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Ramsay's 'Enquiry': Text and Context

Bernard D. Frischer

Besides, we may observe, in every art or profession, even those which most concern life or action, that a spirit of accuracy, however acquired, carries all of them nearer their perfection.
David Hume, An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding, 1748

The first issue of Archaeologia, or Miscellaneous Tracts, Relating to Antiquity. Published by the Society of Antiquaries of London, appeared in 1770. Among its sixty-one articles, two stand out both because of their authors' renown and because of their diametrically opposed views of archaeology: Martin Folkes's 'On the Trajan and Antonine Pillars at Rome'; and William Stukeley's 'The Sanctuary at Westminster'. Stukeley was the eighteenth century's most distinguished scholar of Stonehenge. Folkes was President of the Society of Antiquaries and one of Stukeley's most vocal critics. Ramsay had been a fellow of the society since 1743. To appreciate his 'Enquiry into the Situation and Circumstances of Horace's Sabine Villa' we do well to position Ramsay between the two poles in British antiquarianism represented by Folkes and Stukeley. These might be characterized as the pole of quantitative empiricism, championed by Folkes; and the pole of high-flying speculative rationalism, associated with Stukeley.

Folkes's article is purely descriptive and quantitative – a relentless accumulation of numbers and measurements without interpretation or commentary. The tone is set at the very beginning: 'The Trajan column at Rome, is all of white marble, and consists of 30 stones, whereof 8 make the pedestal, 19 the pillar, and 3 the basis of the statue that stands on top. The side of the lowest plinth of the pedestal contains 20 English feet and three inches'.

Stukeley's essay is quite different. In six short pages it covers not only the little church (seventy-five feet square) known as The Sanctuary, which was being torn down when Stukeley visited it in 1750, but also ranges discursively over an amazing range of issues, including a catalogue of stone buildings before the Conquest and the origin of architecture itself:

Our church at Westminster is of the ... sort ... we may call Roman-Saxon ... from whence I infer it is later Saxon work, when there was and had been many years, perhaps, as now, too much intercourse between us and France; and when our builders began to conform to that later sort of architecture, with pointed arches.

How this later manner of pointed arches prevailed in Europe, over the former manner of semicircular arches, I cannot otherwise account for, but in supposing we had it from the Saracens ... they brought it from Africa, originally from Arabia; and from the southern parts of Asia ...

When I have thought on the origin of architecture, I persuade myself, this Arabian manner, as we ought to call it, is the most antient of all ... The original of all arts is deduced from nature; and assuredly the idea of this Arabian arch, and slender pillars, is taken from the groves sacred to religion, of which the great patriarch
Abraham was the inventor. The present Westminster Abby, and generally our cathedrals ... present us with a true notion of those verdant cathedrals of antiquity; and which our Druids brought from the east into our own island, and practised before the Romans came hither.6

For Stukeley, the little building of his study was a synecdoche for vast themes and contexts. On the other hand, Folkes’ essay — though written about monuments of far greater cultural import to the learned readers of his age — is couched in a tone so dry as to be dessicated. One almost wishes that Folkes and Stukeley could have exchanged topics: it is Stukeley whom we would like to read on Trajan’s Column, and Folkes on the Sanctuary at Westminster.

To assess Ramsay’s achievement in the ‘Enquiry’ we must apply the standards both of his day and of our own. There is, in fact, much more to praise in the ‘Enquiry’ than to criticize. Ramsay’s essay is the first compendious presentation of the Licenza site conventionally known as Horace’s Villa, and the range of information synthesized exceeds anything until Mazzoleni (1891) or Lugli (1926). Ramsay knew the key works of earlier scholars, and he was intimately familiar with the villa site and the valley in which it is situated. He presented most of the passages about the villa that occur in Horace’s poetry, relating the poet’s descriptions to the topography of the Licenza valley. Observing standards set by Archaeologia and by British antiquarians such as Robert Plot and John Aubrey in the previous century, he apparently planned at one stage to provide illustrations of the valley, commissioned from Jacob More. He also wished to include a relief map, commissioned from Jakob Philip Hackert, and to present his own drawings of architectural details and small finds. Hackert’s map was printed separately, and even today it is a useful aid for understanding the topography of the Licenza valley (see Fig.6.3).

The ‘Enquiry’ stands the test of time well, not simply because it offers several precious verbal and visual descriptions of archaeological remains not otherwise available for study, but also because it integrates so well the very different themes of a Stukeley and a Folkes. Methodologically, it succeeds because it represents an application of the ‘mitigated scepticism’ of Ramsay’s friend, David Hume. ‘To be a Humean, precisely, is to take no system as final, nothing as ultimate except the spirit of enquiry.’7 Ramsay’s treatise, entitled with the very Humean word ‘Enquiry’,8 shows that its author was as critical of himself and his views as he was of his predecessors and their theories, and that he knew full well that the investigation in which he was engaged would continue long after his death. He even concluded with a modest disclaimer about the finality of his results and sketched a future plan of research for finding the Temple of Vacuna near Rocca Giovine that is still valid today:

[I] shall conclude these remarks by observing that though they contain all the lights I have been able to acquire, I am far from thinking that the subject has received all the light that may be possibly thrown upon it. Something more certain and precise may still be learnt concerning the particular situation of Mandela and the extent of the Massa Mandelana by an examination of the title deeds of the family of Orsini, anciently Lords of all this territory; or of those of Nuñez and Borghese who derive
The enquiry into Horace’s Villa is organized into two parts. Ramsay began with the ‘situation,’ or location, of Horace’s estate (pp.1–5 in Ramsay’s pagination), examining the arguments of such earlier scholars as Biondo, Cluverius, Holstenius and Volpi.” Comparing their views with Horace’s own hints about where his country house was located, he found that everyone except Holstenius is contradicted by passages in Horace’s poetry, by geographical features or by both. Holstenius, the great geographer and Vatican librarian of the mid seventeenth century,” had implicitly placed Horace’s villa in the valley of the Licenza River, several kilometres to the north of Vicovaro.” Ramsay agreed, as have most scholars down to the present day.” As we will see, this reflects Ramsay’s Folkesian side of careful measurement and observation.

In the much longer second part of his treatise (pp.6–67), Ramsay considered the ‘circumstances’ of the villa. This term covers a large number of topics, including the hydrology, agriculture and flora of the Licenza valley; the probable size of Horace’s estate; the exact location of the dwelling and its unexpectedly large scale; the later owners and subsequent history of the estate; and the characteristics of the valley’s inhabitants. Throughout, Ramsay showed himself competent at handling a surprisingly wide range of disciplines, including archaeology and architectural history, literary and textual criticism, cartography, epigraphy, geography, linguistics and even Church history. He also displayed admirable warmth toward the humble comuniti of Licenza. Here, then, we see Ramsay working in a more expansive, Stukeleyan mode.

Unfortunately, Ramsay did not organize his treatment topically but according to the order of poems in the edition of Horace he was using.” Since the poems are not arranged in chronological order, it was awkward for Ramsay to treat the historical evolution of the villa or the poetic development of the villa theme.” Then, too, the poems are to some degree repetitive in their presentation of the villa. To solve this problem, Ramsay made good use of cross-references, but he did not entirely avoid the trap of repetitiousness.” Finally, while the structure of the ‘Enquiry’ might have made sense had Ramsay been pursuing the villa theme as an element in Horace’s poetry, it is rare that he stopped to consider the role played by a villa passage within the overall context of the poem in which it appears.” Similarly, he did not pay attention to the effects of the various genres (satiric, lyric, and epistolary) on Horace’s descriptions of his villa, although this is a topic to which the structure of his essay would have been well suited.

Of course, Ramsay’s approach to organizing his material had the virtue of being straightforward and, whatever its flaws, does not detract from the
material itself and his methodology. It is to these that we will turn after setting the stage for Ramsay’s essay by reviewing work on the villa by other antiquarians in the period 1440–1770.

The Antiquarian Context: Situating Horace’s Villa, 1440–1770

Not surprisingly, in over twenty poems mentioning his villa Horace never had occasion to locate the place with any precision. That is not what poets generally do. Horace did, however, note several places that were near his villa. Locating the villa, at least in a general way, has thus always entailed finding the modern places that correspond to the ancient sites in Horace since, as was well known by the mid sixteenth century, if not before, place names in Italy quite frequently had changed beyond recognition from antiquity to modern times. The places appearing in Horace’s villa poems include the Digentia River (Epistles 1.18.104), the Fanum Vacunae (Epistles 1.10.49), Mandela (Epistles 1.18.105), the Mons Lucretius and Valley of Ustica (Odes 1.17), and Varia (Epistles 1.14.3). None of these names survived intact to modern times.

There were old local traditions at Tivoli, Vicovaro and Licenza placing Horace’s villa near these towns. Such folklore was at first ignored or
neglected by scholars concerned about the situation of the villa, the earliest of whom was Flavio Biondo. Biondo’s influential *Italia Illustrata*, written in the mid fifteenth century, put the villa near Farfa. This view was adopted by such important sixteenth-century Horatian commentators as Cruquius.

In 1624, Cluverius’s *Italia Antiqua* put the villa near Montelibretti on the basis of the similarity of the modern place name with Horace’s Mons Lucretii. This was soon challenged by Cluverius’s student, Lucas Holstenius, in posthumously published notes on his teacher’s book. Holstenius was librarian of the Vatican Library until his death in 1661 and an acknowledged expert on ancient geography. His views were thus taken very seriously, and his new placement of Horace’s Villa in the Licenza valley quickly received important support from the cartographers Mattei and Ameti as well as from Fabretti in his influential work on the Roman aqueducts.

Holstenius’s identification rested on Cluverius’s equation of Vicovaro with Varia; on an etymological derivation of Licenza from Digentia; and on a religious-historical syncretism of the Roman goddess Victoria with the Sabine...
goddess Vacuna. Holstenius knew of a Roman inscription mentioning Victoria at Rocca Giovine, and he inferred from this that since Rocca Giovine was in Sabine territory, this might reflect a pre-Roman cult of Vacuna. While this is certainly possible, it should be noted that the Romans equated Vacuna with several Roman goddesses, not just with Victory, and that no other evidence has come to light in Rocca Giovine of a cult of Vacuna, whereas since the Renaissance much evidence of such cults has been discovered elsewhere in the Sabina, particularly in the area around Rieti. Thus, Holstenius’s thesis required additional support. It also needed to be made more precise, since it did no more than situate the villa somewhere in the valley of the Licenza, which is over eight kilometres long. Kircher, Fabretti, Mattei and Aletti in their maps of the valley differed about where Horace’s villa should be situated and made mistakes that show they were only vaguely familiar, at best, with the valley’s principal features.

Precision in locating the villa required, first of all, an accurate map, and this was still a desideratum for the Licenza valley at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The first map of the area, made with the aid of trigonometry and containing a scale, was that of Diego de Revillas in 1739 (Fig. 5.1). Though considered accurate for its day, its quality should not be overestimated, for if we superimpose a scaled version of Revillas’s map over an accurate contemporary map such as the Carta Tecnica Regionale of the Regione Lazio, Sezione 366110 (Licenza), we can see that Revillas’s map is distorted. For example, Rocca Giovine is one kilometre farther north than it should be, and the Licenza River and adjacent land extend too far to the east. At any rate, Revillas’s map caught the attention of antiquarians because he followed Holstenius in identifying Licenza as Digentia and Rocca Giovine as Fanum Vacunae. Though he did not, in his first edition, include Horace’s Villa, he was apparently eager to take this next logical step, and in the posthumous second edition of 1767 we find the first indication of ‘ruins of Horace’s Villa’ on a map. When Allan Ramsay made his first trip to find Horace’s Villa in 1755, we know that he used a sketch he made of Revillas’s 1739 map (Fig. 5.3).

Finally, in 1755, the Jesuits Cristoforo Maire and Ruggero Giuseppe Boscovich published their highly praised maps of central Italy, including one of the Papal States undertaken at the request of Pope Benedict XIV. On this map we find few ancient sites or place names, and none in the Licenza valley. But the location of modern sites was determined with a scientific exactness that easily surpasses anything found earlier. The Maire–Boscovich map of Latium was republished and reused many times in the later eighteenth century and became the basis for modern maps of the area. Ramsay knew it and referred to it in the ‘Enquiry’, using it to criticize the map of De Chaupy (Fig. 5.4; on De Chaupy, see below), which was a throwback to the days of unscientific mapmaking, in which the position of Mandela, Vicovaro, Rocca Giovine and Licenza could shift about unreliably from one cartographer to another. Maire–Boscovich provided antiquarians with a critical new tool that they would need if further progress was to be made.
Employment of this new tool required a task that it could help discharge, and though (as Ramsay’s first trip to Licenza shows) there was a perennial interest in visiting Horace’s Villa among learned people of all European nations, only a handful actually did so. Ramsay’s account, in fact, is the earliest to survive. It is interesting because it shows Ramsay turning to a country man near Licenza for help in finding the Fons Bandusiae. This implies that local tradition located the villa near the site where the Roman remains now known as Horace’s Villa were excavated from 1911 to 1914 by Angiolo Pasqui. Within ten years of Ramsay’s visit, several other British travellers were to come, including James Boswell and Andrew Lumisden. We know from them that there were no ruins visible above ground in the 1750s and 60s.

For their part, antiquarians felt no special urgency to focus on Horace’s Villa, since there were hundreds of sites and monuments available for study in Rome, in the Roman Campagna, on the Bay of Naples and elsewhere. The eighteenth century was a period of intensive archaeological exploration and discovery, and attention was naturally directed to the new artifacts that came out of the ground and to exploring sites which, judging from the ruins visible above ground, might yield spectacular finds. The relative neglect of Horace’s Villa is thus not surprising.
In 1757, the situation changed somewhat when the Vicovaro notary Giuseppe Petrocchi found an ancient inscription giving an important clue about the location of another place name mentioned by Horace in his villa poetry. The inscription (CIL xiv.3482; Fig.5.5) is an epitaph mentioning Valeria Maxima, the proprietor of a large group of properties (massa) known as Massa Mandelana. Massae were often named after a nearby town, and a
'Massa Mandelana' should thus be an estate near a town called Mandela. Horace says in *Epistles* 1.18.104–105 that his country estate is near the Digentia River, 'the cool stream from which Mandela drinks'.

Petrocchi recognized the importance of the inscription, finding suggestive, too, the fact that it was found near a town called Bardella. Bardella, he concluded, is the modern name for Mandela; a new piece of the puzzle about the location of Horace's Villa had been found. Of course, the new piece resembled Varia and Fanum Vacunae in simply indicating in a general way where the villa had been built. However, the fact that another Horatian place name had been located raised anew the old problem of finding the exact spot.

None of the leading antiquarians in Rome seems to have been inspired by Petrocchi's find to grapple with the problem. Winckelmann, for example, made no contribution to the study of Horace's Villa. All we know about his views is that he placed the Fons 'Blandusiae' near Tivoli. It may or may not be coincidental that the few people known to have been interested in Horace's Villa were (like Revillas before them) members of the Accademia degli Arcadi: the Dutch physician and poet George Nicolaus Heerkens and a priest of Tivoli, Domenico de Sanctis. Heerkens gave a talk to the Arcadians about his visit to Horace's Villa. The talk does not survive, nor is there a trace of it in the Archives of the Arcadians at the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome, though the date would appear to be in the period 1757–58. A few years later, in 1761, de Sanctis wrote a short tract on Horace's Villa, and he began by saying that it was Petrocchi's discovery of the Massa Mandelana inscription that made him eager to see if the site itself could be found.
De Sanctis's little book is less important for its author's own account of the Licenza site – which is in fact minimal, since most of the book concentrates on the villa passages in Horace's poetry – than it is for the light it throws on another pair of colourful figures who in c.1760 undertook the first known excavations of the Licenza site: the Baron de Saint'Odile and the abbot Bertrand Capmartin De Chaupy. The nature of the Saint'Odile–De Chaupy partnership is complex and has been treated more fully elsewhere. Born Mathieu-Dominique Charles Poirot de la Blandinier at Blamont (Lorraine) in the early 1700s, Saint'Odile came to be one of the leading diplomats of mid-eighteenth century Rome. Though mainly concerned with his diplomatic duties, he was typical of his age in also cultivating antiquarian interests. He enjoyed touring the Roman Campagna, and we hear of one trip he made to the Tivoli area, during which he travelled far and wide and stayed at Count Fede's villa, which stood on the grounds of the Villa of Hadrian. He himself wrote that Tivoli was his 'customary place to breathe fresh air'. On another trip he travelled up the Anio Valley, eventually reaching Ancona before returning to Rome. An unconfirmed source tells us that Saint'Odile even corrected the map of the Campagna published in 1711 by the great French cartographer Guillaume Del'Isle. This map was not noticed by Frutaz in his comprehensive collection of the maps of Lazio, and no trace of it remains in the cartographical collections in Washington, DC, London and Rome. One wonders whether it might not correspond to the map published in De Chaupy that was criticized by Ramsay.

As will be seen, Saint'Odile promoted the explorations at Horace's Villa. De Sanctis, our best informant about the De Chaupy–Saint'Odile project, describes their work as follows:

I will conclude by making honoured mention of the further lights shed by the most praiseworthy care and diligence of the Baron de Saint'Odile, the Plenipotentiary to the Holy See of his Majesty the Emperor and Grand Duke of Tuscany, a man who in the midst of his duties nourishes a strong love for learning and literature. He, too, completely persuaded that Horace's Villa was located in Licenza, did not neglect to investigate the truth of the matter in a more certain way. Since having observed the remains of an ancient structure not far from the site I have indicated, and under a spring from which without doubt the stream of the Licenza takes its name, he imagined that Horace's house once stood here, and he undertook its excavation [scavamento]. There he discovered well-built foundations and a cellar, which may be signs of a dwelling that – if not magnificent and luxurious – was at least proper and comfortable. There a pipe is also seen bringing water from the spring to the house both for domestic use and also, perhaps, for the convenience of a domestic bath complex.

De Sanctis's short book was first published in 1761, which provides a terminus ante quem for Saint'Odile's excavations in Licenza. We can also establish a terminus post quem of 1756, the year in which the Abbé Capmartin De Chaupy arrived in Rome in exile from his native France. As De Chaupy's acquaintance Joseph Jérôme La Lande wrote in 1769:

All the antiquarians placed the house of Horace at Tivoli because he often speaks of Tivoli in his works. But the Abbé Chaupy having thoroughly discussed this matter,
and having combed the whole area with the Baron de Saint'Odile, wrote a work in several volumes in which he strongly argued the view that when Horace speaks of Tivoli, he refers to the house of Maecenas or of someone else; but when he speaks of his own house, he speaks of the Digentia [River], the Mons Lucretius, or the Sabine valleys, which is therefore where one has to find its location.

Thus, by dating the beginning of De Chaupy's work at Horace's Villa, we can also date the excavations of Saint'Odile. De Chaupy wrote that he began exploring the villa 'a few years after the discovery' of the inscription now referred to as CIL xiv.3482, which, as noted, was found in 1757 near
Elsewhere, he explained that he arrived at his first sketch of the idea that the Licenza villa was Horace’s a few months before the publication of de Sanctis’s Dissertazione, which could not have happened before mid April of 1761.52 Putting these two passages together, we may infer that De Chaupy and Saint’Odile were exploring the countryside sometime in late 1760 or early 1761.

De Chaupy presented two lengthy and consistent descriptions of the finds in the third volume of his book. To summarize, he reported finding two separate structures, both in opus reticulatum, which he dated to the first century bc and took as evidence that the villa was Augustan. The first structure, he wrote, occupied the ruined church of St Peter. Because of its small size, the water pipes found leading to it and its low position, he conjectured that it was probably a bath complex. The second building was located in a more open position and was much larger, implying to De Chaupy that it was the residence. Also found scattered around the site were tesserae of mosaics – some polychrome – as well as fragments of columns and entablatures.54 Near these structures was a garden, which, from De Chaupy’s description, corresponds to the area below what today is called the Nymphaeum of the Orsini, several hundred meters to the west of the archaeological site known from Pasqui’s excavations in the period 1911–14. In this area the local winegrowers found fragments of lead pipes inscribed T. CLAVDI BURRI and T I CLAVDI B. These were destroyed later in the eighteenth century when the Archpriest of Licenza, to whom they had been entrusted, used them for birdshot, as Allan Ramsay recounted several years later.55

That Saint’Odile published no account of his excavations is certain; but it is less clear that he wanted his important discoveries to remain completely unknown. In favour of the hypothesis that Saint’Odile meant to keep silent about his finds is not only the lack of publication but also the odd fact that De Chaupy never explicitly mentioned his partner, or sponsor, Saint’Odile, in his publication of Horace’s villa. Instead, Saint’Odile is named only by de Sanctis, a man who was to become De Chaupy’s bitter rival in a dispute about who could rightly claim priority in identifying the Licenza site as Horace’s Villa. Yet, the excavations at Licenza, if made known to the world, could only have raised the Baron’s standing in the eyes of the cultural and political élite of Europe in this age of the Grand Tour. In this context we may compare Robert Adam’s archaeological publication of Diocletian’s palace at Split, which was begun in the late 1750s and was intended to be, in Adam’s memorable words, ‘a great puff, conducive to raising all at once one’s name & character’.56

If Saint’Odile consciously chose to forego the glory of being known as the discoverer of the site (as opposed to having been deliberately omitted from the story of the excavations by De Chaupy), this may have been a necessary consequence of his failure to obtain an excavation permit: publishing a report would have been a de facto admission of flouting the law.57 Another reason may have been that Saint’Odile felt his project was not yet finished and hence not ready for publication. The end of the first printing of de Sanctis’
Dissertazione of 1761 reads: 'thus continuing the enterprise he [Saint’Odile] has begun – as is most desirable for the Republic of Letters – one can hope that some more singular monument can be found, which will make the identification of Horace’s Villa in Licenza ever more secure.' At the end of the third and final printing of de Sanctis’ study in 1784, this expression of hope has been changed into a statement of disappointment that ‘well-known events have prevented [Saint’Odile] from completing the enterprise he began’. The allusion is undoubtedly to Saint’Odile’s abrupt dismissal from office in 1774 for improper behaviour and to Archduke Pietro Leopoldo’s order that his erstwhile ambassador never again set foot in Rome or Florence.

What motivated the Tuscan ambassador to Rome to excavate Horace’s Villa in the first place is still a mystery, though in view of his reputation as an intriguer, the scandalous end to which he came and the eighteenth-century view of archaeology as a business the purpose of which was to find salable treasure, we may well suspect that Saint’Odile’s motives were more mercenary than scientific. Be that as it may, at least we know from de Sanctis that it was the Baron de Saint’Odile who first had the idea of digging at the Licenza site and of initiating the long project, still alive today, of empirically testing the thesis that the Roman villa located there was Horace’s Sabinum.

As for De Chaupy, the fact that he never mentioned the Baron by name in his book may have been a deliberate attempt to rob his partner of any credit due him for the project at Horace’s Villa. This was typical of the abbé, who also felt compelled to belittle the contribution of de Sanctis and to claim priority in discovering the villa site, even though (as de Sanctis and others noted) it was really Holstenius who deserved to be considered its discoverer. De Chaupy’s quarrelsome nature was perhaps less of a problem than his prolixity: his book on Horace’s Villa ran to three stubby volumes. Contemporaries noted this with disapproval or amusement. Ramsay, in the ‘Enquiry’, wrote: ‘at least one half of his book is employed upon subjects which, though very interesting in themselves and very learnedly and ingeniously treated, have little or no relation to the general title of the work.’

Immediately upon completion of his three-volume Diverse maniere d’adornare i cammini, in 1769, Ramsay’s friend Piranesi mocked the poor abbé with a satirical satirical engraving (Fig. 5.7) serving as the tailpiece to the book’s ‘Apologia’. Although Piranesi makes no reference to it and does not express his motives in printing it, the engraving is self-explanatory. It depicts a work in three volumes, on the spines of which the author is given variously as Cap Martin Chaupy and Capo confuso (‘Muddle-Head’). At the top of the engraving is an inscription with the exclamation, ‘A dry spring and a few broken walls have brought forth three big volumes. What do you have to say about this, o my Baretti! Where is your goad?’ Giuseppe Marco Antonio Baretti was the author of an Italian-English dictionary, a traveller’s guide to Italy and, more to the point, a book of literary criticism called La frusta letteraria (‘The Literary Goad’). Below the inscription is a large map with a real place name, Licenza, but also with such imaginary places as Corrupt Passages and the Academy of Fanatics. Dominating the centre of the map are
the 'Ruins of Horace's Villa,' and the turd-like shape these take leaves very little doubt about Piranesi's opinion of their worth.

Such satirical engravings were Piranesi's characteristic mode of attacking important antiquarian adversaries. His satire also reflects more profound disagreements with De Chaupy, the man and the scholar. We do not know if the two ever met, but if they did, they must have found very little in common. Piranesi was a member of Monsignor Giovanni Gaetano Bottari's anti-Jesuit circle of antiquarians. Bottari and his followers believed in the necessity of preserving, interpreting and publishing Rome's pagan and Early Christian monuments, and they viewed a reformed and enlightened Church as the institution best suited to undertake this enormous task. De Chaupy—who at the beginning of the French Revolution was to publish a long attack on Voltaire—upheld the ancien régime and had been exiled from France in 1756 for publishing an attack on the Parliament of Paris. Beyond their ideological differences, Piranesi and De Chaupy held strongly divergent views about the purpose of antiquarian research. For Piranesi, study of the past served to provide creative sources of inspiration for new architecture.
For De Chaupy, the study of Horace’s villa was an end in itself, justifiable by the importance of Horace’s poetry. Piranesi was influenced by Bottari’s view that the archaeologist should modestly serve the public, not promote himself. Bottari even went so far as to leave his name off the books he published. De Chaupy’s egotistical boasting about his priority in discovering the true site of Horace’s Villa must have been highly offensive to Piranesi and other members of the Bottari circle. Finally, where Piranesi revelled in providing detailed technical diagrams and (often fanciful) architectural renderings and reconstructions of the sites he studied, De Chaupy’s text is wholly unillustrated. That De Chaupy’s verbal approach to archaeological description would have displeased Piranesi is clear from the title page to Piranesi’s Osservazioni sopra la lettre de M. Mariette (1765). Two insets contrast Mariette’s one-and-only tool, the pen, with the well-stocked toolkit of an architect such as Piranesi, which included a compass, a palette with brushes for illustration, a hammer and chisel, etc.

With Piranesi, we come to the end of the period leading up to Ramsay’s ‘Enquiry’. It is apparent that the problem of Horace’s Villa never engaged the leading Italian antiquarians at any period, except in passing. The remains on the surface were too sparse in comparison with other sites closer to Rome or Naples. In the eighteenth century, excavations were often undertaken to find treasure such as statues, and both the condition of the Licenza site and Horace’s descriptions of his villa as a humble farm must have made it seem unlikely that digging there would repay the investment. When excavations finally did occur, they did not result in significant finds that anyone could or would talk about. To make matters worse, the site had become the focus of a distasteful and pitiful baruffa in which, from the Italian point of view, the aggressor was a foreigner and an egotistical bully. By 1769 the Licenza site almost seemed to suffer from ‘guilt by association’ with De Chaupy, whom, as Piranesi’s engraving shows, Italian scholars understandably found disagreeable.

Ramsay’s ‘Enquiry’: Composition, Characteristics, Significance

Ramsay was an old friend of Piranesi, though they, too, had their public disagreements, especially about the relative merits of Greek and Roman art (see pp.12–13 above). Ramsay’s decision to write about Horace’s Villa shows that on the matter of its importance, he also took leave to differ from his friend. For Ramsay, the villa was important not for the height of its walls, nor for the art treasures to be found there, and certainly not for the fame that a book about it might bring to its author, but for its literary and sentimental associations and for the scientific discoveries that could still be made there. As the son of a poet who had been a long-time admirer of Horace (see pp.7–10 above), a wealthy and successful portraitist and a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, whose journal, Archaeologia, shows that there was practically no antiquity, no matter how humble, that was not worthy of a
serious publication, Ramsay approached the Licenza site with very different goals and expectations from a Piranesi, a De Chaupy or a Saint’Odile. Moreover, we should not neglect a purely personal motive for Ramsay’s decision to persist with the writing of the ‘Enquiry’: he found the related travel and study a fillip to his spirits, if not to his health, which was failing in the period of his fourth and final visit to Italy (1782–4). What Ramsay wrote to his friend Archibald Hamilton about his visit to Naples in June of 1783 is valuable testimony of this: ‘Here my infirm body is relieved by the gentleness of the climate; and my spirits kept up by the company of my son, and the variety of objects which a country, uncommonly interesting, daily presents to me.’

But even before the infirmity of his old age, Ramsay did not need Petrocchi’s 1757 discovery of the Massa Mandelana inscription or the de Sanctis–De Chaupy controversy to draw his interest to the site. This is clear from the fact that he had already visited Licenza looking for Horace’s Villa during his second trip (1754–7) to Italy; indeed, he is the first person on record to have visited. Sketches and a crudely drawn map (cf. Fig. 5.3) survive, showing us where he went and what he saw.

Ramsay journeyed to the site in September of 1755 with his wife and an English lady friend of hers. In a letter to Sir Alexander Dick, Ramsay described the trip as a pleasant jaunt of two days, during which time he saw the Fons Blandusiae and some other things that he sketched on a map and in some views he made. These survive and show that Ramsay put the villa up the Licenza Valley north of Vicovaro, between Rocca Giovine and Licenza. He placed the site to the west of the town mill, which is not shown on his map but in a drawing preserved in Edinburgh.

When the idea of writing the ‘Enquiry’ occurred to Ramsay is not known with certainty; it is, however, likely that the project began to form in his mind during his first visit to Licenza in 1755. We know only that he began the book during travels through Italy in 1775, as the title indicates. The manuscript was not finished when Ramsay returned to England in 1777, and Ramsay appears not to have touched it again until he went back to Rome in 1782. By the time he died in Dover on 10 August 1784, the text was almost finished, and Ramsay had commissioned an unknown amanuensis to copy his second draft, making what was possibly a fair copy by incorporating the various changes of the draft of 1782–3 and by the addition of finished drawings of the illustrations he planned to use. Judging from this third copy, now at the University of California, Los Angeles, Ramsay decided in the end not to use the watercolours he had commissioned from Jacob More, which he perhaps planned originally to have converted into engravings. The appearance in 1783 of Jakob Philipp Hackert’s ten engravings of the Licenza valley, supplemented (with Ramsay’s knowledge and encouragement) by the publication of a map showing the valley, doubtless made Ramsay see that publishing his own views would be superfluous. At pages 55–6, Ramsay added a note in which he mentioned Hackert’s ten views and praised his map.
The deliberate pace at which Ramsay let his project develop, despite the enthusiastic encouragement to publish quickly, which he received as early as 1778 from such friends as Boswell, Gibbon, Sir Joshua Reynolds and Samuel Johnson, shows that Ramsay was operating in the careful spirit of a scientist-antiquarian, not that of a self-promoting writer on the make. Of course, this is hardly surprising, since his reputation had already been made by the time he started his project on Horace’s Villa.  

The diary of Ramsay’s son, John (b 1768), gives us some precious glimpses into Ramsay’s work on the ‘Enquiry’ from late 1782 to 4 October 1783, when he and his father were living in Rome. Despite Ramsay’s failing health, he had enough good days to enable him to make progress on his project. We can easily imagine that he was determined to finish the ‘Enquiry’ before dying. From the diary, it is clear that Ramsay still had an impressive range of acquaintances among the artists and antiquarians of Rome, including James Byres, Jacob Philip Hackert, Gavin Hamilton, Angelica Kauffmann and Jacob More. Unfortunately, our diarist was only a youngster when observing the events and personages he covered, and he had a tendency to write about his father’s meetings without conveying anything about their content, giving the reader the impression of watching fascinating encounters behind soundproof glass. Thus, despite John’s record of several meetings between Ramsay and More, we have no idea what the two discussed.  

Luckily, there are some important exceptions. For example, on 12 February 1783, John and his father ‘called upon … Mr Hackert who showd us several of the drawings he had made near Horace’s Villa, all of which he was making prints to which my Father subscrib’d.’ Two days later John returned home to find Hackert talking with his father. On 8 April Hackert visited the Ramsays, and John wrote that he showed his father ‘the drawings from which he means to make his prints my father assisted him very much in adjusting their titles and motto’s.’ From 9 April to 27 June the Ramsays travelled south through Albano, Nemi and Velletri to the Pompentine Marshes, Terracina and ultimately to the Bay of Naples. On 1 July, a few days after their return to Rome, Hackert spent an evening with Ramsay, bringing with him ‘a map he had made of Horace’s country house and the country adjacent’ (see Fig.6.3), about which Ramsay wrote in the ‘Enquiry’. Ramsay obviously had maps on his mind, for John wrote that on 8 July, ‘In coming home we stopped at the Calcografia and bought the map of the Sabine country as also that of Latium by Ametio.’ These are the Revillas and Ameti maps to which Ramsay referred several times in the ‘Enquiry’. Meanwhile, there are several more visits with Hackert, on 2 and 9 July, and finally, after these preparations, John and his father set out for Tivoli on 17 July.  

At this point, John’s strengths as a diarist, such as they are, came to the fore, since he and his father then retreated to the countryside more to tour and observe than to socialize and converse. They used Tivoli as a base from which to explore the area up to Licenza, staying at Signor Cochimara’s house, where the garden covered the site of the Temple of the Sibyl – ‘the most beautiful elegant thing I ever saw,’ wrote John. Work related to the ‘Enquiry’ began in earnest on 30 July; John described the day as follows:
Set off from Tivoli at 7. The country all the way betwixt Tivoli and Vico Varo is very picturesque the road being all by the side of the Anio whose banks are famous for their beauty. Arrived at Vico Varo at 10. Went to Sig.a Camilla whose house we found in a very quiet disorder. ... Went to the Villa Bolognetti where I copied some inscriptions and particularly that one of Abbé Chaupy in which [is indicated] the situation of the ancient town of Mandela. Dined at 2. At 4, we ordered the chaise & went to San Cosimato a convent in a most charming picturesque situation. From it you have a very fine view taking in Licenza, Cantalupo, Vico Varo, Castel Madama &c. From there, we came home straight to Tivoli ... Arrived at Tivoli at 8.

A few days later, on 4 August, the Ramsays and a fellow hotel guest whom John calls 'the Frenchman,' and some ciceroni set off on asses for Vicovaro at three o'clock in the morning. They reached the town in time for breakfast. John continued:

I went to the Arciprete who gave me a letter of recommendation to the Arciprete of Rocca Giovane. Travelling for almost an hour in the most delightful country we arrived at Licenza where we found that my father could get good lodgings at the Arciprete's. From thence we set out for Rocca Giovane. Rocca Giovane is situated upon the top of a high rock to which the ascent and descent is very difficult. The arciprete of Rocca Giovane told us that this town was so miserably poor; that there were not a house that had a window in it; that it was utterly impossible to find a lodging of any sort. Going out of the gate of Rocca Giovane I copied an inscription which said that Vespasian had restored the temple of Victory which was going to ruin. Set out from Rocca Giovane at 11. Arrived at Sig.a Camilla's at Vico Varo about 12. Dined at 1. After dinner we took a walk about the town in which there is nothing very remarkable ... Set off from Vico Varo at 5 ... Arrived at Tivoli at 8.

The purpose of this visit appears to have been to find a place to lodge near Horace's Villa and to record the Victory inscription (CIL xiv.3485) in the town. Having failed to find a place to stay, the Ramsays returned to Tivoli, presumably somewhat disappointed. In the days that followed, John Ramsay took short trips in the Tivoli area, visiting the villa of Quintilius Varus, the Lago della Solfatara (that is, Bagni di Tivoli), and churches in Tivoli itself. John sat for his portrait, which his father worked on for several hours at a time over a period of several days. Ramsay père remained in his room, reading and making sketches of the landscape. Finally, on 18 August, the Ramsays returned to Rome. On 22 August Allan Ramsay received a letter from Count Orsini giving him permission to use the palace at Licenza, and by the next day he had returned to Tivoli with his son. By the 27th, the Ramsays were settled in the Orsini Palace in Licenza. John wrote:

Arrived at Licenza about 9 where we got very good lodgings in the Palace of Count Orsini out of each of the windows we had a most beautiful view of the valley of Licenza which reached down to San Cosimato & of Horace's country house which was just under our windows. The arciprete & Sig. Antonio dined with us. After dinner we went all together to see Horace's country house of which there is very few remains. They dug for us and opened us up a piece of marble which was in this form [here follows in the manuscript a drawing of the arrowhead mosaic in Lugli room G1; see Fig.5.8 below]. Near this there is a great piece of antient wall. From thence we went up to the Cascada which is a little artificial fountain pretty enough. Came home at 7.
On the next day, John read de Sanctis's *Dissertazione* to his father, undoubtedly to refresh his memory, since Ramsay already shows familiarity with the book in the 1777 manuscript of the 'Enquiry'. On the 29th the Ramsays went to the Fonte Ratini, where they drank the water 'with a great zeal and found it to be most excellent water tho' very cold'. Next, they visited the little church between Horace's Villa and Rocca Giovine known as S. Maria delle Case. After having a 'pleasant repast' at Rocca Giovine, the Ramsays returned to Licenza. On 31 August the Ramsays went to Percile, where Ramsay père wished to see 'Theresa a young girl of Licenza married to the surgeon of Percile and who had been the companion of my sister Amelia when she was in this country. She was exceedingly happy to see my father again and inquired a great deal about my sister.' This recalls the ending of the 'Enquiry', where Ramsay, after making a rather disparaging remark about the superstitiousness of the 'country people' of Licenza, concluded by saying of them:

they seem to be of the same stamp with those who, according to the poets and historians, inhabited that country in the days of Numa Pompilius, with the same laborious manner of living, the same contented poverty, and the same innocence; so that when my wife, my daughter Amelia, and I took our leave of them upon the 28 of June, 1777, we did it with much regret.  

For the next twelve days, Allan Ramsay seems to have stayed in the town of Licenza, continuing his work on the portrait of his son, who read to him from Cellini's autobiography in the evenings. It is a fair guess that he also worked on the text of the 'Enquiry'. Meanwhile, John Ramsay explored the area, taking walks to Colle Franco, Roccupo, Percile etc. On 7 September the mysterious Frenchman came to Licenza from Tivoli, paying the Ramsays a visit and being shown Horace's Villa by John. Allan Ramsay felt strong enough on the 12th to travel in his chaise to Colle Franco to see the view of Horace's Villa visible from that vantage point. He also visited the local apothecary, who had an ancient seal found at Horace's Villa, which close inspection showed to be Christian. The next day, Ramsay père travelled by chaise to Civitella. By the 14th, the Ramsays felt that they had completed their researches in the Licenza area and started their return to Rome via Vicovaro and Tivoli. 

Ramsay lived almost one more year before dying on 10 August 1784 at Dover, where he had sailed in order to be reunited with his daughter Amelia, who had returned to England from Bermuda, where her husband was stationed. At the time of his death, his manuscript of the 'Enquiry' was all but complete. It is to an assessment of this that we now turn. 

Ramsay's account of previous work on the situation of Horace's villa is solid and reliable. He knew the work of his predecessors, omitting only two of any importance.  

He was *au courant* about the recent publications on the site by de Sanctis and De Chaupy, though he never showed awareness of the driving force behind their researches, the shadowy Baron de Saint'Odile. He even consulted an unpublished manuscript by the Vicovaro notary, Abate
Giuseppe Petrocchi. In treating the work of previous scholars, he was fair and balanced, just as likely to assign praise as blame. After the nasty and absurd battle that had broken out in the previous decade between de Sanctis and De Chaupy, Ramsay’s dispassionate objectivity is a welcome relief. For example, although he criticized De Chaupy for the incorrect orientation of his map and other errors, he praised the abbé for his work in identifying the Fons Bandusia near Horace’s birthplace of Venusia (Venosa) and for his publication of an inscription important for locating the ancient site of Mandela.

In method, Ramsay showed himself to be firmly committed to empiricism and autopsy. For centuries, he believed, scholars had fallen into error because they allowed their prejudices or ‘prepossessions’ to dictate their beliefs about Horace’s Sabinum. This was as true of the ancient commentators (or, ‘scholiasts’) as of contemporaries such as De Chaupy. Thus, writing about the latter, he stated, ‘but in [the map] of the Valley of Licenza drawn by Abbé De Chaupy ... the good Abbé has suffered his pencil to be guided rather by his prepossessions than his eyesight and has moved heaven and earth in order to make the actual situation of things correspond with what he believed to be Horace’s description of them.’ Similarly, he penned the following complaint against one of the ancient commentators on Horace’s poetry:

But here our Scholiast is of very little authority, as he appears to have no knowledge of the place [i.e., Ustica; cf. Odes 1.17.11] or its circumstances beyond what he had picked up from passages of Horace and Virgil, which were they sufficient, lie at this time as open to us moderns as to him. ... The best commentary upon this passage in Horace is to be found in the present Valley of Licenza.

It should be noted that Ramsay was prepared for just such an attack on ancient and modern authorities by papers printed by the Society of Antiquaries in the 1770s. In 1770, Smart Lethieullier published a letter showing that Stukeley’s speculative reconstruction of the route of the Icening-street between Newbury and Old Sarum was fanciful. In 1772 Daines Barrington argued that Caesar was mistaken in identifying the Medway River as the Thames. Thus, in questioning the authority of the scholiast and in suspecting that his identification of Ustica is an unreliable back-formation from the poetry, Ramsay was a product of his age. This form of criticism has gathered strength in recent years, anticipating the trend to doubt the veracity of many of the biographical details reported by the scholiasts.

For Ramsay, the corrective to such prepossession was accurate observation of the ‘present Valley of Licenza.’ He encouraged the successful engraver Jacob Philipp Hackert to prepare a new map of the valley (see Fig.6.2), and he struggled through various attempts to identify the site of Ustica by reconciling Horace’s descriptive passages about the place with several possible hills in area. We can follow Ramsay’s mind at work in the 1777 version of the ‘Enquiry’ in the National Library of Scotland, wherein his first idea was that ‘perhaps Ustica might have been the name customarily given to the sloping ground to the west of Licenza’. But a moment’s reflection told
him that this spot did not particularly correspond to Horace’s description, and so he crossed out this passage and wrote: ‘To say the truth, there is nothing in the appearance of this piece of ground that is very distinguishing, or deserving of any epithet at all, and Horace’s curiosa felicitas in the choice of his terms ought to make us suspect that none of them are employed idly.’

So Ramsay had second thoughts about equating the slope to the west of the town of Licenza with Ustica, and he set off in a new direction, trying to find a feature that could fairly be described in the words Horace uses in Odes 1.17 as being cubans (‘redining’) and as having levia saxa (‘smooth rocks’):

What if the present Rocca Giovane was the ancient Ustica? It is a singular situation to which the word cubans and levia Saxa will very well apply. For here is a village built upon the top of a bare rock in most places perpendicular [see PL.VII]. The whole of this rock lies in a hollow, shaped like a cradle, and on every side, except to the east, is surrounded by ground higher than itself; particularly to the west. All this is in the straight part which gives entrance into the Valley, and one afternoon in my return from Horace’s farm, I had occasion to hear a remarkable echo in this place, by one country man bawling to another, on the other side of the Digentia.

But Ramsay was not satisfied with this conjecture, and so he again cancelled his text, writing instead: ‘Some inscription may be hereafter found, or some charters of the neighbouring lands, able to give us light into this matter; in the mean time it would be shutting the door against future discoveries if we were to mention things as certain, which have no better support than loose conjectures.’ Ramsay knew that others would rely on his accuracy of thought and observation and that if he put forward an identification as certain that was merely speculative, it might ‘shut the door against future discoveries’. Moreover, if documentary evidence should emerge from which the location of Ustica could be inferred, and if his guess was wrong, then he would open himself to the kind of criticism that Stukeley had to endure from his critics.

In 1777, then, Ramsay decided to play it safe, noting that Horace’s Valley of Ustica could not be securely identified and that his readers should be so apprised. But, as the final draft of 1783 shows, Ramsay continued to ponder the question, and in the end decided that he was on the right track in his initial supposition but had wrongly limited his survey to the western slope of the hill of Licenza. Thus, in the final draft, he wrote:

In reading the words levia saxia which resounded with the pipe, I had, all my life, formed an idea of living rocks of considerable magnitude; which by the help of valleys, or recesses, adjoining to them performed this mimic function. Accordingly upon coming into the middle of the Valley of Licenza I looked about for some place which might correspond to the image I had formed in my mind and soon observed at the north end of the valley some rocky ground, and particularly one rock, perpendicular on the east side, upon which is built the little village called Licenza ... I observed likewise other deep recesses to the west of this rock and was satisfied that this rock was the Ustica, and these recesses the valleys mentioned in the ode, as uniting to produce the echo.

With regard to the Usticae cubantis, the old Scholiast does not seem to have accurately performed his function of grammarian in assigning the same meaning to jacens and cubans, as the one means in the best authors ‘lying’, and the other ‘reclining’. The epithet of ‘reclining’ may tolerably well suit the hill of Licenza which
slopes all the way to the top on that side which looks towards Horace’s house; and the whole hill, though high with respect to the plain, is low with respect to the hills behind, and on each side of it, to a degree that will surprise any one who views it from Civitella. Ramsay’s ultimate solution to the puzzle of where Ustica was located may not be completely compatible with the one immediately preceding it, but we must at least grant that Ramsay did not present the identification as unproblematically as he did in his first suggestion or as speculatively as he did in his third idea. In navigating between the overly optimistic speculation of Stukeley and the overly cautious empiricism of Folkes, Ramsay may even have hit upon the correct solution, since two important twentieth-century topographers have independently arrived at the same conclusion: that Ustica is the hill on which the town of Licenza sits. The key factor enabling Ramsay to reach the solution of 1783 was his autopsy of the Licenza valley from the top of Civitella, which he first visited on 13 September 1783, just when he was writing the final passage. Observing Ramsay struggling to identify Ustica, we are reminded of Hume’s ‘doctrine of belief’: ‘the sentiment of belief is nothing but a conception more intense and steady than what attends the mere fictions of the imagination, and ... this manner of conception arises from a customary conjunction of the object with something present to the memory or senses’.

Ramsay’s methods included excavation, at least to a modest extent. He recorded two specific dates on which he had the country people dig in the Vigne di San Pietro to expose a mosaic in the room labelled G1 on Lugli’s plan of 1926 (Fig. 5.8). Although on the first occasion, 27 June 1773, he incorrectly inferred from the layout of the mosaic that the building of which it was a part was orientated to the cardinal points of the compass (it is actually oriented NW-SE), Ramsay was right to attempt to raise this issue. He also tells us that he had ‘at other times been shown parts of this mosaic composed of flowering foliages’. The mosaic in room G1 was completely exposed in Pasqui’s excavations of 1911-14, and it cannot be described as having ‘flowering foliages’. Some of the nearby rooms and passageways are lacking a pavement. Perhaps what Ramsay saw (but, unfortunately, did not draw) was part of a mosaic in one of these other parts of the building. Be that as it may, Ramsay gave no sign of planning to undertake large-scale excavations of the site; nor did he show any of Thomas Jefferson’s grasp of how stratigraphy could be used to illuminate the history of a site. When Bernardo Pomfili, a local farmer, brought to Ramsay’s attention the remains of cubilia in his field, Ramsay did not bother to dig the site but was satisfied to indulge in some speculation that the gatehouse to Horace’s Villa might have been located there. His goal in writing the ‘Enquiry’ appears to have been simply to provide a stimulus for someone else to undertake the task of thoroughly digging and publishing the villa.

Turning from Ramsay’s method to his results, the first thing to note is that he raised some issues that were far ahead of his time. This is, doubtless, not because he was farsighted but because he had a Stukeleyan breadth of vision
of the scope of antiquarian research, which went far beyond the quantitative aspects of a monument to its real-life uses and its cultural significance. Like recent scholars, for example, he wondered about the size of the estate, speculating that it was very large. He had a panoramic view of the history of the property, differentiating the various ancient periods from each other, antiquity from the Middle Ages, and the Middle Ages from his own day. He realized that understanding the Horatian phase of the site required peeling away layers from his day back to the first occupation of the area. His ideas about dating the various phases have held up remarkably well, considering how slight the evidence was on which they were based. For example, he was right to conjecture a major rebuilding in the mid imperial period, though he was wrong in identifying the person responsible as Sextus Afranius Burrus. He was also probably correct in imagining that the property was donated by Constantine to the church of St Peter and Marcellinus, remaining largely in Church hands until his own day. Among students of Horace’s Villa to the present day, he is unique in wondering how often and at what times of the year Horace used the place.

Also quite progressive is Ramsay’s survey of the ancient remains all around the Licenza valley. He was interested not only in standard questions such as the identification of Horatian place names, but also in such new problems as whether Horace had any neighbours and, if so, where their properties might be located. In giving the results of his survey, he reported finds not otherwise known, such as an inscription on an altar at the door of a peasant in Licenza. Ramsay’s sympathy for the country people enabled him to track down places and objects that other investigators missed, perhaps because they did not stay at Licenza as long as he did and because they were not nearly so open to intercourse with the uneducated inhabitants of the valley. Bernardo Pomfili (whom Ramsay familiarly calls ‘Bernardo’) showed him the ruins of an important structure in opus reticulatum on his land not far from the villa site. Ramsay’s informant thought that the cubilia on his land were used as pavement for a road, but Ramsay preceptively noted that the Romans never used this construction technique for laying causeways. He was quite right, too, to ponder the still unresolved question of how the villa site was reached by a diverticulum from the main Roman road through the valley. Another man in Rocca Giovine invited Ramsay into his house to see a missing piece of the Victory inscription over the door (Fig. 5.9), and Ramsay went beyond previous students of the inscription by probing the circumstances that may have surrounded Vespasian’s restoration of the temple of the goddess. Other natives told him about various place names (Il Sainese, Il Pomario etc) that gave him leads (albeit possibly false) about the ancient identity of the areas. At least once he appeared to have misunderstood what his informants told him when he reported the find of a ‘marble chariot’ instead of ‘a cartload full of marble’, though in general his Italian was quite good. Ramsay’s most significant discovery was the mosaic in room G1 on the Lugli plan. It is easy to imagine that it was Ramsay’s interest in the inhabitants of
the Licenza valley that enabled him to be the first scholar on record to see this pavement; in his description of how he came to view the mosaic, he wrote as though it had long been known to ‘the master of the vineyard’ and did not imply that it was found through his own independent efforts. Even if we might wish that Ramsay had dug more extensively on the site, he must be praised for garnering as much information as possible from local peasants. Here, Ramsay looks forward to the Romantic antiquarians of the nineteenth century.
Of course, for all his virtues, Ramsay suffered both from the general limitations of his age and from his own personal shortcomings. While he was generally effective in linking Horace’s descriptions of places in the valley to likely sites on the map, he sometimes went too far, as when he thought he could find the spot mentioned in *Odes* 3.18, where ‘the peasants play on the grassy-matted soil, round their oxen, free from toil.’ His description of the villa site as covered with ‘thousands of stones’ is precious, but even more valuable would have been various views of the site. The one long view he made from a window in the Orsini Palace is, for its time, uniquely informative but cannot substitute for a series of close-ups in and around the Vigne di San Pietro. Likewise, we are grateful for his illustrations of the mosaic in room G1 but wish he had also left a drawing of the apothecary’s Christian seal or of the mosaic, now vanished and never otherwise recorded, with ‘flowering foliages.’ Undoubtedly, the poor state of his health – particularly during his last visit to the site – prevented him from making as many illustrations as he might have liked.

Ramsay’s sense of the topography of the valley was very strong and reliable, but he too blithely assumed an uninterrupted continuity from antiquity to his own day. For example, he thought that the modern place name ‘Il Pomario’ marked the spot of Horace’s garden, and he believed that ‘La Romana’ applied to the site of an ancient Roman structure. In the last example, he may be faulted for violating his own principle of autopsy, since he relied on the hearsay of the country people for the report that there were ancient walls on the site. In general, when he most went astray it was because he digressed or neglected his own policy of sceptical enquiry.

Nevertheless, Ramsay’s strengths outweigh his weaknesses. What most differentiates him from many of his contemporary antiquarians in Italy is the honesty with which he conducted his research and the purely scientific aims that he pursued. He viewed digging as a tool for ascertaining the truth of archaeological conjecture, not as a means of finding treasure that could be sold for self-enrichment. Indeed, he realized that excavation undertaken on behalf of the advancement of knowledge will certainly cost more money than it will return. But, whatever the costs, Ramsay knew from personal experience that digging would bring sufficient satisfaction to ‘men of classical curiosity’ to justify the expense.

Ramsay’s plan for an extensive excavation of the Vigne de San Pietro site took over a century to be realized. Throughout most of the nineteenth century, the Licenza site was unquestioningly accepted as Horace’s in the guidebooks, but it was occasionally challenged by scholars. In 1891 Mazzoleni published a magisterial article re-arguing the case in favour of the site in the Vigne de San Pietro, and after repeated official requests by the town of Licenza to the government in Rome, the first scientific excavations were undertaken from 1911 to 1914 by Angiolo Pasqui on behalf of the Ministry for Public Instruction. Pasqui died before completing his work, and in 1926 his preliminary results were published by Giuseppe Lugli, who was to become
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one of the twentieth century's leading scholars of Roman topography. In 1930–31, Thomas Drees Price, a Fellow in Landscape Architecture at the American Academy in Rome, reopened the excavations in collaboration with Lugli, continuing work on the east side of the quadriporticus where Pasqui had stopped digging fifteen years earlier."9

By 1932 the foundations of the villa on the San Pietro site had largely been revealed. The core of the site was a structure orientated NW–SE and measuring c.110 x 40 m. The structure consisted of three parts (Fig.5.8): a two-storey residence to the north, with an atrium and peristyle and well-preserved floor mosaics in several rooms; a garden and quadriporticus to the south; and a bath complex to the west. Four phases were identified but only vaguely dated to the pre-Horatian period, the Horatian period, the mid-imperial period and the early medieval period. The significant remains from the site were placed in a local museum in the Palazzo Orsini in Licenza. These included some statuary from the quadriporticus, statuettes from the residence, and wall painting dating to various building phases from an undetermined part of the complex. No hard evidence was found proving or disproving the identification of the site as Horace's. Occasional archaeological surveys of the Licenza valley have found no other villa occupied during Horace's lifetime, and so the latest authority agrees that, faute de mieux, it is probable that the San Pietro site was the one owned by Horace.120

Notes

1. On the creation of the journal, see J. Evans, Society of Antiquaries, 1956, pp.134–47.
2. On Stukeley see S. Piggott, William Stukeley, 1985; on Martin Folkes and his quarrel with Stukeley, see ibid., pp.115–17, and Evans, loc. cit., pp.91–2, 126 (citing Stukeley's diary entry on the death of Martin Folkes in 1754, that 'most miserable object of dereliction').
5. W. Stukeley, 'Sanctuary at Westminster', 1770, p.47.
6. ibid., p.44.
9. The term 'enquiry' appears only once in a title in Archaeologia during the period 1770–80, when over 175 articles were published. On Ramsay's close personal and intellectual relationship with Hume, see D. Macmillan, Scottish Art, p.104.
10. 'Enquiry', pp.65–6 (Ramsay's manuscript pagination, here and elsewhere).
11. For the identification of these scholars, see pp.152–3 below, notes 3, 4, 5 and 7.
13. See L. Holstenius, Annotaciones, 1666, p.106. On this page, Holstenius equates modern Rocca Giovine with the Fanum Vacuae and the hilltown of Licenza with Digentia, both places stated by Horace to be near his villa (cf. Epistles 1.10.49 [Vacuna] and 1.18.104 [Digentia]). Holstenius does not explicitly discuss Horace's Villa.
15. Bentley's; cf. 'Enquiry', p.22 ('Doctor Bentley, whose text I generally follow') and p.6 (I shall therefore, according to the order in which they commonly stand in Horace's works, select all those passages which relate to his farm, accompanying them with such explanations and remarks as my reading upon the subject, and my attentive inspection of the ground itself have enabled me to make').
16. Scholars had begun working out the chronology of Horace's poems before Ramsay wrote the 'Enquiry'; see A. Dacier, Oeuvres d'Horace, 1733; J. Masson, Q. Horatii Flacci Vita, 1708.

17. See, for example, 'Enquiry', p.47: 'Following the Colle Franchiai, or Francolisi, westward, up the Lucretia, and along the north side of the Fossa Saine, this ground has the name 'Il Saine,' that is the Sabinens, as I learnt from several of the country people'; and p.60: 'The Digesta anciently divided the Sabina from the country of the Marsi, and the country people to this day call part of the ground on the west side of it the Saine, that is the Sabinens.'

18. The exception to this comes at p.59 in his discussion of Epistles I. 16, where he writes, 'Upon a general review of this Epistle, I suspect that it has come down to us mutilated and confused, and very different from what it was when sent out by Horace to his friend, if ever it was sent. He begins it with a number of questions concerning the produce of his farm, all which he promises to answer loquaciter or in a very particular manner. But we look in vain for those answers, and after sixteen lines of general and desultory hints, fall all at once into a string of moral precepts, very good in themselves, and very much in the spirit of Horace, but as little connected with one another, as with the proposed subject of the epistle. The whole is probably made up of memorandums left unfinished at the author's death, or of fragments of his finished works picked up afterwards by his admirers, and stuck together in the best way they could.'

19. cf. G. di Castaldi, i nomi antichi, 1562, in which over 300 ancient places in Italy are listed with their sixteenth-century Italian equivalents.

20. I omit mention of the Fons Blandusiae (Odes 3.13), which may not have been near Horace's Villa.

21. For the tradition linking the Convent of St Antonio in Tivoli with Horace, see A. Del Re, Dell'antichità illustrata, 1611, p.16; J. Landucci, Viaggio di Rome, 1792, p.45. The most recent study of the subject is G. D'Anna, 'E veramente esistita', 1964, who argues that Horace had only the Licenza villa until c.17 BC, when he seems to have come into possession of a property at Tivoli. For the popular tradition of the villa of Horace near Vicovaro (in the area called San Giovanni in Camporaccio), see L. Torrentius, Q. Horatii Flacci, 1608, p.679: 'Atque adeo nunc quoque inter Tibur et Faeneste locus est non incertus, qui Italas Vicovaro appellatur: quo fit, ut facilius credam Horatii villam ad octavum ultra Tibur lapidem fuisse ... Quin et incolas affirmantes aut divis, extare adhuc eius vestigia in campo, quem hodieque Horatium vocant' ('and now there is a place, not unknown, between Tiboli and Palestina, which the Italians call Vicovaro, where [as I can easily believe] the villa of Horace was located near the eighth milestone beyond Tivoli ... Indeed, I have heard the inhabitants state that there are still remains of it in a field that today is called 'Camporaccio'.')

22. See F. Biondo, De Romu, 1527; see also p.100 above, note 3.


24. L. Holstenius, Annotationes, 1666; see also p.152 below, note 7.

25. I. Mattei, Nuova e esatta tavola, 1674, on which see A.F. Frutaz, Le carte del Lazio, 1572, vol.2, tav. 157 (xxx.2.b); G. F. Areti and D. de Rossi, II Lazio, 1693, on which see Frutaz, loc. cit., p.xxxii, vol.2, map xxviii.2.
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28. CIL XIV.3485.

29. See Porphyrio and Ps.-Acro on Horace's Epistles 1.10.49 (quoted in Ramsay's 'Enquiry'), p.42.
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33. Ramsay's map can be linked to Revillas's through a number of features the two share that are not common on other eighteenth-century maps. These include the Rio Cupo south of Rocca Giovine; Casal Questione at the junction of the Rio Cupo and the Licenza River; and 'La Villa
diruta' on the east side of the valley. Ramsay wrote an account of the trip in a letter to Sir Alexander Dick; above, note 21.


35. Maire and Boscovich, Carta geografica, 1762 (whose map is at a scale of c. 1:100,000), place Licenza 0° 37′ east of Monte Mario, while the I.G.M. map of 1940 puts it 37° east of Monte Mario; Maire and Boscovich place Licenza at about 42° 4′ of latitude, not far different from the 42° 4′ 3′′ of the L.G.M. map.

36. See Ramsay, 'Enquiry', p.54.

37. C. De Chaupy, Découverte de la maison, 1767–9, vol. 1, p.xxcvii, reported that he was told that the first visitors to Licenza in living memory were two Englishmen who arrived in 1755. George Nicolas Heerkens, a Dutch physician and poet, states in a book published in 1765 that he visited Licenza during the pontificate of Benedict XIV (d 1758). Heerkens is vague about the exact date of his visit, stating only that he arrived in Rome in the first days of December of a year he does not mention. His dedication, on the other hand, is dated to 14 November 1755, but this is an oddly early date for a book not published for ten years and may represent a typographical error. On Lumisden's visit, see A. Lumisden, 'Letter to John MacGouan', 1767; on his and Boswell's visit see also pp.16–17 above. I am indebted to lain Gordon Brown for this reference.

38. For an overview see C. Pietrangeli, Scavi e scoperti, 1983.


41. D. de Sanctis, Dissertazione, 1784, p.9x.
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52. ibid., vol.1, p.xxxix. The earliest de Sanctis's book could have been printed after he received permission from the Holy Office to publish it on 18 April 1761 (p.[v]).
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A Note on the Text of Ramsay’s ‘Enquiry’

Bernard D. Frischer and Iain Gordon Brown

Three versions of Ramsay’s ‘Enquiry’ survive. They are located in the National Library of Scotland (hereafter NLS); the Edinburgh University Library (EUL); and the Library of the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). All three manuscripts make reference, in their titles, to Ramsay’s travels in Italy between 1775 and 1777: in no case has the title been changed to indicate that on his later visit in the early 1780s Ramsay continued to pursue the project. The manuscripts represent work done largely in the 1770s, although it is evident that they must comprehend also the results of Ramsay’s topographical explorations and his thinking about the subject during his final visit to the region. Indeed, additions in Ramsay’s hand in the Edinburgh University Library manuscript are dated 1782 or 1783 and refer to the personal observations on the site, or reflections on the topic in general, made in those years.

The earliest of the manuscripts, and the least polished, is the version in NLS, MS730. It is largely in Ramsay’s hand and in that of his wife, who acted as amanuensis. The earlier portion of the manuscript is more or less a fair copy in her hand. Later folios indicate that she had been allotted the task of copying quotations which appear between passages of commentary or argument in her husband’s autograph. Mention on f. 29 of an event in June 1777 (cf. ‘Enquiry,’ p. 67) gives a terminus post quem for the composition of at least this portion of the manuscript. Ramsay evidently returned from time to time to this original manuscript, for there are passages or insertions in his later and rather more infirm hand. All in all, it is something of a patchwork of hands and additions of varying dates. The binding is modern blue buckram. Paper size is 18.5 x 24.5 cm. The NLS manuscript was presented to the Library in 1932 by The Hon. Sir Hew Hamilton Dalrymple, sometime Vice-Chairman of the Library’s Board of Trustees and Chairman of the Trustees of the National Gallery of Scotland. He had collected a number of manuscripts and sketchbooks relating to the history of Scottish art of the period. The earlier history of the manuscript is not known. The NLS manuscript is primarily interesting for the five landscape sketches by Ramsay which are bound at the end (cf. Catalogue, Ramsay 3).

The next manuscript in date is that in EUL, MS.La.111.492. It is more complete and more polished, being later than the NLS version. On the title page, the author’s name was originally given as ‘A.R.’ At an indeterminate later date, someone added ‘Allan Ramsay.’ It is almost wholly written in the hand of Ramsay’s wife, who died in March 1782. Ramsay later added some passages in his own hand. The manuscript retains its original grey paper-covered boards. Paper size is 19 x 23 cm. The EUL manuscript was presented to the Library under the bequest of the distinguished bookseller, librarian and collector, David Laing, who died in 1878. Laing also owned (and bequeathed...
to the Library) a number of important manuscripts of the elder Ramsay and
the autograph life of his father by the painter, as well as drawings and
sketchbooks of Allan Ramsay the Younger and Jacob More, which he
bequeathed to the Royal Scottish Academy. From there these graphic works
passed to the National Gallery of Scotland. All the manuscripts had been
bought by Laing at the sale of the library of Sir John Murray of Henderland,
Lord Murray, a Scottish judge who was the heir of General John Ramsay, the
painter's son. The 'Enquiry' can be identified as lot 1527 in the Dowell and
Lyon sale catalogue, Edinburgh, February 1862. From a collation of the nls
and eul copies, we can see that from 1777 to 1783 Ramsay continued to
struggle with difficulties such as the identification of the Valley of Ustica, and
he also moderated his tone and degree of assertiveness on problematic
points. Thus in 1777 he wrote: 'Volpi's opinion is still more foolish' (nls ms.,
f. 5); but by 1783 this had become the more diplomatic 'Volpi's opinion is
more foreign' (eul ms., p.30). At first Ramsay attempted to date the composi­
tion of Odes I.17 to 'about the beginning of August' on the basis of when
strawberries become available in the Licenza Valley; but in the eul version he
wisely dropped this piece of speculation.

The third, latest, and by far the best version of the text is the ucla copy.
Purchased in 1965, it has been catalogued under 'Anonymous' since then
because, unlike the nls and eul manuscripts, it lacks Ramsay's name or
initials on the title page. The shelfmark is: Bound Manuscripts, Collection
170/376, Department of Special Collections, Charles E. Young Research
Library, ucla. The manuscript contains 67 pages, which are numbered. The
paper size is 29 x 23.25 cm. It is bound in half-calf over pink papered
cardboard. The binding is 30 cm. high, 24.2 cm. wide, and 1.3 cm. thick. There
are head- and footbands. The spine is tooled with seven compartments.
"M.S." is blocked on the second compartment, and there are fleurons in the
other compartments. The end-papers are of the same paper as was used for
the text, as can be determined from one watermark which is just barely
visible (on the paper and watermark, see below), making it all but certain that
the binding (which ucla Rare Books Librarian P. G. Naiditch independently
dated as 'late eighteenth-century') and manuscript are contemporary. The
provenance of the manuscript is unknown. It was accessioned by ucla in
October 1965 and attributed to Ramsay by Bernard Frischer in October 2000,
immediately after it was brought to his attention by P. G. Naiditch.

Examination of the ucla version shows that it was written by an
amanuensis and fitted out with finished drawings of the illustrations he
intended to use. We do not know who was responsible for the drawings, nor
the identity of the amanuensis. The close association of the ucla manuscript
with Ramsay is demonstrated by two facts. There are two corrections written
in pencil, very probably in the unmistakable infirm hand of Ramsay's old
age. Secondly, the ucla version is written on the same paper as the eul copy:
the Turkey Mill paper of James Whatman II, whose paper was considered the
finest in England (see A. H. Shorter, Paper Mills and Makers in England
1495-1800, Monumenta Chartae Papyraceae Historiam Illustrantia, vol. VI
Bernard D. Frischer and Iain Gordon Brown

[Hilversum 1957] pp. 58-9, 187-88; and for the watermark [crown, horn, fleur-de-lis, and the initials GR] see nr. 198 [p. 378 with p. 268]). In view of the foregoing, we have based our text of Ramsay's 'Enquiry' on the UCLA manuscript. We thank P. G. Naiditch for bringing it to our attention; and Anne Caiger for granting us permission to publish it. Conceivably, the UCLA manuscript was Ramsay's final copy, but definite proof is lacking.

The changes between the EUL and UCLA manuscripts are few and not substantive. The UCLA version incorporates corrections to the EUL manuscript, and so is later. The UCLA copy enabled us to ensure that the text we present corresponds to Ramsay's last wishes; and it also confirms our earlier suspicion that Ramsay did not, in the end, intend to use Jacob More's views to illustrate his text.

The UCLA copy was still incomplete with respect to a trivial detail when Ramsay died: at p. 38 he has left blank the measurement of a pillar. Since the pillar in question is no longer to be found in Licenza where Ramsay saw it, the editor has had perforce to retain the blank. Ramsay's Latin was excellent, and Latinity was universal among the educated public for whom he wrote. There is no indication that he would have translated the Horatian passages and other Latin quotations. To help the modern reader who may well have little or no Latin, extended passages from Horace have been quoted in the original, followed by the English versions of Philip Francis, the most popular British translator of Horace in Ramsay's day. Translations of shorter passages and other Latin texts have been furnished by the editor. Spelling, punctuation and capitalization have been modernized. The editor's additions are indicated by square brackets. The text has been equipped by the editor with endnotes which explain points that might be obscure to the non-Classicist; and the attempt has been made to provide an update on several of the most important topics discussed by Ramsay such as, for example, the location of the Fons Bandusiae of Odes 3.13. Ramsay's own notes are printed as footnotes. Since the UCLA manuscript is thought to be Ramsay's last, we have given its pagination in the margins of the 'Enquiry', and this pagination has been used throughout in all references to the 'Enquiry' in this volume. In illustrating the 'Enquiry', we have used the UCLA drawings, wherever possible.
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