

of its genuineness; and I have invariably stated the place (when known) where each was found, with the authority both for this statement, and for the text that I have adopted. The inscriptions, that are given in the lithographic plates, are *fac-similes* of the originals, as they are represented in De Rossi's work; the others are copied with as much accuracy as I could attain, using ordinary type. The notes are few and brief, as many of the difficulties are explained in the expansions and translations that I have given.

I subjoin a list of the editions of the principal works to which I refer in the article:—

ARINGHI,	<i>Roma Subterranea</i> ,	<i>Lutetiæ Parisiorum</i> , 1659.
BOECKH,	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum</i> , . .	Berlin, 1828-1856.

itself sufficient to excite the strongest suspicion. Ligorio, a Neapolitan, was a practised forger of inscriptions, which he sold to collectors, and many of his impostures have been exposed by scholars. His work, however, was confined to imitation of the Heathen *tituli*. But there were others who took up the manufacture of Christian inscriptions. The celebrated epitaph on *Daciana Diaconissa*, who was "the daughter of Palmatus the Consul, and the sister of Victorinus the Presbyter, and prophesied many things," although it passed the ordeal of Maffei's fastidious scrutiny, is now known to have been forged, and has been traced to Ferrara. See De Rossi, p. xxx. Bosio's great work in Italian, on the Catacombs of Rome, was, as is well known, translated into Latin by Paul Aringhi, who made additions, to the original, contributed by himself and Severano. There is no doubt that a second Ligorio imposed on both of these scholars. See De Rossi, p. xxvi. Again, Boldetti, who published what may be regarded as a supplement to Bosio, was so deficient in scholarship and critical acuteness, and so regardless of accuracy, that no reliance can be placed on his copies, even of inscriptions that he himself saw. As this may appear to some to be too harsh a censure on a writer, whose authority was once held in high estimation, I subjoin one of the many adverse opinions pronounced on him by De Rossi, who was thoroughly acquainted with his work in all its details: *Hujus (scil. Boldetti) in id genus apographis excipiendis imperitiam et incuriam non centena, sed millena exempla testantur*. See p. 24.

Other authors might be mentioned in illustration of the necessity for examining the authority for each inscription; but, probably, enough has been said on the subject. It is a more agreeable duty to bear my testimony to the remarkable merits of Signor De Rossi's learned volume—*Inscriptiones Christianæ Urbis Romæ Septimo Sæculo Antiquiores*—a work, which is *facile princeps* of all that have been published on the subject.

† I have examined Perret's splendid volumes, but have not taken any extract from them. Their reputation for accuracy is not good; Burgoz does not hesitate to call the work "simply a Romance."