Strada, leading them to posit twin smaller arches from this point.24 There cannot be space for them in a narrow area of twenty-four and a half feet, the distance between B and A, where the brick-faced arches of this aqueduct come to an end from this direction. The sketches of the distinguished Francesco Gottifredi, that great and most trustworthy exponent of numismatics, confirm the credibility of our coin; our Francesco Cameli, deprived of physical sight but a Lynceus of the mind, whom I name for the sake of honor and friendship, has kindly suggested the parallel.

It is pleasing now to digress somewhat and to supplement this coin and, at the same time, the history of Nero Drusus from another different coin completely intact, which the most distinguished Count Francesco Mezzabarba Birago has indicated exists in the Septalian collection. It shows a small vessel within the tympanum, two augural staffs at its side from each direction, and, toward the ends but at the same height, a patera in relief on the right and an urn on the left, arranged generally in that order in which we see them presented (somewhat obscurely) in Oisel.25 As a result, it appears from the staff (which Cicero [Div. 1.17.30] calls the most famous emblem of the augurate) that Drusus was an augur, although history says very little about Drusus’s augurate. Dio (in whose book 54 there are quite a few things about Drusus) and Suetonius [Claud. 1.3] make reference only to his quaestorship, consulate, and proconsular imperium.

For this reason, nevertheless, since the coin that we have compared to the Arch of Drusus, is seen to have been struck by his son Tiberius Claudius Caesar, I do not agree with Angeloni, who asserts that this arch was constructed and adorned by Claudius himself.26 In addition to our own
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arguments about Augustus, which we have set forth already, Dio [55.2.3] seems to speak about the matter, not only decreed but also brought to completion at the time of Augustus: “Drusus himself was carried out into the Campus Martius by the knights, those holding the equestrian rank officially and those who were of senatorial rank. Having been cremated here, he was buried in the mausoleum of Augustus. He was also given the name Germanicus, with his sons, and he received the honors of both a statue and an arch, as well as a cenotaph next to the Rhine.” Augustus “made honors, magnificent ones, for Drusus,” as Tacitus has entrusted to his history [Ann. 3.5], and, to cite the words of Suetonius [Claud. 1.5], “loved him so much while alive that he made him coheir with his sons; praised him in public assembly after his death; and, not content to have inscribed an epitaph on his tomb in verses composed by himself, composed a memorial of his life in prose.” It is not believable that he would have neglected the honor of an arch decreed immediately after Drusus’s death for the twenty-three years in which he survived his nephew and left it uncompleted for so long, especially since his wife, Livia, was urging him. Livia would scarcely have permitted this last honor for her son and solace for herself to have been postponed, given her most bitter and very great grief for him, with which she almost consumed her own life, as Albionvanus Pedo bears witness in these verses:

She would have been able to survive for scarcely a few hours
when Caesar brought aid to her unwilling;
He applied prayers, mixed with them a sense of duty,
and wetted her dry throat with water poured forth.
[Consolatio ad Liviam 419–22]

Moreover, the emperor’s coins show openly that this arch on the Via Appia has very little to do with Trajan (as Andrea Fulvio believed);27 they display a triple arch [built by Trajan], not a single one, such as this one. To exclude Lucius Verus, whom we know to have had an arch in the same region, as we said, we do not have such ready arguments as in Trajan’s case, since no coins of his with his arch are extant. Nonetheless, as a result of so many arguments through which we have established that Augustus built this arch, we will remove from it another builder, after we

27. Fulvio, 246.
have sufficiently declared that the Arch of Drusus, unless I am mistaken, is situated under this aqueduct—indeed, at the highest point of this Clivus of Mars.

Nevertheless, all these matters, perhaps not useless to know in other respects, will seem to have been argued more than enough, given the limits of our investigation. Whatever doubt there can be about the name of this Specus Octavianus, let the following (which is sufficient for us) be beyond every hazard of a doubt: its water could in no way have been brought back at so great a distance to the Baths of Alexander in an opposite flow, against both the nature of the ground and its downward fall, with its nymphaeum [terminal fountain] left so far behind, as we shall soon argue.

g. The Aqua Traiana

As a result, the whole investigation falls back on this: whether Alexander brought into the city the aqueduct on the Janiculum, which we will identify as the Traiana, or this aqueduct, which we will call the Labicana, from the territory in which it arises. In this, I would wish that you remember that we have more than once reviewed, not without disgust, each of the inscriptions—the one on top of the impressive fountain on the Janiculum, the other on the arch on the Via Aurelia below the Horti Pamphilj—in which this aqueduct is called the Aqua Alsietina and its conduits are said to have been built by Augustus Caesar. How, except through the greatest stupidity, could the Alsietina be confused with this aqueduct? According to Frontinus [Aq. 18.8], it was lower than all the aqueducts, had no arcade except for 257 paces and, moreover, no substructure above ground [Aq. 11.4], and was allotted a different source, from the name of its own lake. The Janiculum aqueduct holds a level either higher or equal to the Marcia itself, acknowledges its source in various springs near Lake Sabatini, and is carried around the city (to summarize) on two thousand paces of arcade and substructure. Therefore, if we establish that this aqueduct cannot admit Alexander as its builder, this Labican aqueduct will remain the only one that must be said to have been related to him.

Probability alone almost forces us to believe this, since it is far from every probability that anyone ever thought to bring a Transtiberine aqueduct to this side of the river for the Baths of Alexander. We learn in particular from Victor [VZ, 1:213] that the Nymphaeum of Alexander stood in Region V, the Esquiliae—indeed, on the very direct course of this aqu-
duct from its arcade to the baths. Ligorio writes that he observed traces of this line and its settling tank near the Church of S. Croce in Jerusalem, where he found this inscription, perhaps, as Ariosto jokes about Turpin, “truthfully in this circumstance” [Orlando furioso 30.49]. The inscription appears not at all spurious, as are most things connected with that man:

To Hercules Protector, unconquered companion of our lord Severus Alexander Pius Victor, always Augustus and most excellent emperor, the most distinguished Marcus Aurelius Priscillianus, curator of the nymphaeum, vowed from his own money . . . [CIL VI, 333*]

Ligorio, in keeping with his habit, was able to add on his own a settling tank to the total, although we are of the opinion and show that the settling tank was elsewhere, and scarcely do we believe that there were two of them.

I will add—and not at my peril, since I have a sufficiently suitable champion of this opinion—that the Janiculum aqueduct could not have been called the Alexandrina (this from the testimony of one of the ancient sources); more accurately, it was one and the same as the Traiana. So recognizes Fr. Aringhi from the Acta, especially those concerning the martyrdom of S. Antonio: “In the same hour, Vitellius ordered Antoninus to undergo the sentence of execution; he, having been led along the Via Aurelia next to the arcade of the Aqua Traiana, was beheaded on August 22nd.”28 The statements of the very ancient manuscript of the Acta of S. Giulio Senatore, which appear in Nardini and elsewhere, also confirm this; in them is cited “the arcade of the Traiana next to the Via Aurelia.” In the Instrument of Donation of Charlemagne, “the arcade of the Traiana up to the Porta Aurelia” is given as the boundary of a certain property.29 The same fact is also dug out from the following citation, although inaccurate, of the librarian Anastasius in the Life of Honorius: “At the same time, he built the Basilica of S. Pancrario at the second milestone of the Via Aurelia from its foundation, . . . and he established there mills up against the wall of the city and an arcade that brings water down into Lake Sabatini.”30

The authority of Ligorio is not of such great value for us that, as a result

---

29. See Nardini, 509.
30. Anastasius bibliothecarius, De vitis pontificum romanorum (Rome, 1718), 121.
of his opinion, we should remove the name Aurelia from that road that, by sure traces from the Porta S. Pancrazio (indeed, from the Pons Sublicius), is joined by direct path with another road that Ligorio does not deny is the real Via Aurelia. Ligorio himself puts before us the single relevant passage of Procopius [Goth. 1.19.4]: “As a result, it happened that two other gates of the city had been occupied by the enemy, the Aurelia (which is now called the Gate of Peter, after the chief of the apostles of Christ, as it is located near his grave) and another, across the Tiber River.”

From this, there is proof that there was a Porta Aurelia located near Castel Sant’Angelo; therefore, Ligorio leads his road with this name from this point and firmly denies that it was elsewhere. He does not refute that the gate at the Janiculum is also called the Aurelia, since so he speaks and ought to be understood. To distinguish between these two gates with the same name, one, as it were, was accustomed to be called the Gate of S. Pietro, the second that of S. Pancrazio, from their proximity to each church. Ligorio’s opinion must also be accepted concerning a Via Aurelia Nova. Since we recognize both a Via Aurelia Nova and a Via Aurelia Vetus from an inscription cited by Gruter [CIL XIV, 3610], we should not erase this old one, the name of which so many famous documents retain before the occurrence of the second.

The sacred memoirs of the early Christians place the Basilica of S. Pancrazio very close to the aqueduct, in the vicinity of the city on the Via Aurelia, which cannot be Ligorio’s Via Aurelia. Moreover, it cannot be doubted that in ancient times and before the Aurelian Wall, there had been no other course of this most ancient road than that already mentioned, from the Pons Sublicius over the top of the Janiculum, where the gate is now seen (whether the Aurelia or Porta S. Pancrazio, as it was called afterward). Even then, no way was open from the city to the Janiculum except over the Pons Sublicius. From here, we see a straight and well-worn route into Etruria Maritima, as excavation, the continuous line of funeral monuments between the villa of Marchio de Nobili and the monastery of S. Pietro in Montorio, and the most recent discovery of basalt pavement running from this point toward the Church of S. Cosimo and to the Pons Sublicius itself openly teach us. What, I ask, is more absurd than to conceive of an ancient and original Via Aurelia over a bridge (which did not yet exist) and through the territory of the Vatican,

31. Ligorio, Paradosse, 42.
over windy circuits like the Meander, and to deny that it was there, where true reason and, I might add, the authority of ancient writers put it?

Livy [5.40.8–10] shows that the road that runs from the Pons Sublicius to the Janiculum and then to the city Caere (which is our Aurelia) was trodden by the Vestals in flight, after the city had been captured by the Gauls, when he cites Lucius Albinius, a man of the plebs, who put the Vestals and the holy relics of Rome on a wagon, after his wife and children had been ordered to get off. I would certainly have thought that from this event must be understood the following fragment of precious stone inserted afterward in the floor of the upper and open-air walkway around the dome of the Pantheon, which so indicates the circumstances and the time (when, indeed, the Gauls “were attacking the Capitolium,” after Rome had been captured):

were attacking the Capitolium . . .
. . . led the Vestals to Caere
. . . and the solemn rituals so that
. . . considered it his task
. . . the sacred objects and the maidens
. . . led

[CIL VI, 1272 = 31583 = ILS 51]

As a result, there is very little doubt that it was inscribed for a memorial and praise of such great devotion.

So certain do I consider these things that I am not pleased by the compromise of Aringhi,32 by which he has also deferred to the opinion of Ligorio33 and removed the Via Aurelia from the Porta S. Pancrazio. Aringhi leads another street, which Ligorio reported as taking its beginning from the Porta Aurelia of Procopius, through the nearby countryside of the Fornaci, beneath the walls of the city, and joins it to our ancient Via Aurelia at the crossroad of S. Pancrazio. Indeed, by this unlikely curving course, a cure worse than the disease has been brought forward, and Ligorio himself would disagree even more strongly. Ligorio, I suspect, thought of the course of the road neither so close to the city nor so violently twisted back; but more reasonably (so we might support so hardworking a man in some-

32. Aringhi, 1.343.
thing), he led his Via Aurelia straight to the Taverna del Pidocchio and from here to the left through a side street, a part of which is seen paved with basalt between the Vigna Carpegna and the distribution tank of the Acqua Paola in the Vigna Burana. Even still more consistently, he connected it there to the ancient Via Aurelia through traces of an old road, which, after leaving Cornelia on the right, runs through the Porcareccino property to the Bottachia property. But we shall make these things clear more fully, God willing, in our work On the Suburban Territory.

As a result, therefore, now that the ancient Via Aurelia has been restored, contrary to Ligorio, as has the more ancient Via Aurelia Vetus alongside the Trajanic aqueduct, to which it was been joined for almost two miles, to each emperor, both Alexander as well as Trajan, has his own aqueduct been returned. Indeed, it is well known, besides the authority of modern writers already cited, that Trajan introduced an aqueduct, from the evidence of a coin struck by decree of the Senate in honor of the accomplishment and through its representation of the divinity of the source as water drawn from a spring, not taken from other conduits. See the coin, carefully reproduced but very badly interpreted by Angeloni; he says abruptly—and as though Frontinus were confirming it—that “Trajan brought the Aqua Marcia onto the Aventine from the Via Valeria, over a course of twenty-three miles,”\(^{34}\) and he concludes that this is shown by the coin. We see that this argument has seduced his other followers, who tend to believe more what “the man himself said” than Frontinus and the truth, as we noted earlier [I.4c]. Most recently, indeed, Angeloni has drawn to his side Jacques Oisel in his *Thesaurus* published this year.\(^{35}\)

5. LEVELS OF THE AQUA TRAIANA AND AQUA ALEXANDRINA

It is by evidence not to be scorned that this Aqua Alexandrina was introduced for the sake of the baths already mentioned. If someone else had built it for the common and accustomed purpose of aqueducts, he clearly could have raised it far more usefully to the same level as did Pope Sixtus

---

34. Angeloni, 114, 123.27.
35. Oisel, 529, table cviii.8.
afterward with his aqueduct, that is, twelve and a half feet above the Marcia (the elevation by which Sixtus’s aqueduct is detected as surpassing the nearby conduit of the Marcia at the Porta Maggiore), and further, to another forty-one and a half feet. The Marcia surpasses the conduit of the Alexandrina by this height, as the measurement demonstrates, taken from the first arches noted [fig. 1, no. 2], near the arches of the Aqua Marcia, very close by at that point. Since the site of Alexander’s baths was indeed lower, the emperor, considering only them, neglected the advantage of a higher elevation and lowered his aqueduct by fifty-four feet. Everyone will agree that such a great difference in elevation had its origin not from lack of expertise but from deliberate plan.

However, how, in his book on the water system, Frontinus, Trajan’s contemporary and superintendent of the water supply under him, could be silent about this most outstanding work of his emperor is clearly understood from the preface of this same book. Frontinus wrote his treatise at the very beginning of the duty enjoined on him—indeed, when Nerva, to whom he dedicated his work, was still alive. Moreover, the introduction of the Aqua Traiana, from the coinage already mentioned, took place when Trajan was consul for the fifth time, or five times consul, that is, at least after the fifth year of his principate.

But if you should object that I am reducing the number of aqueducts against the expressed opinion of ancient authorities—Victor names twenty (or even twenty-four, according to some manuscripts) [VZ 1:255–56]; the Notitia Imperii names nineteen [Jordan, 2:569–70; VZ, 1:154–56]; and Procopius, although he names fewer, clearly names fourteen [Goth. 1.19.13]—I will respond that Victor and the Notitia do not overly concern me, since they make reference not to conduits but to sources of water. More than one of them could have been channeled into a single conduit, as Frontinus [Aq. 12, 14.2, 15.4, 73.8] testifies in the case of the Augusta, Albudine, and Herculean springs and as the inscription of the modern Porta Tiburtina [CIL v1, 1245] confirms in the case of the Aqua Antoniniana. I shall prove at some other time that Procopius, who speaks about the aqueducts, is in agreement with me, and I shall bring forward certain new things for the clarification of this point, if I may only be permitted to interpret the words Rome and city in a different way. I put off this subject for the present time, so as not to go entirely beyond the limits of a letter.
6. EVIDENCE OF BRICK STAMPS AND THE TOMB OF ALEXANDER SEVERUS

If someone desires a still more certain proof of my opinion concerning Alexander as builder of the work, he should take care (as we shall do) to investigate the brick stamps from other monuments of Alexander. Two of them are undisputed: namely, the baths in the Palazzo Medici, for the purpose of which, as we have just said, this aqueduct we are discussing was introduced; and the tomb between the Via Latina and the Via Labicana in what is now called Monte del Grano. Perhaps there might occur either the brick stamp illustrated earlier [fig. 5] or another [fig. 15], with the inscription “SEX.CAEC.PRO . . .” [CIL XV, 2313.b.3], which is inscribed in a way similar to the brickwork even now on the arches at number 7 of the topographical map [fig. 1].

Indeed, the same characters will certainly demonstrate that the two constructions were contemporaneous. It is plausible that the bricks, as they had first been fired, served the very great number of projects that were then being built and that they were not accustomed to being kept for a long time in the brickyards, as is the practice even today.

Since, as Flaminio Vacca says, it is the mark of natural modesty to confess by whom you have profited, I report to you news I have learned. The funeral monument at Monte del Grano covered the ashes of Alexander and his mother, Mamaea. I repeat Vacca’s account, which you indicated to me, investigated and confirmed: “I remember a mile outside the Porta S. Giovanni, having passed the aqueducts, where the place is called Monte del Grano, there was a large ancient construction, made of cement; the impulse was sufficient for a digger to break into it, enter inside, and then take himself down, with the result that he found a large sarcophagus decorated with the rape of the Sabines, and on top of the lid, there were two figures stretched out, with the portrait of Alexander Severus and his mother, Julia Mamaea. Inside were found some ashes; the sarcophagus mentioned now is found on the Campidoglio, in the middle of the courtyard of the Palazzo dei Conservatori.”

Vacca writes these things to Anastasio Simonetti in a letter of November 1, 1594, in a simple style indeed, but with greater truthfulness than Fr. Aringhi, who says that the sarcophagus was found on the Via Labicana.

36. F. Vacca, Memorie di varie antichità trovate di diversi luoghi dell’alma città di Roma nell’anno 1594 (Rome, 1704), memoria 36.
37. Aringhi, 2.34.
although the place is somewhat closer to the Via Latina and is distant from
the Labicana by about seven stades. However, in a modern inscription on
the base, atop which the sarcophagus has been installed, the provenance is
said to be outside some Porta Labiena, of which there is scant trace among
authors. Although a contemporary writer from France denies that the
images of the sarcophagus just mentioned reflect those of Alexander and
Mamaea,38 the common agreement of scholars and the clear resemblance
with their coins give more than enough support to our assertion, and they
do not permit an imposition on us. As a result, perhaps, there may be
added an important argument from the aqueduct built by Alexander, if we
consider that the Senate and Roman people revived the eternal memory of
its builder in erecting the mausoleum at a place not at all far from it, where
there is a full view of the tomb from the source of the aqueduct itself. The
construction, although ugly and stripped of all ornamentation, shows that
the size of the tomb was not modest. Lampridius exaggerates this when he
says, in his Life, “He earned a cenotaph in Gaul and a most magnificent
tomb at Rome. [SHA Alex. Sev. 63.3]. We add a plan of it here [fig. 16].

7. SOURCES OF THE AQUA ALEXANDRINA AND
ACQUA FELICE

The modern aqueduct today is drawn from various sources, especially
those that issue beneath the Colle delle Pantanelle, from marshy and
moist soil. I am doubtful whether Alexander or his engineers sought these
same sources at one time; the opposite, rather, persuades me, the nature of

38. Bernard de Montfaucon, O.S.B., Diarium italicum sive Monumentorum veterum, bibliothecarum, museorum, etc. notitiae singulares in itinario italico collectae (Paris, 1702), 138.
the modern aqueduct being different from the ancient one. The Alexandrina produced a huge deposit in its conduit, as we have said; the Felice, after a course of nearly a hundred years, shows its conduit still pure and gleaming. As a result, I would determine that the source of the Aqua Alexandrina was in those very springs of the Osa stream that flow in a scattered way here and there at the sides of that valley.

Fig. 16. Monte del Grano tomb: cross section

A. Round chambered cella, in which was found the sarcophagus with the images of Alexander and Mamaea, today on the Campidoglio
B. Small chamber, through which there opened an entrance into the burial chamber already mentioned, through a door in M
C. Steep stair, through which the sarcophagus was carried through the door in M
D. Wall, behind the sarcophagus, in front of the raised door of the burial chamber, so that all approach might be blocked
E. Modern opening, from which the following was discovered
F. Round hypogeum, with a sunken chamber, under the burial chamber
G. Door to the same, five feet three inches wide, having a five foot thickness in the wall
H. Cryptoportico, five feet three inches wide, eighty feet long, inclined six and a half feet along that entire length
I. Space at the head of the cryptoportico, with a raised arch, for supporting the upper stair
K. Pavement laid under the entire structure, of travertine blocks, one foot three inches thick.
L. Ruins of a building, an uncertain structure, but, as can be judged from the huge heap of them, a magnificent one, as according to Spartianus

Aqueduct Hunting in the Seventeenth Century: Raffaele Fabretti's De aquis et aquaeductibus veteris Romae
Harry B. Evans
Yet with the greatest certainty, I report that a modern geographer is shamefully mistaken: in his topographic map published in 1674, he shows the source of the Acqua Felice as the lake (today the Lake of Monte Falcone) that Holste calls Lake Regillus, quite correctly in my opinion. Shafts above the underground channel, which are seen near this lake, perhaps furnished the cause of the error. The writer, clearly having taken too little care, noticed neither that they continued up to the source of the aqueduct or to the first distribution tank nor even the tank itself, set apart an entire mile from here. The lake, however, contains water that is stagnant and altogether unsuitable for drinking, and it would not suffice for distribution of a single day besides. In the summer season, moreover, it would supply water that is indeed smelly and polluted, on account of the very great supply of flax and hemp that the inhabitants of the neighboring towns bring here for grinding.

There are those who have said that the Acqua Felice arises to the left of the Via Praenestina, and in this way, in an exemplary inscription and with more than exemplary error, it is described at its principal fountain near the Baths of Diocletian. But they have been mistaken; today, because the Via Praenestina itself is interrupted and impassable, one cannot approach Palestrina except by the Via Labicana, to which, therefore, they assign the name of the Via Praenestina everywhere. Holste recognized this and corrected it with reference to Clüver, but Holste himself was likewise mistaken when, enticed by some old fragments of inscriptions scattered in the structure of the Osteria del Finocchio, he accepted the modern Via del Finocchio, diverging from the Labicana after Torrenova, as the ancient Via Labicana and looked for nothing besides—supported by only censure of his Clüver, who, I say, had championed and glorified him (in this, with the greatest ingratitude and at the same time bitterness of speaking, he makes mistakes too frequently). To the right are certain traces of the ancient Via Labicana, better surely for the mind than for the feet. We have, however, observed an ancient branch road crossing this way from the Taberna dell’Osa, on the Via Praenestina, past the Casale of S. Antonio, which from there, a little above the Tor Forame, crosses the Labicana and runs in the direction of the Via Tusculana and Via Latina, and we have marked it in its place on our map [fig. 1]. To such an extent, as very frequently, “those who do not know the path,” to quote Cicero [Div. 1.58.132], “show the way to the other.”

I could show you these things face-to-face and on the ground itself more easily and perhaps more usefully, but since you now reject labor, using your age as an excuse, take advantage of the privilege of old age—which I dearly wish you to enjoy for a much longer time, for the common benefit of literature—and present your opinion while sitting down. Farewell. Written from our museum, on the last day of the year of salvation 1677.

Commentary

The first dissertation of the De aquis was originally written without section headings, but the edition published in 1680 includes marginal numbering for subjects cited in its index (omitted here because all such topics are included in the general index). The dissertation is here organized as follows:

1. Introduction
2. The Aqua Alexandrina: Course, State of Remains, Description, and Route
3. Proof that Alexander Severus Built This Aqueduct
4. Review of Other Aqueduct Conduits in Rome
   a. Aqueducts at Porta Maggiore
   b. The Arcus Caelimontani
   c. The Claudia Branch to the “Trophies of Marius”
   d. The “Arco di Druso” Aqueduct and Specus Octavianus
   e. The Aqua Appia
   f. The “Arco di Druso” Itself
   g. The Aqua Traiana
5. Levels of the Aqua Traiana and Aqua Alexandrina
6. Evidence of Brick Stamps and the Tomb of Alexander Severus
7. Sources of the Aqua Alexandrina and Acqua Felice

The scope of the dissertation is much broader than simply a discussion of the Aqua Alexandrina. Fabretti also reviews all the aqueduct conduits brought into the ancient city, both those cited by Frontinus in the De aquaeductu and the Aqua Traiana of the early second century A.D.
Giovanni Lucio of Trau (Ivan Lučić, 1604–79). At one time a mathematical tutor to Fabretti’s nephew, Lucio was the author of De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae libri sex (Amsterdam, 1668) and other studies on Trau and Dalmatia. Fabretti cites him in the preface to his corpus of inscriptions (Inscriptionum, 2) as the friend whose example had inspired him to undertake his own epigraphical collection. See Ashby, 2 n. 4 (20 n. 9); Mennella, Museo Lapidario, 19 n. 2.

1. INTRODUCTION

Aqueducts around the Anio River. This is a possible reference to the second dissertation of the De aquis, which treats the sources of the Marcia and Claudia in the upper Anio Valley. Fabretti states that bad weather had prevented a second trip to the area, implying that he had already explored the upper Anio Valley. He seems to have informed Lucio about the work in progress and may have sent him a draft of the second dissertation.

Acqua Felice. This aqueduct was introduced by Pope Sixtus V (1585–90) and named from its builder, who was Cardinal Felice Peretti before his elevation to the papacy. Designed by Domenico Fontana, the Acqua Felice takes a higher and largely underground course to the watershed between the Anio and Tiber Rivers, then parallels the route of the Marcia/Tepula/Julia (the arches of which Fontana used to facilitate construction) and the Claudia/Anio Novus into the city at Porta Maggiore. For the history of its construction and route, see Lanciani, 389–93; Motta, “L’aquedotto Felice,” 220–25.

2. THE AQUA ALEXANDRINA: COURSE, STATE OF REMAINS, DESCRIPTION, AND ROUTE

Adrien Auzout of Rouen (1622–91). Auzout was an antiquarian and mathematician particularly interested in problems of ancient engineering and measurement. One of the first members of the Académie des Sciences at Paris, he is credited with the invention of the movable thread microm-
eter used by astronomers to observe the dimensions of heavenly bodies. He was also the first to decipher the canceled line on the Arch of Septimius Severus (CIL VI, 1033 = 31230) and served on the committee to tap the water of Lake Bracciano for the Acqua Paola. Paraphrasing Apuleius (Met. 2.23), Fabretti describes Auzout elsewhere as “perspicacior ipso Lynceo, vel Argo, et oculus totus” [more keen-sighted than Lynceus himself, or Argus, every bit of him an eye] (De columna Traiani syntagma [Rome, 1683], 118). See DSB, 1:341–42 (R. M. McKeon); Ashby, 308 n. 3 (365 n. 3).

Topographic map. Each of Fabretti’s dissertations begins with a detailed map depicting the topography of the subject to be covered, based on extensive autopic investigation of the region. The Latin pentameter that appears above the title in the upper right-hand corner of the map in fig. 1, “est aliquid memori visa notare manu” [It is no small accomplishment to note with mindful hand the things one has seen], a direct quotation of Ovid (Pont. 3.4.18), is more than decorative, clearly indicating to the reader Fabretti’s pride in his cartography and the firsthand knowledge of the region it represents. He repeats this quotation on the topographical map of the second dissertation (fig. 17).

The map in fig. 1, entitled “Plan of the Area of Latium from Rome to Labicum,” presents, according to Ashby (308 [365]), a “very accurate” rendering of the course of the Aqua Alexandrina from its source to the area of Spes Vetus, as well as other topography to be discussed. J. B. Ward-Perkins (“The Via Gabina,” BSR 40 [1972]: 122) notes, “[Fabretti’s] account, though supplemented in detail by modern writers, has proved to be in all respects remarkably reliable.” For the orientation of Fabretti’s maps with modern topography, see fig. 38.

Fabretti’s listing of details on the map in his text is selective, focusing almost entirely on sections of the Alexandrina and other aqueducts cited in this dissertation. The numbered citations in his legend correspond to the following identifications and descriptions by modern topographers:

1. Substructure closest to Rome: Ashby, 315 (374); Van Deman, 356.
2. Fifty-two arches in the valley of the Acqua Bollicante: Ashby, 315 (374); Van Deman, 355–56; Aicher, 106–7.
3. Substructure near the Via Labicana: Ashby, 315 (374); Van Deman, 355.
4. Centocelle arcade: Ashby, 314–15 (373–74, figs. 106–8); Van Deman, 352; Aicher, 106–8. For an account of recent restorations in this area,

5. Seven arches in the next valley: Ashby, 314 (373); Van Deman, 352; FI 1.10, x, 541–42 (no. 439).

6. Twenty-three arches: Ashby, 314 (371); Van Deman, 361; FI 1.10, 535–41 (no. 438); Aicher, 109.

7. Eighteen arches: Ashby, 314 (371); Van Deman, 351; FI 1.10, 530–35 (no. 436); Aicher. 109.

8. Branch line of aqueduct: FI 1.10, 556–57 (no. 448); Van Deman, 351.

9. 102 arches: FI 1.10, 546–56 (no. 447); Van Deman, 349.


11. Twenty-two arches in a curve: Ashby, 312 (370); Van Deman, 347; FI 1.10, 497–503 (no. 415); Aicher, 111.

12. Fifty arches in a curve: Ashby, 312 (369); Van Deman, 346.

13. Branch line to the north: Ashby, 312 (369); Van Deman, 346; FI 1.10, 490–97 (no. 414).

14. Single arch in substructure: Ashby, 312 (369); FI 1.10, 484 (no. 402); Van Deman, 346.

15. Twenty-eight arches: Ashby, 311–12 (369); Van Deman, 346; FI 1.10, 487–83 (no. 399); Aicher, 111.

16. Four lower arches: Ashby, 311 (369); Van Deman, 345–46; FI 1.10, 474–45 (no. 388)

17. Single arch: Ashby, 311 (368–69); Van Deman, 345; FI 1.10, 462–63 (no. 370). Cf. Ward-Perkins, “Via Gabina,” 99–100: “There is nothing to be seen at the crossing today, but there is no reason to question Fabretti’s record of a single-arched bridge of Gabine stone (which he thought carried the aqueduct); and since the aqueduct is elsewhere faced with brick and of relatively slight proportions, one may confidently accept Ashby’s suggestion that the bridge carried, not the aqueduct, but the road beside it.”


20. Substructure: Ashby, 311 (368); Van Deman, 344.

21. Sixty-seven arches: Ashby, 310 (367); Van Deman, 343–44.

22. Sixty-two arches: Ashby, 310 (366); Van Deman, 343–44

23. Forty-five arches: Ashby, 309 (366); Van Deman, 343
24. Settling tank: Ashby, 309 (366); Van Deman, 343; Lanciani, 382.

Topographical features indicated on the map but not noted in Fabretti’s legend include the major Roman roads emanating from the city, with prominent topographical features along them, as well as the major tributaries of the Anio River in the Roman Campagna. Fabretti shows the underground course of the Acqua Felice from its source to the area of “Roma Vecchia” (Old Rome), where it emerges to ride on arches into the city at the Porta Maggiore, as well as the courses of the Aqua Virgo, the Aqua Marcia/Tepula/Julia, and the Aqua Claudia/Anio Novus.

The map also indicates landmarks cited later in the dissertation: the Monte del Grano (identified as the “Sepulchrum Alexandri et Ma- maeae”), discussed in I.6; Colonna (identified as the “site of ancient Labicum”), discussed in I.2; and Lake Regillus and topographical features of the ager Labicanus, discussed in I.7. The map focuses only on the eastern *suburium* of the city, giving no information about the Aqua Traiana and topography of the area outside the Porta S. Pancrazio, even though Fabretti discusses this region and its roads at some length (I.4g).


Despite his fame as a polyhistor, Kircher’s work on Roman topography was primitive by modern standards and certainly lacking in Fabretti’s eyes. Ashby (3 n. 5 [21 n. 21]) writes, “Kircher’s inaccuracies in regard to the
representation of the aqueducts in his maps are flagrant: and his text is equally full of errors.” The map cited by Fabretti (Kircher, opposite p. 70) is a particularly striking example of such faulty cartography: as Fabretti observes, Kircher wrongly indicates the source of the Aqua Virgo near the town of Colonna and omits any representation of the Anio River.

**Arcade and settling tank.** Fabretti’s illustrations of the two sections of arcade and settling tank of the Alexandrina (figs. 2–5) are generally accurate. Ashby (314–15 [366]) and Van Deman (352–55) present without comment or correction Fabretti’s depiction of the double arches in fig. 2 (part of the long arcade indicated at no. 4 on the topographic map, in the area of the modern Centocelle).

Fig. 2 presents a section of the arcade in the Valle di Pantano (no. 21 on the map): see Ashby, 309–10 (367); Van Deman, 344. For the settling tank, see Ashby, 309 (366); Ashby notes that while the dimensions as given by Fabretti can be confirmed, Fabretti’s representation of the settling tank in fig. 3 is incorrect in its placement of the openings. Van Deman (343) also observes that the outlet “was not exactly in the middle, as represented on Fabretti’s plan,” and she gives measurements of 12.5 meters in length and 10.64 meters in width for the tank, citing Fabretti’s dimensions as “somewhat larger than those here given, including, it is probable by some error, the outer walls of the structure.” Ashby (309 n. 5 [366 n. 13]) further notes that Lanciani (382), who follows the description given by Fabretti here, reverses Fabretti’s measurements in his description of the settling tank.

This settling tank itself is small and relatively simple in its construction and functioning, as Fabretti illustrates and explains it; we may contrast the much more ambitious settling tanks closer to the city that are discussed and illustrated in the second dissertation (II.5a–b, figs. 28–30). The location of the tank, quite close to the source of the aqueduct, might have been a factor: no provision is indicated for local distribution of the water from the tank, and its sole function seems to have been to clear the water having been tapped from the springs.

**Later reworking.** Fabretti’s description of the conduit in the valley of the Acqua Bollicante (fig. 1) is cited without correction by Ashby (315 [374]). Cf. Van Deman, 356: “Of the original structure but little is now traceable, since the greater part of it is buried in later encasing walls, with reinforcing arches under the older arches. . . . The construction of the later encasing walls and reinforcing arches, of which some fragmentary remains are still left, is of concrete of an inferior grade faced with late brickwork the exact date of which is not clear.”
Aqua Crabra. This ancient water source in Tusculan territory is cited by Frontinus (Aq. 9.4–9) as intended for local delivery independent of the Roman water system but tapped at one time to supplement the Aqua Julia. Fabretti presents a much longer treatment of it in the third dissertation (III.4c). For further discussion, see Hodge, 249–50, 448 n. 17.

As noted by Lanciani (325–27) and Ashby (315 n. 3 [374 n. 35]), Fabretti is incorrect here in his identification of the water carried by the reworked arcade of the Alexandrina as that of the Aqua Crabra, a mistake repeated in the third dissertation. Fabretti’s error was a common one: the papal Acqua Marrana Mariana, introduced by Calixtus II in A.D. 1122 to supply the area of the Lateran, had been identified with the Crabra in many maps of Rome throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, most recently in Giovanni Battista Falda’s 1676 map (see Frutaz, 3: table 360). Nardini (505) makes the same error of identification.

This later channel installed in the conduit of the Alexandrina described by Fabretti carried a branch of the Marrana. Lanciani (327) cites a chapter of the city statutes published by Pope Paul II in 1519 referring to maintenance of a branch of the Marrana: “‘vadit ad aquam Bollicantem usque ad formam ruptam quae vadit ad pedem turris sancti Joannis (Tor tre teste) ad turrim Quatraris (Quadraro).’ La forma rupta è quella dell’alessandrina. Infatti anche oggi un ramo della marrana traversa la valle d’acqua Bollicante, correndo nel nucleo dei cinquantadue archi del vetusto aquedotto” [“It goes to the Acqua Bollicante up to the broken conduit that goes at the foot of Tor tre teste to the Tor Quadraro.” The broken conduit is that of the Alexandrina. In fact, even today a branch of the Marrana crosses the valley of the Acqua Bollicante, running in the center of the fifty-two arches of the ancient aqueduct]. John Henry Parker also described this reuse of the Alexandrina in The Aqueducts of Ancient Rome (Oxford, 1876), 133: “This arcade had been originally double, and the lower one only now remains, with a modern specus [channel] made upon it . . . , but the water now flows from the Marrana, at the foot of the arcade of the great aqueducts . . . and runs down upon this arcade to the garden and small monastery of S. Peter and Marcellinus, at the Mausoleum of S. Helena.” On the Marrana, see R. Motta, “La decadenza degli acquedotti antichi e la conduzione dell’acqua Mariana,” in Trionfo, 203–5.

Incrustation. Cf. Ashby, 316 (367): “There are considerable overflows of heavy deposit from small leaks, noted by Fabretti.”

Route. Ward-Perkins (“Via Gabina,” 125) comments on the course of the aqueduct, “The Aqua Alexandrina was able to follow an unusually
direct route to Rome for two reasons: because its objective was the low-
lying quarters of Rome and because Severus Alexander was prepared to
spend what even so must have been a large sum of money on carrying the
conduit above ground for an unusually high proportion of its course.”

Ashby (311 [369]) repeats Fabretti’s comments concerning the route of
the Alexandrina and also notes that the winding course may well have
been chosen to achieve a gradual fall for the conduit: the entire Alexan-
drina had a fall of not more than .438 percent, “far lower than that of the
great aqueducts” (Ashby 309 [366]). Van Deman (342–43) also notes that
its course is unusual, in contrast to the route chosen by Sixtus V for the
Acqua Felice, and cites reconstruction to raise the channel floor in the
section at Procoio del Pantano (fig. 1, no. 21) “to correct some error of
construction or in the rate of fall of the water” (Van Deman, 344).

Neither Ashby nor Van Deman comments on the third reason for the
route cited by Fabretti in this passage: Alexander Severus planned his
aqueduct as a line to be carried on extensive arcade above ground, despite
its low level, and the conduit itself is most impressive. The aqueduct
bridge at Centocelle, surrounded by modern apartment buildings, is strik-
ing even today.

It is surprising that Fabretti says nothing about suburban distribution of
the Alexandrina, although he notes branch lines of the aqueduct in the
legend to his map (fig. 1, nos. 8, 13). Supply to villas and property in the
ager Labicanus was no doubt a factor in fixing the route of the line. For such
distribution along the lines of the Aqua Claudia and Anio Novus, see F.
Coarelli, “L’urbs e il suburbium,” in Società romana e impero, tardoantico, ed.
A. Giardina (Rome, 1986), 2:43–45; Blackman and Hodge, 86. For
another parallel in the ager Tiburtinus, see H. B. Evans, “In Tiburtium
usum: Special Arrangements in the Roman Water System (Frontinus, Aq.
Via Praenestina (indicated as “Torre Schiava” on fig. 1) might well have
been supplied by a branch of the Aqua Alexandrina outside the city. See
Bruun, 128–29.

3. PROOF THAT ALEXANDER SEVERUS BUILT
THIS AQUEDUCT

Aldus Manutius the Younger (Aldus Manutius Paulli f. Aldi n., 1547–
97). Son of Paulus Manutius and grandson of Aldus Manutius, Aldus
Manutius the Younger was a professor in Venice, Bologna, and Rome. Aldus published learned treatises by the age of eleven but never achieved the standing of his father. Joseph Justus Scaliger’s comment on this last member of the Manutius family (Scaligerana 149) is quoted at length by Sandys (2:101 n. 4): “Aldus filius miserum ingenium, lentum; quae dedit valde sunt vulgaria: utrumque novi; Patrem imitabatur, solas epistolas bonas habet: sed trivit Ciceronem diu. Insignis est Manucii commentarius in Epistolae ad Atticum et Familiares. Manucius non poterat tria verba Latine dicere” [Aldus the son was a man of pathetic and slow talent. His works were really quite common. I knew each man. He imitated his father and alone wrote good letters, but he worked on Cicero for too long a time. His works were really quite common. I knew each man. He imitated his father and alone wrote good letters, but he worked on Cicero for too long a time. There is a notable commentary of Manutius on the Letters to Atticus and Letters to Friends. Manutius could not speak three words of Latin]

Manutius’s twenty-page treatise De aquis, in urbe Romam olim influentibus presents a summary of Roman aqueducts listed chronologically, based primarily on Frontinus, whom, surprisingly, Manutius mentions only once in his discussion, citing the sedulitas (attentiveness) of the curato aquarum in instituting administrative reforms (De aquis, 43–44). Manutius also includes citations from Pliny and Suetonius, as well as the inscriptions on the Porta Maggiore, Porta S. Lorenzo, and “Arch of Dolabella,” but his short work hardly fulfills its stated goal “qua[e] antiquorum monumenta sparsim apud scriptores scripta leguntur, in unum collecta ob oculos posita essent” [to have collected in one place the written notices of ancient monuments scattered among the writers] (26). The treatise also contains some striking errors: Manutius associates the Aqua Marcia, for example, with Ancus Marcius and locates its sources “in ultimis montibus Paelignorum” [in the furthest mountains of the Paelignians], east of the Fucine Lake and Marsian territory (31). Fabretti’s sharp criticism of the tract is therefore justified. Poleni (26), commenting on Fabretti’s censure in this passage, writes, “Si quicumque oculis non lippis illud legat, per se id certe sit percepturus” [If anyone will read Manutius’s work with clear vision, he will certainly perceive its shortcomings].

Review of other lines. By process of elimination, Fabretti demonstrates that the conduit described in section 2 cannot be identified with any of the nine aqueducts listed by Frontinus. His arguments in this section are based largely on literary evidence, which explains his concern to identify the edition of Frontinus he cites.

Benedetto Millini. Librarian to Queen Christina of Sweden during the period 1661–65, Millini published (under the pseudonym “Modello Tien-
tibene”) the play La costanza delle donne (Rome, 1647), as well as scholarly and religious treatises in his own name. He also contributed a preface to Famiano Nardini’s 1666 guidebook, Roma antica.

Millini’s edition of Frontinus is a mystery; it was surprisingly also unknown to Poleni, who states in his preface (only forty years after the publication of Fabretti’s work), “Is tamen neque Romae in bibliothecis codicum refertissimis neque inter Millini libros, neque inter libros Fabretti ab eis, qui ut gratum mihi facerent, conquisivere inventus est” [It was not found, either at Rome in the libraries with the largest collection of editions, or among Millini’s books, or among those of Fabretti, which those seeking to assist me searched] (30). Millini’s edition was also unknown to the commentator of the Barbiellini edition (12 n. b): “Nos quoque in eiusdem Millinianii Indicis inquisitione versati sumus, eademque fere diligentiam adhibuimus; nec tamen, ut reperiremus, contigit” [We, too, engaged in the same search for the Millini edition and applied almost the same diligence, but it was not our lot to find it].

Lucas Holste (Holstein, Holstenius, 1596–1661). A native of Hamburg, Holste studied at Leiden, converted to Catholicism, and from 1627 until his death, lived in Rome, where he became librarian of the Barberini Palace and the Vatican. A protégé of the geographer Philip Clüver (1580–1622), whom he accompanied on extensive travels throughout Italy, Holste had planned to produce editions both of ancient geographers and of Frontinus, but these projects were never realized before his death. His annotations on Clüver’s Italia antiqua were published posthumously by Cardinal Carlo Barberini as Annotationes in Geographiam sacram Caroli a S. Paolo, Italiam antiquam Cluverii, et Thesaurum geographicam Ortelii (Rome, 1666) and are cited frequently, with criticism, by Fabretti. For accounts of Holste’s life and geographical work, see R. Almagià, L’opera geografica di Luca Holstenio, Studi e Testi 102 (Vatican City, 1942), 1–24; Sandys, 2:364–65; Pökel, 125.

Holste’s identification of Labicum with the modern town of Colonna has been accepted by some modern topographers, most recently by L. Quilici and S. Quilici Gigh (see Barrington Atlas, map 43 and Directory, 1:628). Other topographers place Labicum at Montecompatri: see S. Barbetta, Via Labicana (Rome, 1995), 53; T. Ashby, “The Classical Topography of the Roman Campagna-I,” BSR 1 (1902): 256–63. Fabretti returns to the site of Labicum in his third dissertation (III.6); the issue is not of critical importance here.

Brick stamp “AVG.N.” (fig. 5). Ashby (309 n. 6 [366 n. 14]) corrects
Fabretti in attributing to the original construction the brick stamp found in the seventh arch at Acqua Bollicante (CIL XV, 211.14); Ashby describes it as “reused material.”

Fabretti is frequently cited as a pioneer in epigraphical studies for his attention to brick stamps, especially in his monumental *Inscriptionum antiquarum*; see, for example, H. Bloch, *I bolli laterizi di Roma e la storia edilizia romana*, Studi e materiali del Museo dell’Impero Romano 4 (1947): 3–4. As a pioneer, however, Fabretti was not aware that the Roman brick industry collapsed after the first quarter of the third century A.D. up until the principate of Diocletian; as a result, virtually no brick stamps are attested for the period of Alexander Severus. Fabretti’s argument here from the abbreviation “AVG.N.” is therefore not compelling. See Bloch, *Bolli laterizi*, 315, 339; E. M. Steinby, “L’industria laterizia di Roma nel tardo impero,” in *Società romana e impero tardoantico*, ed. A. Giardina (Rome, 1986), 2:99–163, especially 99–109.

**Citation of the SHA.** While Spartianus’s Life, like most works of the SHA, is frequently discounted by scholars as a historical source for building activities, the list of constructions it attributes to Alexander Severus can be largely confirmed by archaeological and topographical evidence. For a recent assessment, see F. Coarelli, “La situazione edilizia di Roma sotto Severo Alessandro,” in *L’urbs*, 429–56, especially 439–42. Cf. Ward-Perkins, “Via Gabina,” 122: “Severus Alexander, it should be noted, is also credited with an interest in the bathing facilities of the city as a whole. We are told of his construction, or restoration, of lesser bath buildings (balnea) in those of the Regions which were ill-supplied; of his completion of the *thermae* of Caracalla; of his imposition of a tax on a curious assessment of craftsmen, mainly in the clothing and metal trades, together with donations of forest land and oil, for the upkeep of the city’s baths.”

**Rondinini collection.** Angeloni (276–77) cites as part of the collection of Alessandro Rondinini the coin here discussed by Fabretti. The seventeenth-century numismatist Exechial Spanheim, in his *Dissertationes de praestantia et usu numismatum antiquorum* (Amsterdam, 1671), also cites coins in the collection of Felicia Zacchia Rondinini, whom he describes as a “praestantissima matrona” [most outstanding matron] (42), “illustre matronarum decus” [noted glory of matrons] (584), and “illustris matrona” [noted matron] (612).

**Francesco Angeloni** (1559–1652). An antiquarian, Angeloni was secretary to Cardinal Ippolito Aldobrandini and author of the *L’istoria augusta* that Fabretti cites frequently. See DBI, 3:241–42 (A. Buiatti). Angeloni
was also the mentor of Giovanni Pietro Bellori, whose publication of Trajan’s Column Fabretti criticizes sharply in this dissertation; the close association between the two men may have prompted some of Fabretti’s criticism of Angeloni’s work here. However, Fabretti appears to accept without critical comment Angeloni’s reading of this coin of Alexander Severus. For the type, see RIC², 4.2:65–66.

Jacques Oisel (1631–86). A Dutch legal scholar, Oisel studied under Salmasius, Gosius, and Daniel Heinsius and became professor of public law in Groningen. His *Thesaurus selectorum numismatum* was published in 1677, the same year this dissertation was written by Fabretti. See J. C. F. Hoefer, ed. *Nouvelle biographie générale* (Paris, 1863), 21:567.

Publius Victor. This name refers to an amplification of the original regionary catalogs that was first published in 1503–4 by Aulo Giano Parraasio under the title *De regionibus urbis Romae libellus aureus* and that was attributed to one Publius Victor; the name seems to have been a concoction inspired by the presence of works by Aurelius Victor in the same codex. Its text may be found in VZ, 1:207–58. This listing was reprinted many times during the sixteenth century and, indeed, well into the nineteenth. However, L. Preller (*Die Regionen der Stadt Rom* [Jena, 1846], 38–46) proved clearly that Victor’s listing was not authentic. For a detailed discussion, see VZ, 1:201–6; Jordan, 1.2:302–12. Fabretti considers Publius Victor an authentic source, citing it separately from the regionary catalogs throughout the three dissertations.

Notitia Imperii. This name is commonly applied to mid-fourth-century catalogs of the fourteen regions of imperial Rome. For their text, see Jordan, 1.2:539–74; VZ, 1:89–192.

### 4. REVIEW OF OTHER AQUEDUCT CONDUITS IN ROME

Moving from literary to archaeological evidence, Fabretti reviews the extant remains of other Roman aqueducts to demonstrate that the Alexandrina is a line separate from them. His survey begins with the most impressive display of aqueducts in the city, that at Porta Maggiore.

#### a. Aqueducts at Porta Maggiore

**Porta Maggiore inscription** (CIL VI, 1256). For a full discussion of this famous inscription, see Ashby, 191–92 (220–21); R. H. Rodgers, “The Mystery of 62 Miles: *CIL VI 1256,*” *ZPE* 63 (1986): 157–60.
Aqua Marcia at Porta Maggiore. Fabretti’s illustration is confirmed by Lanciani (299), Ashby (130–31 [161–62]), and Van Deman (105). For recent excavations in the area, see R. Volpe, *Aqua Marcia: Lo scavo di un tratto urbano* (Florence, 1996), 63–72. However, the identification of the three conduits of the Marcia, Tepula, and Julia within the Aurelian Wall at Porta Maggiore presented here is not original; Nardini (505) had made the same observation.


Fabricius’s description of the aqueduct lines at Spes Vetus is vague, citing distribution of only the Claudia, to which he assigns the three superimposed conduits preserved in the Aurelian Wall north of the Porta Maggiore: “ruinas eius in Aventino prope S. Priscam et prope Portam Naeviam in muro vidimus, canales scilicet saxeos tres, alterum alteri impositum, tantae amplitudinis, ut unus a me perreptari posset” [we saw its remains on the Aventine, near S. Prisca and near the Porta Maggiore in the wall, three channels, one atop the other, of such a width that I could crawl through one of them].

Although Fabretti’s criticism of Fabricius is accurate, he fails to note in this passage Nardini’s earlier identification (505) of the conduits of the Marcia, Tepula, and Julia; the discussion presented here therefore gives the incorrect impression that Fabretti’s observations and arguments are entirely new.

b. The Arcus Caelimontani

Fabretti’s discussion of this high-level branch of the Aqua Claudia is brief, presenting a correction of Fabricius on the Claudia’s distribution in Rome and an inscription attesting to Severan repairs to the conduit in the early third century A.D. On the Arcus Caelimontani, see H. B. Evans, *Water Distribution in Ancient Rome: The Evidence of Frontinus* (Ann Arbor, 1994), 118–24.

Marcello Severoli (1644–1707). Severoli was a friend of Fabretti and a member of the Accademia degli Arcadi. For his career, see Crescimbene, *Le vite*, 2:275–96. Fabretti also praises Severoli in his *De columna Traiani syntagma* (346, 383).
c. The Claudia Branch to the “Trophies of Marius”

**Janus Gruter** (Jan Gruytère, 1560–1627). A Dutch philologist and epigrapher, Gruter lived in England, was educated at Cambridge, studied at Leiden, held professorships at Rostock and Wittenberg, and ended his career at Heidelberg, where he spent thirty-five years. He was appointed librarian there in 1602, the same year that he published his corpus of ancient inscriptions, begun at the instigation of Joseph Justus Scaliger. Renowned for his tireless erudition, Gruter also produced editions of at least seventeen Latin authors, including Tacitus (1607), Livy (1608), and Cicero (1618). See Sandys, 2:359–62; Pökel, 104; EHCA, 545–46.

“Trophies of Marius” *castellum.* In his discussion, Fabretti challenges two theories common at the time: that the “Trophies of Marius” were a *castellum* of the Aqua Marcia and that the *castellum* was built by Trajan in connection with that emperor’s reworking of the Marcia.

Scholars who have credited Trajan with improvement of the Aqua Marcia and its extension to the Aventine cite as evidence Frontinus’s *De aquaeductu* 87.3 and 93.4, passages that discuss reworking and improvements of the city’s aqueducts, including the Marcia and Anio Novus. For example, Poleni (13) argued that Frontinus completed his *commentarius* under Trajan and therefore paid tribute to that emperor’s restoration in progress. The text of *De aquaeductu* 93.4, however, is not without difficulties; the manuscripts name Trajan as the *auctor* of the refurbished Anio Novus (“novum auctorem imperatorem Nervam Traianum Augustum praescrivente titulo”), but the citation of Trajan himself in them has recently been questioned as a later gloss: Frontinus wrote his *commentarius* when he assumed responsibility for the *cura aquarum* under Nerva (*Aq.* 1–2.1, 93.1), and an inscription commemorating improvements would have named Nerva, not Trajan, as their *auctor*. See the discussion in R. H. Rodgers’s forthcoming commentary.

Fabretti does not identify the contemporary writer whose attribution of the “Trophies of Marius” *castellum* to Trajan he attacks in this passage, but he is without a doubt Giovanni Pietro Bellori (1613–96), the prominent antiquarian, critic, and librarian to Queen Christina of Sweden in Rome. Alberto Cassio (1:121), working in the mid–eighteenth century, certainly understood Fabretti’s reference and cited Bellori by name as the object of Fabretti’s attack. It is surprising, however, that the commentator of the Barbiellini edition in 1788 did not know his identity (see Bar-
biellini, 19). For Bellori’s career and publications, see EHCA, 140–41 (E. Cropper).

Bellori had twice assigned the “Trophies of Marius” to Trajan. He did so first in his notes to Pietro Santi Bartoli’s study of Trajan’s Column (Colonna Traiana . . . accresciuta di medaglie, iscrizioni e trofei da Gian Pietro Bellori [Rome, 1672], pl. 118), basing his argument on similarities between the “Trophies” themselves and representations of trophies on the reliefs on Trajan’s Column. He did so a second time, in the following year, in his study of the Severan Marble Plan (Fragmenta vestigii veteris Romae xx. tabulis comprehensa [Rome, 1673], table IX, “Monumenta Comitis Herculis, seu Monumenta Mariana” [= Graevius, 4:1955]).

Scholars today discount Bellori’s arguments, citing differences in detail between the “Trophies of Marius” and reliefs on the column and arguing that any similarities between the two are the result of stylistic conventions rather than any direct connection between the two monuments. In addition, archaeological evidence does not support arguments for an earlier Trajanic version of the nymphaeum; excavations carried out in connection with restoration of the “Trophies” in 1982–88 have revealed that Alexander’s nymphaeum was built over structures of opus reticulatum dating from the Augustan period. For a summary of the evidence, see LTUR, 3:351–52 (G. Tedeschi Grisanti).

Fabretti seems to have had intense dislike for Bellori’s scholarship, since he attacks his work on Trajan’s Column frequently and vigorously in his own De columna Traiani syntagma (102–5), where Fabretti identifies Bellori only by the scornful reference “Neotericus” and repeats the same arguments made here about the level of the aqueduct supplying the “Trophies of Marius” castellum, reproducing figure 7 from this dissertation. It is therefore not surprising that Fabretti does not think it necessary to identify Bellori by name here, although he cites Angeloni, Nardini, and Fabricius (all dead in 1677), attacking them vigorously in this section. Cassio (1:121–22) comments critically on Fabretti’s censure here, “E nel tempo stesso tratta da vano il collettor di numismi Angeloni: da inavveduto Nardini, e da ignorante Fabricio: quali aggravi non si vogliono qui rapportare potendo da ciascuno vedersi nella di lui Dissertazione” [At the same time, he treats the numismatist Angeloni as vain, Nardini as rash, and Fabricius as ignorant; such charges need not be repeated here, since they can be read by anyone in Fabretti’s own dissertation].

In attacking Bellori’s view that Trajan built the “Trophies of Marius”
castellum, Fabretti rejects completely the interpretation by Angeloni of a sestertius of Trajan’s fifth consulship (= RIC², 2:248 [Trajan nos. 463, 607–9]; see Ashby, 299 [357]). Indeed, Fabretti returns to this same point later in this dissertation (I.4g), when he attacks Angeloni again, as well as Oisel, for reading the coin as a representation of a Trajanic nymphaeum. In his third dissertation (III.6), Fabretti revisits the issue, this time focusing not on numismatic evidence but on the text of Frontinus (Aq. 87.3) that credits Nerva with improvement and extension of the Marcia to the Aventine.

Assigning construction of the “Trophies of Marius” castellum to Trajan is the first issue Fabretti addresses here; assignment of the castellum to the Aqua Marcia is the second. This longstanding identification had been advanced since the sixteenth century: the castellum was attributed to the Marcia by Leonardo Bufalini in his map of 1551 (Frutaz, 2: tables 193–94, 198), an identification followed in the maps of Pirro Ligorio in 1553 (Frutaz, 2: table 225), Giovanni Antonio Dosio in 1561 (Frutaz, 2: table 229), and Alo Giovannoli in 1616 (Frutaz, 2: table 284). It had been supported as well by Nardini in his Roma antica, in the passages quoted by Fabretti in this section. For a history of this identification with the Marcia, see G. Tedeschi Grisanti, “Primo contributo ad una livellazione urbana sistematica degli antichi acquedotti di Roma,” in Trionfo II, 59–69.

Nardini cited three outlets in the castellum and suggested that they might have served to distribute the Marcia, Tepula, and Julia separately. Fabretti rejects Nardini’s hypothesis on two grounds: (1) there are actually five outlets in the castellum, not three; (2) none of the three lines Nardini cites was high enough to supply the castellum, and only the Claudian aqueducts could have reached the “Trophies of Marius.” Fabretti directs this same argument against Georg Fabricius but cites him only in passing at the end of this section; Fabricius (201 [= Graevius, 3:527C]) had assigned the branch line to the “Trophies” to the Aqua Julia: “ductus in Esquilino rudera apparent, inter portam et Marii tropaeae” [remains of the conduit appear on the Esquiline, between the gate [the Porta S. Lorenzo] and the “Trophies of Marius”].

Fabretti is incorrect here in his identification of the “Trophies of Marius” castellum as the principal castellum of the Aqua Claudia and Aqua Anio Novus. According to Frontinus (Aq. 20.2), the main point of distribution for the two lines was actually situated “post hortos Pallantianos” [behind the estate of Pallas], where the waters of the two conduits were mixed for delivery throughout the city. The structure, destroyed by fire in
1880, has been securely located not far west of the Porta Maggiore (see Ashby, 243–44 [295–96]; Van Deman, 251, textcut 33; Nash, 1:37:, fig. 29).

In addition, Fabretti’s argument based on conduit levels is vague: although he cites his own “certitudo, mathematicis demonstrationibus explorata,” he does not provide explicit statistics about levels at the “Trophies of Marius,” nor does he clearly state that he actually took levels there, in contrast to his detailed statistics for the levels cited for the five aqueducts at Spes Vetus. Later, in his De columna Traiani syntagma (102–5), Fabretti still gives no details about conduit levels at the “Trophies.”

Fabretti’s failure to cite detailed evidence on levels at the “Trophies of Marius” had far-reaching consequences, leading to misidentification of the castellum for more than three centuries. In the early eighteenth century, Poleni (72) accepted Fabretti’s assignment of the Claudian aqueducts to the “Trophies of Marius” castellum. Forty years later, however, Giovanni Battista Piranesi published new levels in his monumental study of the “Trophies” (Del castello dell’Acqua Giulia [Rome, 1761], 1–6), rejecting both Nardini’s and Fabretti’s arguments and identifying the structure as a castellum of a branch of the Aqua Julia. Piranesi’s reading of the evidence and identification were supported in 1821 by the architect A. M. Garnaud (“Memoire explicatif de la restauration de château de l’eau Jules (Aqua Julia) à Rome,” reprinted in G. Tedeschi Grisanti, I “trofei” di Mario: Il ninfeo dell’Acqua Giulia sull’Esquilino [Rome, 1977], 75–77) and in 1879 by Lanciani (383–85).

Lanciani’s assignment of the “Trophies of Marius” to the Aqua Julia also won wide acceptance, with only Ashby (297–98 [355–56]) questioning the identification because of the differences in elevation. Pace (160–61) publishes a letter of Ashby on the subject. Only in 1986, through new levels taken during restoration of the castellum, has it been demonstrated that all the leveling previously reported was incorrect: the height of the aqueduct conduit supplying the “Trophies of Marius” castellum has now been established as 62.28 meters above sea level (masl), considerably higher than that of the Julia at Spes Vetus (59.37 masl). Only the two Claudian aqueducts, the Aqua Anio Novus and Aqua Claudia (respectively, 65.99 masl and 63.85 masl at Spes Vetus), would have been high enough to supply the castellum and the branch aqueduct leading to it (see Tedeschi Grisanti, “Primo contributo”). Fabretti’s assignment of the
castellum to the Claudian aqueducts was therefore correct, even if he was wrong in identifying the “Trophies” with the main distribution tank of the two Claudian lines and did not definitively document his argument about levels here. For a summary of the history of identification of the “Trophies,” see Tedeschi Grisanti, *Trofei*, 39–40.

d. The “Arco di Druso” Aqueduct and Specus Octavianus

**Porta Capena.** In an attempt to identify the aqueduct carried by the “Arco di Druso” just inside the Porta S. Sebastiano of the Aurelian Wall, Fabretti first confronts the erroneous identification of that gate with the Porta Capena of the republican “Servian” Wall. He cites no specific authority for this identification, but it appears to have been widespread at the time, attested in fifteenth-century itineraries and so identified by Poggio Bracciolini in 1518; see Tomassetti, 2:50–51. For similar seventeenth-century identifications of the gate with the Porta Capena, see Donati, 69–70 (= Graevius, 3:593D); Nardini, 42; Giovanni Battista Falda’s 1676 map in Frutaz, 3: table 360.

To demonstrate that the Porta S. Sebastiano cannot be identified as the Porta Capena, Fabretti notes that according to Frontinus (*Aq.* 5.5), the low-level Aqua Appia ran next to the Porta Capena, where that aqueduct consisted of a substructure and arcade of only sixty paces, much shorter than that of the conduit carried by the “Arco di Druso.” All the topographical evidence, Fabretti concludes, puts the Porta Capena in the valley between the Caelian and Aventine, the location accepted by modern topographers; see G. Säflund, *Le mura di Roma repubblicana* (Uppsala, 1932), 146–48. Fabretti cites as topographical landmarks for its location the Villa Mattei (Nolli, no. 944), the Church of S. Maria in Navicella (Nolli, no. 942), and nearby fortifications constructed by Pope Paul III; this last citation, however, is too vague to be useful. On the fortifications of Paul III in the area, see R. Lanciani, *Storia degli scavi di Roma e notizie intorno le collezioni romane di antichità* (Rome, 1902–12), 2:98–99. Fabretti’s citation from Strabo does not add significant weight to his argument here but rather serves to introduce his discussion of the Porta Latina in the following paragraphs.

**Luca Peto** (Lucas Paetus, 1512–81). A Roman jurisconsult and administrator, Peto wrote an account of Pope Pius IV’s restoration of the Virgo,

**Porta Latina.** Fabretti introduces this argument to counter possible objections to his location of the Porta Capena, which would have been based on the proximity of the Porta Latina of the Aurelian Wall to the Porta S. Sebastiano. He does not identify the proponents of such arguments, but the reasoning is implied by the discussion presented by Donati (69–70 [= Graevius, 3:593D]) in his treatment of the gates of Rome.

**First milestone of the Via Appia** (CIL X, 6812). Fabretti cites this inscription, which was moved to the Capitoline and installed on the balustrade of the Piazza del Campidoglio in 1588, as sure proof of his location for the Porta Capena, although he appears to acknowledge some uncertainty about whether the inscription was found in situ. In actuality, the milestone, part of a private collection when it was moved to the Capitoline, does not strengthen Fabretti’s argument. On its uncertain provenance, see CIL X, 6812; CIL X.2, p. 991; Helbig4, 2:16–17.

**Arcus stillans.** With reference to the scholiast on Juvenal, Fabretti addresses what remains a longstanding topographical problem, identification of the *arcus stillans*. Jordan (2:19) interpreted the *arcus* as the Porta Capena itself, wet because of leaks from a nearby aqueduct. The evidence of the twelfth-century *Mirabilia Urbis Romae* (“intus portam arcus stillae,” 10.2 [= Jordan, 2:615]), which Fabretti does not cite, suggests that the *arcus* was a separate structure inside the gate, not the gate itself.

Fabretti’s identification of the *arcus stillans* with the Rivus Herculaneus of the Marcia has been repeated by modern topographers: see Ashby, 155 (188); Van Deman, 141. Poleni (71 n. 12) observes that Fabretti is following here the manuscript reading “initur” at *De aquaeductu* 19.9 accepted by Giovanni Giocondo in his 1513 edition of the *De aquaeductu*; Poleni himself adopts Rubenius’s emendation “finitur,” accepted by most later editors. Poleni also questions Fabretti’s proposed addition of “modus” to the text: “bona venia manium tanti viri dixerim: etiamsi verbum modus adderetur, nondum tamen sententia perspicua fieret” [by leave of the spirits of so great a man, even if the word modus were added, the meaning still would not be made clear].
Clivus of Mars inscription (CIL VI, 1270). Fabretti’s notice is correct about the provenance of the inscription cited, but the passages of Servius and Ovid that he introduces do little more than confirm that the area of the Temple of Mars mentioned was situated outside the Porta Capena; the evidence does not significantly strengthen his arguments about the location of the Porta Capena itself.

S. Giovanni’s martyrdom. Fabretti’s citation of Prochorus’s account of the martyrdom of S. Giovanni at the Porta Latina now permits Fabretti to introduce an attack on Paolo Aringhi (1600–76), an Oratorian who translated into Latin and expanded Antonio Bosio’s systematic study of the Roman catacombs, Roma sotterranea (Rome, 1651).

Maxima bibliotheca veterum patrum. A collection of writings of the church fathers first published by Marguerin de la Bigne in 1575 and augmented in a series of editions. Fabretti cites the most recent edition of 1677 (in twenty-seven volumes), paraphrasing here the notice of Giovanni Brisichella in its alphabetical index and inserting Bellarmine’s censure of Prochorus’s account (also appearing in the Maxima bibliotheca [2:46]).

Robert Cardinal Bellarmine, S.J. (1542–1621). A famous scholar and teacher, Bellarmine became rector of the Collegio Romano and a leading champion of the church against Protestant criticism. This citation seems gratuitous, to strengthen Fabretti’s argument against Aringhi.

Justus Lipsius (Joest Lips, 1547–1606). Born in Belgium, Lipsius studied Roman law at Louvain. He spent two years in Italy, exploring libraries and examining inscriptions, and became one of leading textual critics of his day, as well as a striking example of the religious fervor of the times, leaving the Roman Catholic Church to convert to Protestantism, then reconverting to Catholicism. See Pfeiffer, 124–26; Sandys, 2:301–5; Pökel, 158; EHCA, 686–87 (A. Grafton). Fabretti’s citation here seems gratuitous; later, in the third dissertation (III.5), he attacks Lipsius’s views on the size of ancient Rome.

Specus Octavianus. The course and purpose of this branch of the Anio Vetus remain problematic because of the scanty evidence available. For modern readings of the evidence, see Lanciani, 264–67; Ashby, 86–87 (107); Van Deman, 66.

Fabretti is certainly incorrect in his assignment of the aqueduct carried by the “Arco di Druso” to the Specus Octavianus branch of the Anio Vetus. Yet his attempt here to link pertinent passages of Frontinus to the
physical evidence at hand was in many ways farsighted; he was on the right track, even if he drew the wrong conclusions. Fabretti’s identification is based on mistaken assumptions concerning levels, the route of the branch, and incrustation. Lanciani (316–17), citing the level of Fabretti’s specus (fig. 1, no. 25) as midway between that of the conduit of the Marcia and that of the aqueduct carried by the “Arco di Druso,” identified this specific section of conduit as part of Caracalla’s branch of the Marcia known as the Aqua Antoniniana. In contrast to his earlier detailed discussion about levels of the Claudian aqueducts and the Marcia/Tepula/Julia at Spes Vetus, Fabretti presents here only general remarks (based on Frontin. Aq. 18.6) about the relative level of the Anio Vetus with respect to the other ancient aqueducts.

De aquaeductu 21, the passage Fabretti cites for the divergence of the branch from the main conduit of the Anio Vetus, is corrupt—a fact he appears to recognize in quoting it. Textual difficulties within the passage make it impossible to determine how Frontinus measured the distance of two miles he cites: was it along the Via Latina itself or along the conduit? If it was along the conduit, as Lanciani (264–65) and Ashby (86 [107]), argue, the specus depicted by Fabretti on his map cannot be in the correct position to be identified with the Specus Octavianus.

Fabretti makes reference to chemical analysis of the incrustation of the channel at the “Arco di Druso” to demonstrate its similarity to the water of the Anio River. For a modern analysis of the deposit of the “Arco di Druso” aqueduct, see G. Garbrecht and H. Manderscheid, “Etiam fonte novo Antoniniano,” ArchClass 44 (1992): 193–234, especially 211–26. In the nineteenth century, Lanciani (318) cited his own chemical analysis, demonstrating that the incrustation was similar to that of the Marcia, tapped by Caracalla for the Aqua Antoniniana, although Lanciani seems to acknowledge elsewhere (Acquedotti, 264) the scientific validity of Fabretti’s analysis in recognizing similarities in Anio River water. By modern standards any chemical analysis done in the seventeenth century must have been primitive; for the difficulties in analyzing incrustation in aqueduct conduits, see C. Puliti, A. Bergioli, and C. Terzano, “Studio chimico-fisico su formazioni calcaree prelevate da antichi acquedotti romani,” in Trionfo, 195–98. On incrustation in general, see Hodge, 227–32; Blackman and Hodge, 100–15; and A.T. Hodge, “Purity of Water,” in Wikan- der, Handbook, 98–99.
Giovanni Ciampini (1633–98). Fabretti makes warm reference to this prominent humanist and scientist of seventeenth-century Rome, who abandoned a legal career to devote himself to research, while working in the Cancelleria Apostolica. Ciampini founded an academy for church history in 1671 and a second for natural sciences, physics, and mathematics in 1679, under the patronage of Queen Christina. As Fabretti remarks here, Ciampini converted his home into a museum of antiquities and became the author of many scientific works in Italian and Latin. He died as a result of asphyxiation from mercury vapors in a laboratory experiment. See DBI, 25:136–43 (S. Grassi Fiorentino).

Specus Octavianus extension. In this discussion, Fabretti combines two separate observations: the first concerning a conduit that he identifies as a continuation of the Specus Octavianus under the Aventine: the second, that of the Aqua Appia itself in the same area. Fabretti’s attribution of the channel to the Specus Octavianus, intersecting with another channel identified as that of the Marcia, was initially rejected by Lanciani (265–66), who identified both structures as drains; however, Lanciani (FUR, 41) later listed them as the Specus Octavianus, with a query. Ashby (87 [107]) noted that in his day, it was impossible to examine these remains and therefore impossible to assess Fabretti’s reading of them.

e. The Aqua Appia

In contrast to Fabretti’s mistaken reading of the channels just cited, modern topographers have accepted his identification of the conduit of the Aqua Appia in the Vigna Santori. Lanciani (249–50) describes his own descent into the same quarries in 1876. Ashby (52–53 [68]) repeats Fabretti’s description in full. See also Van Deman, 27. The site was no longer accessible in Ashby’s day.

f. The “Arco di Druso” Itself

Fabretti now introduces a lengthy digression on his erroneous identification of the aqueduct conduit atop the “Arco di Druso,” arguing that the arch itself is the work of Augustus, the honorary arch erected by the Senate after Drusus’s death in 9 B.C., according to Suetonius (Claud. 1.3).

Fabretti’s identification is incorrect; the arch over the Via Appia Antica inside the Porta S. Sebastiano is actually contemporary with and a
part of Caracalla’s Aqua Antoniniana, the branch of the Marcia supplying the Thermae Caracallae. See Garbrecht and Manderscheid, “Etiam fonte,” 193–206; Nash, 1:179, with bibliography cited; Richmond, 138–39. For a full discussion of the evidence for Augustus’s Arch of Drusus itself, see F. S. Kleiner, The Arch of Nero in Rome (Rome, 1985), 33–35; Kleiner (28–30) also discusses the Augustan arch at Rimini (cited by Fabretti in this section).

**Pirro Ligorio** (ca. 1510–83). A Neapolitan architect and painter, Ligorio came to Rome and devoted himself to the study of antiquities. Ligorio excavated Hadrian’s villa near Tivoli while designing the Villa D’Este and published many works on ancient Rome, but he was notorious even among his contemporaries for his forgeries and falsification of inscriptions. For a comprehensive assessment of his work, see R. W. Gaston, ed., *Pirro Ligorio: Artist and Antiquarian* (Florence, 1988); a briefer account may be found in *EHCA*, 680–82 (R. W. Gaston). Fabretti never seems to tire of attacking Ligorio; cf. Cassio’s description of Ligorio as “flagellato ad ogni passo dal Fabretti” [whipped at every step by Fabretti] (1:203).

**Coin representation.** Fabretti gives no reference for this coin, which seems to be identical to *RIC*², 1:128, Claudius no. 98 [= British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* (London, 1965), 1:181, no. 121]. Cf. *RIC*², 1:130, Claudius 114 [= BM Coins, Rom. Emp., 1:191, no. 188, pl. 36.2]; Kleiner, *Arch of Nero*, pl. VII.1. The “very great similarity” of design cited by Fabretti is, in fact, negligible, mainly the single-span construction and the height of the attic. Gronovius (*Responsio ad cavillationes Raphaelis Fabretti* [Leiden, 1684], 13–14), replying to Fabretti’s criticism—in the third dissertation (III.6)—of his textual emendation of Livy, vigorously attacked Fabretti on this very point.

**Linguistic arguments.** Later topographers have generally interpreted the word Octavianus as a reference to the emperor Augustus; see Lanciani, 265; Van Deman, 66; Ashby, 86–87 (107). However, Augustus appears never to have used his adoptive name for official purposes. It is therefore tempting to associate the branch with some other Octavius, but no censors with that name are attested in the late republic or early empire. Gronovius (*Responsio*, 53–54) criticized Fabretti for his identification of the word Octavianus with Augustus. Fabretti’s arguments from the words clivos and planitia (from *CIL* VI, 1270) do not add much weight to his case for association with Augustus.
Guillaume Philandrier (Philander, 1505–65). Philandrier was a French philologist whose edition of Vitruvius, first published in 1544, was reprinted many times. For a recent assessment of his work and career, see F. Lemerle, Les “Annotations,” 11–47. Lemerle also reproduces a facsimile of an early edition of Philandrier’s Annotationes (Lyons, 1552), from which all citations of the work in the present book have been taken. Fabretti’s comparison of the arch with the instructions and proportions recommended in De architectura are simply another example that Vitruvius’s treatise, highly theoretical in nature, frequently conflicts with what we know of actual practice in the Roman world.

Porta S. Lorenzo arch. Fabretti gives only a partial depiction of this arch, with its Augustan inscription, to strengthen as much as possible the parallel with the arch at the Porta S. Sebastiano. He does cite its later modifications and inscriptions by Vespasian and Caracalla. On the arch at Porta S. Lorenzo, see Richmond, 170–81.

Enea Vico (1523–67). An engraver and numismatist from Parma, Vico published Augustarum imaginum aereis formis expressae (Venice, 1588), which, like de Strada’s publication, depicts the arch on the Claudian coin as triple.

Octavius de Strada à Rosberg (sixteenth century). De Strada authored Vitae imperatorum caesarumque Rom. orient. et occid. uxorum et liberorum eorum (Frankfurt, 1629).

Francesco Gottifredi (d. 1660), Francesco Cameli, Francesco Mezzabarba Birago (d. 1697). These antiquarians were connected with the circle of Queen Christina of Sweden. Cameli succeeded Gottifredi as curator of the queen’s medallions and library and served as secretary to the Accademia Reale, which later became the Accademia degli Arcadi. He was forced to relinquish his appointments with Queen Christina in the late 1670s because of failing eyesight (to which Fabretti alludes in this passage) and was succeeded by Giovanni Pietro Bellori. See DBI, 17:163–64 (N. Parise).

Coin of Drusus with augural staff within the tympanum. Coins of this type appear in RIC2 (1:129, Claudius no. 62, pl. VIII.126) and BM Coins, Rom. Emp. (1:181, nos. 121–23). See also Kleiner, Arch of Nero, pl. VII.2.

Albinovanus Pedo. An Augustan poet, Pedo was roughly contemporary with Ovid. Twenty-four lines of his epic poem on Germanicus’s campaigns, describing the disaster of the expedition to the North Sea, can be found in E. Courtney, ed., The Fragmentary Latin Poets (Oxford, 1993).

**Andrea Fulvio** (ca. 1470–1527). A poet, grammarian, antiquarian, and advisor to Raphael, Fulvio presented a verse inscription of Roman antiquities to Pope Leo X in 1513 and proposed a scheme for a plan of Rome divided into the ancient regions. See Sandys, 2:121; *EHCA*, 471–73 (R. W. Gaston). Fabretti’s citation of the coins of Trajan is not meant to reject Fulvio’s arguments; Mattingly and Sydenham list a coin of Trajan depicting a triple arch (*RIC*², 2:274, Trajan no. 420), but if the *Notitia* is correct in its notice that the Arcus Traiani was erected after the emperor’s death in A.D. 117 (Jordan, 2:542; *VZ*, 1:91, 165), the coin representation, dated to A.D. 100, is more plausibly to be connected to a triumph of that year. See *LTUR*, 1:112 (D. Palombi).

**Baths of Alexander.** Fabretti now returns to his principal subject, identification of the aqueduct that supplied the Baths of Alexander Severus. Fabretti’s mistaken interpretation of the “Arco di Druso” in the preceding discussion does not invalidate the main thesis of this dissertation.

g. **The Aqua Traiana**

**Inscriptions on the Janiculum and Via Aurelia.** Fabretti cites here two well-known papal inscriptions of the Acqua Paola, the first on the terminal fountain, or *fontanone*, built by Flaminio Ponzio on the Janiculum in 1611–12, the second on the so-called Arco dei Tiradiavoli or Arco Paolina spanning the Via Aurelia Antica outside the Porta S. Pancrazio alongside the Villa Doria Pamphilj. Both inscriptions erroneously identify Paul V’s aqueduct with the Aqua Alsietina introduced, according to Frontinus (*Aq.* 11), by Augustus. A third papal inscription of the Acqua Paola near Cesano, cited by Ashby (304 [361]), repeats the error.

Fabretti’s severe criticism is surprising here, since he points out in the second dissertation (II.4) that such errors are common in church docu-
ments, citing a papal bull of Paul V that makes a similarly incorrect identification. Fabretti’s vigorous rejection of the papal inscriptions seems deliberate, to strengthen his argument that the aqueduct on the Janiculum is the Traiana and can in no way be connected with the aqueduct of Alexander Severus. On the Acqua Paola, see C. Cancellieri, “L’acquedotto Paolo.”

**Inscription cited by Ligorio.** Apart from the listings of the Notitia (see Jordan, 2:548; VZ, 1:105) and Publius Victor (see VZ, 1:213) that Fabretti cites here, the inscription cited by Ligorio (rejected by CIL as a forgery) was for Fabretti the only independent evidence for a nymphaeum of Alexander Severus on the Esquiline. For this reason, he appears here to accept its authenticity, though not without censure of Ligorio’s argument for the existence of a settling tank. Cassio (Corso, 1:220) describes Fabretti’s acceptance of Ligorio’s inscription as a “miracolo.”

Where Ligorio cited a settling tank in addition to the Severan nymphaeum remains a mystery. The commentator of the Barbiellini edition writes, “Quae hic ex Ligorio proferuntur forte in illius manuscriptis adhuc latent; in iis enim, quae typis mandata vidimus, quorum iam meminimus, etsi aliquid argumenti ea de re citato loco exhibeant; tamen id ipsum non est, quod Fabrettus ex illius sententia hoc in loco docet” [These remarks attributed to Ligorio perhaps still lie hidden in his manuscripts; in his published works that we remember, although there is some argument along the lines presented here, there is no specific mention of the point Fabretti makes] (41 n. a).

**Evidence for the Aqua Traiana on the Janiculum.** Fabretti’s citations of the Acta and the Instrument of Donation of Charlemagne in this section come from contemporary secondary sources, Aringhi and Nardini, both of whom he criticizes elsewhere. Only Fabretti’s citation of Anastasius seems to be from an independent and separate source, and that evidence, incorrect in its details, adds little to his argument. Fabretti’s debts to his contemporaries in arguing for this course of the Traiana should therefore be acknowledged.

Earlier identification of the Aqua Traiana was confused and mistaken. In 1639, Donati (298 [= Graevius, 3.836]) had identified the Aqua Traiana with Trajan’s reworking of the Marcia and its extension to the Aventine, cited by Frontinus (Aq. 93); Angeloni (114) had made the same argument in 1641, based on the Trajanic coin representations of the aqueduct, an interpretation supported by Oisel in 1677 (see the discussion in
commentary to 1.3). Nardini (508–9) had associated the Traiana with an aqueduct tapped between the site of ancient Veii and Formello and introduced into “Campo Vaticano” and the Borgo. Fabretti’s argument that the Traiana was to be identified with the Janiculan aqueduct reworked by Paul V, while a corollary to this dissertation’s principal subject (the Aqua Alexandrina), must be recognized as a significant scholarly contribution that had far-reaching consequences.

Ligorio’s Porta Aurelia. Ligorio (Paradosse, 37–38) did indeed argue what Fabretti attributes to him in this passage: “La porta detta hoggidì san Pancrazio non è la Porta Aurelia, come quasi tutti gli antiquarii moderni tengono: perché Procopio la mette in Borgo, non quasi lontano dalla mole d’Adriano cio è Castel Sant’Angelo. Onde possiamo per verisimil coniettura pensare, che ella sia quella di San Spirito, o pur che ella fosse in quel contorno guasta per avventura da qualche Papa. Egli è ben vero che la Porta di San Pancrazio la sua via andava verso la Aurelia, e con essa si congiungeva, ma non era però ne la porta ne la via Aurelia, essendo nel luogo ove s’è detto” [The gate called today that of S. Pancrazio is not the Porta Aurelia, as almost all modern topographers hold, because Procopius connects the gate with the tomb of Hadrian, that is, Castel Sant’Angelo. We can therefore reasonably identify it with the Porta di S. Spirito or with another in that vicinity destroyed by the activity of some popes. It is indeed true that the street from the Porta S. Pancrazio went toward the Aurelia and joined it, but they were neither the real Porta or the Via Aurelia, since they were in the place indicated].

Modern topographers posit two gates of ancient Rome with the name Porta Aurelia: the first is that identified with the modern Porta S. Pancrazio at the top of the Janiculum; the second, also known as the Porta Aurelia Sancti Petri, is now destroyed but was originally situated near the present Castel Sant’Angelo. There were also two ancient roads with the name Aurelia: the Via Aurelia Vetus, beginning from the Pons Aemilius at the Tiber and running almost in a straight line to the Porta S. Pancrazio; and the Via Aurelia Nova, following a much more gentle ascent from its starting point at the Porta Aurelia Sancti Petri and meeting the Aurelia Vetus outside the walls of the city. See G. Gatti, “Il viadotto della via Aurelia nel Trastevere,” BC 58 (1940): 129–41.

Fabretti does not categorically deny the existence of a second Via Aurelia, but he strenuously objects to Ligorio’s location of the Porta Aurelia near Castel Sant’Angelo, to the exclusion of Porta S. Pancrazio. Fa-
bretti introduces here epigraphical evidence (CIL XIV, 3610) attesting to both a Via Aurelia Vetus and a Via Aurelia Nova being under the jurisdiction of one curator viarum. The inscription he cites can be paralleled by others: cf. CIL VI, 1512, which cites a curator of the Via Aurelia and Cornelia Triumphalis.

**Course of the Via Aurelia Vetus.** Fabretti cites the evidence of tombs along the course of the present Via Aurelia Antica to strengthen his arguments about its course from the Porta S. Pancrazio. These cemeteries have been amply documented: see A. Nestori, “Osservazioni sulla topografia cimiteriale dell’Aurelia Antica,” RACrist 40 (1964): 112–22; “La Catacomba di Calepodio all III miglio dell’Aurelia vetus e i sepulchri dei Papi Callisto I e Giulio I (I parte),” RACrist 57 (1971): 169–278.

Fabretti’s citation of the famous passage from Livy on the Gallic sack of Rome adds little to his argument concerning the course of the Via Aurelia Vetus. Certainly, in the early fourth century B.C., the only route across the Tiber to Caere would have been via the Pons Sublicius, not a bridge located much farther to the north outside the city of the early republic.

**Course of the Via Aurelia Nova.** Aringhi’s route for the ancient Via Aurelia Nova would follow closely that of the modern Via delle Fornaci, which meets the Via Aurelia Antica very close to the modern Via Vitelliana running to the Basilica of S. Pancrazio. Fabretti argues for a different route for the Via Aurelia Nova, one running more directly southwest, which he ascribes to Ligorio, but without reference to a specific work. He also illustrates such a course in his third dissertation, on his topographical map (III.2, fig. 31) and on his more detailed map of Rome’s walls and gates (III.3, fig. 32).

The route outlined here by Fabretti corresponds quite closely to that given by Tomassetti (2:563–88). Fabretti’s Taberna del Pidocchio appears to be the modern Contrada Madonna del Riposo (or del Pidocchio) described by Tomassetti (2:582–83). For an explanation of the name, see Tomassetti, 2:588. Fabretti’s Vigna Carpegna is to be identified with the Villa Carpegna, property of Fabretti’s patron Gaspare Carpegna, the cardinal vicar of Rome; see Tomassetti, 2:584–86. The office held by Carpegna gave its name to the modern Vicolo del Vicario running near the property (see Tomassetti, 2:551). On the Porcareccino property, see Tomassetti, 2:591. Its name and that of the property of the Bottachia are also attested in a systematic listing of estates in the Roman Campagna of the early seventeenth century. Cf. J. Coste, “I casali della Campagna di Roma all’inizio

**Fabretti’s On the Suburban Territory.** Fabretti appears to have planned a comprehensive work on the entire Roman Campagna. He cites this study in progress again in his third dissertation (III.6) while discussing the topography of the *ager Tusculanus*. The commentator of the Barbellini edition writes, “De pertexendo opere, quo Agri Suburbani res expenderet Fabrettus noster, ut clare ex hoc loco intellegitur, cogitaverat; de eo tamen non modo aliquid typis non commisit, sed ne hilum quidem inter illius M. Scripta ab iis repertum est, qui ea diligentius pervolutarunt, quo maxime de huiusmodi opere aliquid cognoscerent” [Fabretti had had thoughts about bringing to completion the work in which he discussed the subject of the *ager suburbanus*, but not only did he not publish something of it, but not even a small part of it was found by those who investigated these matters to learn as much as possible about the work] (45 n. a). Ashby (3 n. 3 [21 n. 19]) notes that this uncompleted work and the illustrated map prepared for it are also mentioned by Fabretti in his *Ad Grunnovium apologema* in 1686 (99). The map (fig. 37) was also published in the Barbellini edition in 1788 (opposite p. 90).

**Conclusion.** To conclude his discussion of the Aqua Traiana, Fabretti summarizes points already made in I.3. He adds only one new argument, that the coin of Trajan depicts an aqueduct drawn from a new source, not the reworking of an older line. He also includes a detail omitted in his earlier discussion, that Jacques Oisel also supported Angeloni’s reading of the Trajanic coin cited before.

Fabretti might have made more of his argument from the coin representation, since Trajan’s coin personifies the aqueduct as a reclining river god holding a reed in his right hand and leaning his left arm on an urn from which water flows. Such a representation would indicate water drawn from an independent source, not an addition to or reworking of another line. This omission is surprising, given Fabretti’s later interpretation of a similar relief of a reclining nymph as a representation of the Aqua Claudia in his second dissertation (II.3d). At the end of the present section, he concentrates instead on attacking both Angeloni and the gullibility of Oisel for having followed Angeloni.
5. LEVELS OF THE AQUA TRAIANA AND AQUA ALEXANDRINA

Fabretti here returns to earlier arguments about the relative levels of the aqueducts entering the city at Spes Vetus, to reinforce his identification of the Alexandrina as a line separate from those listed by Frontinus and also distinct from the Traiana, the topic just addressed. His observations about the relative levels of the papal Acqua Felice and ancient Marcia and Alexandrina repeat points made earlier (I.4a) but are cogent in establishing that the Alexandrina was independent of the other lines. On the difference in height between the two aqueducts, Ward-Perkins (“Via Gabin,” 123) writes: “It was this crucial factor of the height at which the Aqua Alexandriana entered the city which distinguished it from the next aqueduct to use the Pantano springs, namely the Acqua Felice. In terms of performance the former, despite the considerable proportion of its course that lay above ground, must be classified as one of the group of low-level aqueducts which could only serve the lower quarters of the city. The latter was specifically designed to bring water at a level high enough to serve almost the whole area within the city walls.”

By reintroducing Frontinus, Fabretti also reiterates earlier arguments that the Traiana and Alexandrina must be considered separate from the lines listed in the De aquaeductu. Fabretti’s citation of the number of aqueducts listed by the regionary catalogs and Procopius indicates that he was already preparing a more detailed discussion of this subject, addressed directly in the third dissertation.

6. EVIDENCE OF BRICK STAMPS AND THE TOMB OF ALEXANDER SEVERUS

Fabretti introduces his discussion of Alexander’s baths (about which he says very little) and the tomb at Monte del Grano to argue for Severan construction from the evidence of brick stamps. Although Fabretti attributes the brick stamp of the Alexandrina arcade west of Centocelle to the time of Alexander Severus, the stamp is instead assigned to the first century A.D. at CIL XV, 2313, which also notes its inscription litteris antiquis [in ancient lettering]. Ashby (314 n. 6 [373 n. 31]) assigns the brick stamp to the district of Palestrina, presumably from the parallel of CIL XIV,
Monte del Grano. This funerary monument, made famous by Piranesi’s study and illustrations in the eighteenth century, is no longer associated with Alexander Severus and his mother. For a discussion of the monument and evidence, see G. Pisani Sartorio, “Tomba detta di Alessandro Severo a Monte del Grano,” in Piranesi nei luoghi di Piranesi (Rome, 1979), 5:65–71; Ashby and Lugli, “La villa dei Flavi cristiani,” 179–82. For the sarcophagus described by Fabretti, presently in the Capitoline Museum, see Helbig4, 2:73–75 (no. 1226); it is now interpreted as representing the discovery of Achilles among the daughters of Lycomedes. Pisani Sartorio (“Tomba detta di Alessandro,” 65, 68 n. 8) notes that shaft E, which Fabretti describes as modern in his key to his cross section of the tomb (fig. 16), is actually an original part of the ancient monument.

Flaminio Vacca (ca. 1538–1605). Vacca was a Roman sculptor and antiquarian. His account of Roman antiquities discovered in his day was addressed to Anastasio Simonetti of Perugia. See Sandys, 2:155; EHCA, 1142.

Contemporary writer from France. As indicated in n. 38, the reference is to Bernard de Montfaucon, O.S.B. (1655–1741), a Benedictine scholar famous for laying the foundations of Greek paleography. Montfaucon spent three years in Italy exploring manuscripts and ancient topography. In his account of his travels, published in 1702, Montfaucon pays special tribute to the earlier descriptions of Vacca, whose schedae or notes he quotes (in Latin translation) throughout his text: “Eas sane, ut nova et intacta multa complectuntur, antiquitatis studiosis non displicituras confido” [I am confident that these notes will not be displeasing to students of antiquity, as they contain many things new and unexplored] (Diarium italicum, 105). See Sandys, 2:385–89; Pökel, 179; EHCA, 764–67. Fabretti’s citation of Vacca here was no doubt prompted by the quotation of Vacca’s account by Montfaucon himself.

7. SOURCES OF THE AQUA ALEXANDRINA AND ACQUA FELICE

Only at this point does Fabretti address the question of the sources of the Alexandrina, although he alluded to the topic in I.2, in his criticism of
Kircher’s topography and discussion of the location of ancient Labicum, and cited the origin of the aqueduct in the *ager Labicanus* in I.5. Fabretti’s identification of the source for the Alexandrina as one separate from those of the later Acqua Felice was rejected by Lanciani (380–81), who cites the incrustation in pipes fed by the papal aqueduct in Rome. Lanciani (381) also suggests that other springs less pure might have supplied the Alexandrina, since the water was intended for Severus’s bath complex in the Campus Martius, not for drinking purposes. Modern topographers today identify the sources of both aqueducts from springs in the basin of the Pantaño Borghese, recognized as the site of the ancient Lake Regillus. See Fl i.10, 879–81; Barbetta, *Via Labicana*, 47–48 and table I (opposite p. 16); G. Caruso, “L’Aqua Alexandriana,” in *Trionfo*, 120–23. For an up-to-date map of the area, see L. Quilici, “Il sistema di captazione delle sorgenti,” in *Trionfo* II, 47–58, especially fig. 5.

**Lake Regillus.** Fabretti here admits doubts about whether his own interpretation of the sources is correct, but he is fiercely critical of an unnamed topographer whose map, published in 1674, indicates the source of the aqueduct as Lake Regillus itself. The object of his censure is certainly to be identified as Innocenzo Mattei, whose *Nuova et esatta tavola topografica del territorio o distretto di Roma* was published in 1674. For discussion and reproduction, see R. Almagià, *Monumenta cartographica vaticana* (Vatican City, 1948), 2:56–57 and table XIV; A. P. Frutaz, *Le carte del Lazio* (Rome, 1972), 1:64–67 and table 154–56. Almagià (*L’opera geografica*, 134–36) demonstrates that though Mattei published the map in 1674, the cartography presented on it reflects the geographical work of Lucas Holste, who had died thirteen years earlier.

Fabretti certainly knew Mattei’s publication and indeed criticizes it again in his second dissertation (II.4b). However, as Almagià points out (*Monumenta*, 2:57), Mattei’s map of 1674 was quickly superseded by the more comprehensive and sophisticated cartographic works of Giacomo Filippo Amenti in 1693 and Giovanni Battista Cingolani in 1704 and became quite obscure—indeed, practically forgotten. It was certainly unknown a century later to the commentator of Barbiellini’s edition, who presents a long note (51 n. a) describing a fruitless search for this reference: “Quae hoc anno charta topographica esset obsignata, quamvis a nobis diligenter conquista, ut oculorum aciem in eam intenderemus; id tamen nullo modo licuit; nec quisquam harum rerum peritus, ex quibus non paucos, ut facem praferrent, rogabamus, quidquid certi indigitare
novit” [Although we searched carefully for a topographical map published in this year to examine it, it was not possible, nor was anyone knowledgeable about such things (not a few of whom we asked) able to indicate anything certain].

There can be no doubt about this identification: Mattei’s map identifies Lake Regillus as the source of the Acqua Felice and presents another error criticized by Fabretti in his second dissertation (II.4b), situating Carseoli east of the Thoranus River, rather than west. Most interesting about Fabretti’s censure here is his refusal to name Mattei himself. Fabretti seems to have been well aware that Mattei was only the publisher (the full title of the map reads “data in luce da D. Innocenzo Mattei”) and that Holste himself was the scholar responsible for the topographical information presented on it. It is not surprising, therefore, that he reserves his most bitter criticism in this section for Holste himself.

The actual location of Lake Regillus remains disputed. See FI 1.10, 879–81; Barrington Atlas, map 43 and Directory, 1:629. Without discussion, Barbetta (Via Labicana, 47–48) places it “quasi certamente” at the site of Pantano Borgese. T. Ashby (“Sul vero sito del Lago Regillo,” RendLinc 7 [1898]: 103–26, summarized in CR 12 [1898]: 470–72) argues for a location further southeast, at Pantano Secco, about two miles north of Frascati. L. Pareti (“Sulla battaglia del Lago Regillo,” StRom 7 [1959]: 18–30) argues from literary evidence on the battle itself for a location near the basin of Prata Porci, about two and a half miles north of Frascati. Pareti’s reading cannot be correct, because of the presence of an imperial villa on the site.

Source of the Alexandrina/Acqua Felice. Fabretti here makes reference to the inscription on the famous Moses Fountain of the Acqua Felice in Rome: “Sixtus V. Pont. Max. Picenus aquam ex Agro Columnae Via Praenestina sinistrorsum multar. collectione venarum ductu sinuoso a receptaculo mil. XX. a capite XXII. adduxit et Felicemque de nomine ante pont. dixit. Coepit anno pont. I absolvit III” [Pope Sixtus V from Piceno brought this water from the territory of Colonna to the left of the Via Praenestina from a combination of springs on a winding course of twenty miles from its reservoir and twenty-two miles from its source and named it Felice from his name before his pontificate. Begun in the first year and finished in the third of his pontificate]. (For the Moses fountain, see N. Cardano, “La mostra dell’acqua Felice,” in Trionfo, 243–50.) Like his earlier censure of Pope Paul V’s inscriptions of the Acqua Paola (I.4g), Fa-
bretti’s criticism is surprising here, since he points out in his second disser-
tation that such errors are common in papal documents (II.4a).

Course of the Via Labicana. Fabretti now attacks Holste in a digres-
sion concerning the route of the ancient Via Labicana east of Torrenova. On Torrenova itself, see FI 1.10, 693–95; Barbetta, *Via Labicana*, 39–41; Tomassetti, 3:485–92.

Fabretti makes only passing allusion here to what was a much debated
issue. Clüver (946) had identified Lake Regillus as the Laghetto della
Colonna: “Ad Praenestinam (viam) vero, e regione dicti opidi, quod vulgo
La Colonna vocatur, est is lacus qui tumulorum supercilio veluti
amphitheatro inclusus vulgo cognominatur sanctae Praxedis; nec alius
circa Tusculum totaque hac regione est lacus. Unde recte viri docti hunc
etiam ante me interpretati sunt Regillum lacum” [Along the Via Praen-
estina, outside the area of the town already cited, which is commonly
called Colonna, is a lake enclosed by a ridge of hills in the manner of an
amphitheater, commonly called the Lake of S. Prassede, nor is there
another lake in this area around Tusculum. As a result, scholars before my
time have rightly identified it as Lake Regillus]. Holste (191–92) corrected
this reading, pointing out that Clüver had confused the Via Praenestina
and Labicana and therefore misidentified the Lake of S. Prassede (i.e., the
Lake of Castiglione near Gabii) as Lake Regillus: “Labicanam viam cum
Praenestina confundit, nam quae sub Colonna transit, non Praenestina,
sed Lavicana est via. Error inde natus quod Cluverius ipse, ut nunc vulgo
omnes faciunt, Praeneste Romam petens ex Praenestina in Lavicanam
divertit. Lacus autem ille Regillus ad XIV. ferme lapidem ipsi viae Lavi-
cana de proximo imminet ad sinistram Roma euntibus Lavicum hoc est ad
Columnam. . . . Sed in hoc quoque fallitur, quod exiguum illum lacum, qui
sub Columna tumulis amphitheatri in speciem includitur, cum lacu S.
Praxedis confundit. Cum iste Lavicanam viam proxime attingat; alter
autem S. Praxedis, sive, ut nunc vocant Il lago di Castiglione, non in Tus-
culano, sed in Gabino agro haud dubie erat” [Clüver confuses the Via Lab-
icana with the Praenestina, for the road that passes below Colonna is not
the Praenestina but the Labicana. The mistake arose because Clüver, like
everyone now, when going to Rome from Palestrina, crosses from the Via
Praenestina to the Labicana. However, Lake Regillus dominates the Via
Labicana itself on the left for those coming from Rome at almost the four-
teenth milestone. . . . In this, too, he is mistaken, because he confuses that
small lake that beneath Colonna is enclosed by hills like an amphitheater
with the Lake of S. Prassede, since Lake Regillus is very close to the Via Labicana, but the Lake of S. Prassede or, as they now call it, the Lake of Castiglione, is without a doubt not in Tusculan but in Gabine territory].

Fabretti does not identify here the source of the error on Sixtus V’s inscription. He uses Holste’s own argument to make the point of error, then singles out Holste himself for special criticism for misidentification of the Via del Finocchio (which follows the course of the modern Via Casilina) as the ancient Via Labicana. This censure seems gratuitous, since the course of the Via Labicana is really not pertinent to the main subject at hand. Moreover, Fabretti appears to base his criticism on the topographical study reflected on Mattei’s map of 1674, which indeed shows the ancient Via Labicana following the course of the modern Casilina. On the course of the ancient Labicana at this point, see Barbetta, *Via Labicana*, 39–41; Tomassetti, 3:483–84.

Holste, however, had correctly recognized the Osteria del Finocchio on the modern Via Casilina as an important junction of ancient roads. Quilici (Fl 1.10, 617–19), Barbetta (*Via Labicana*, 46–47), and Ashby (“Classical Topography-I,” 236) make similar observations, and Fabretti himself seems to imply the same thing when he adds his own findings on the “viatrium vetus” or ancient roadway indicated on his topographic map (fig. 1), giving details about its course from the Taberna dell’Osa to the north (for its location, see Barbetta, *Via Labicana*, 47; Tomassetti, 3:576; Ashby, “Classical Topography-I,” 176–77), south past the Casale of S. Antonio (see Barbetta, *Via Labicana*, 47), to the Tor Forame on the ancient Labicana (see Barbetta, *Via Labicana*, 47). Fabretti’s “viatrium” seems to have been a continuation of the Via Cavona constructed to help communication between the Via Appia to the southwest and other roads to the northeast; see Ashby, “Classical Topography-I,” 176–77. Fabretti’s observation about the side road is therefore correct, but his attack on Holste is harsh.

**Closing**

**Lucio’s age.** Lucio would have been seventy-three years old in 1677, when this dissertation was written. Fabretti was sixteen years younger than his addressee.