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In antiquity, the Sabina had settlements characterized by small plots of land under family management according to the “Catonian” model. Coexisting with such small farms were villas of greater size, an example of which is the Roman villa at Licenza. In the second half of the eighteenth century, this villa was identified with certainty as Horace’s famous Sabine estate by the Tivoli lawyer Domenico De Sanctis and the French abbot Bertrand Capmartin de Chaupy. Their efforts to find the actual location of the site carried forward work in the previous century by Lucas Holstenius and Raffaele Fabretti, who had recognized in the Licenza river Horace’s Digentia, in Mt. Gennaro his Mons Lucretilis, and in Roccagovine the Horatian fanum Vacunae. Both De Sanctis and de Chaupy correctly considered their discoveries of the remains to be extremely important, and in their respective publications their claims for priority degenerated into a ridiculous quarrel about who stole from whom. In the early years of the twentieth century, an effective publicity campaign conducted by Vincenzo Ussani in the national press of Italy persuaded the Ministry to undertake the task of investigating the site from 1911-1914. The project was entrusted to Angelo Pasqui, Director of the Superintendency which, at that time, was known as the Ufficio per gli Scavi del Lazio Antico.

Pasqui excavated the site from 1911-1914, when his work was interrupted by the outbreak of World War I, and he himself died in 1915, before being able to publish a final report. In 1926, Giuseppe Lugli, at that time an inspector in the Superintendency, wrote a long account of Pasqui’s results, reconfirming the old identification of the villa as Horace’s. After other explorations by Lugli in 1930-31 in partnership with Thomas D. Price of the American Academy in Rome, and by the young Adriano La Regina in 1957, the ruins at Licenza have been almost unanimously attributed to Horace. Even if the poems of Horace contain no precise descriptions of the appearance of the house, the poet does provide ample details about his villa’s location and geographical features, which are unequivocally situated in this part of the Sabina: the Lucretilis mons, the river Digentia, which watered the village of Mandela, and the nearby sanctuary of Vacuna.

The territory of the Monti Lucretili was assigned by Horace to the Sabina insofar as it belonged to the IV Regio Sabina et Samnium, according to the regional division of Italy made by Augustus in 18 B.C., although the area, close to the Anio valley, can be more accurately considered a hinge between the Sabina, Latium, and the Marsic hinterland.

The villa is described as situated halfway up the hill, on a pleasant hillock. Horace’s desire to own a piece of land “not too large” (modus agri non ita magnus), with a garden, ever-flowing spring near the house (the famous fons Bandusiae, which has the same name as a spring in the area of Venosa, Horace’s home town), and a small wood had become a delightful reality when the poet wrote the sixth satire of the second book, which concludes with the famous fable of the city mouse and the country mouse. In the wood populated by the oak and the ilex, Horace ate, drank, and slept under the open sky.

The tradition of excavations at Licenza by the American Academy in Rome was revived by the new investigations of Bernard Frischer, which brought Horace’s Villa back into the limelight of the scientific world.

It is therefore with great pleasure that the Superintendency, whose representative Maria Grazia Fiore supported the resumption of studies and excavations of Horace’s Villa, helps to launch this important new publication.

Anna Maria Reggiani
Superintendent
Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio

Rome, October 2003
Many of us first encountered Horace’s *Sabinum* in our school days, when we read about his villa stretching along the stream *Digentia* near the villages of *Ustica* and *Mandela*. Before it was excavated in 1911, Horace’s Sabine villa owed its fame to the poet’s sky-high reputation. Equally responsible was its splendid environmental context, officially recognized in 1989 with the creation of the Natural Regional Park of the Monti Lucretiili, a name that itself is evocative of the Horatian toponym, *Lucretii*. It is precisely this impalpable mixture of historical memory with the natural environment that the contemporary visitor first of all perceives and admires: in a certain sense, the archaeological remains come “afterwards” and are primarily the object of admiration of students and scholars. A more romantic impression is made by what were a few years ago felicitously called the “Horatian places,” the *vallis, rivus, mons, silva*, among which the poet took refuge when fleeing from the *negotia* of the city to write his poetry. Yet, the prosaic archaeological remains also merit our careful attention since the villa is a worthy example of the Italic *domus*, with rooms closely arranged around an *atrium*, mosaic floors, and an observation area furnished with a fountain facing the splendid cliffs (*levia saxa*) of Licenza.

But—as has often been observed—the thing that strikes one the most about the residence is the long porticated garden, highly suited to the exercise of *otium litterarum*. It was perhaps requested by Horace himself and thus commissioned by Maecenas for the villa when he donated it to the poet in 32 B.C. Also interesting are the baths, which were gaudily added in the first and second centuries A.D. to the western side of the complex, the excavation of which is still far from being finished.

From an archaeological point of view, many features of the monument were still obscure before the 1997-2001 campaigns, including, most importantly, the use of some of its parts and its building history before and after Horace. This is not only the result of the fact that the earliest excavations (Pasqui, 1911-1914) were conducted with a methodology that was scientifically deficient, but also from the massive restorations, which have tended more to restore the planimetric lines of the villa than to permit a philological reading of the ancient features still remaining today.

It was thus with enthusiasm that I received the proposal of Bernard Frischer and his team to reopen the excavations with a series of interventions and analyses aimed at throwing new light on the most problematic issues. At the conclusion of the project, the results of which are here splendidly presented, we can affirm that the villa today is much less enigmatic, and it has reacquired the critical complexity that is its due, even if much additional work still remains to be done. New pieces of evidence have been added to permit a better interpretation of the historical data; the building phases are clearer, as is the shape and design of the villa; its post-Augustan history and uses are much better understood; and its contextualization within its territory is better delineated.

Thus I feel obliged to express my deep gratitude to Prof. Frischer and to the impressive international team that collaborated with him. The new data they have brought to light furnish a solid foundation for the new research, investigations, and site presentation that the Superintendency plans to undertake in the future. We will have to study how to make best use of these new results, not only by means of didactic tools, but also with new archaeological work on the site itself. Mention here should also be made of the new finds brought to light from 1997 to 2001. They will considerably enrich the Museo Oraziano in the Orsini Castle of Licenza. Such finds, indeed, comprised not only of artistic objects (like the decorative statuettes found in the baths), but also the humble *instrumenta domestica*, perfectly conform to the philosophy with which the small museum was reorganized in 1993 on the occasion of the bimillennium of the death of the poet.

In applauding publication of the work that has been done, and, moreover, the exemplary speed with which Frischer and his team have written up their results and presented them to the scientific world, it is incumbent on us to greet this publication as a significant example of re-reading and in-depth study of a site that had previously been thought to be completely understood,
but which now, on the basis of new work, proves to have had many secrets still to reveal.

Maria Grazia Fiore
Official Archaeologist Responsible for Horace’s Villa
Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio

Rome, October 2003
I am very happy to participate in the presentation of this publication, which collects the scientific research carried out in recent years at the archaeological site of Licenza, the Villa of Horace.

The archaeological site of which we speak is today one of the most visited and important monuments of the Province of Rome; given by Maecenas to Horace in the first century B.C., for this territory it has provided the concrete and unique possibility of participating in the development of the society of the Anio valley in the Province of Rome.

In 1997, this campaign of excavations began under the leadership of Prof. Bernard Frischer, sponsored by the Romagnoli family and under the scientific direction of the Ministero dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali, Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici del Lazio, in the person of Dr. Anna Maria Reggiani, Superintendent, and Dr. Maria Grazia Fiore, Archaeological Inspector of the zone. Since then the Villa of Horace, and the town of Licenza along with it, have lived a second era of archaeological excavations, and I have been fortunate to be able to participate and collaborate in this fruitful project. As Mayor, I worked hard, in conjunction with the Town Council, in order that this great experience could happen, and that this important chance to create development in the context that I believe is the most appropriate for tourism and culture would come to pass, linking true economic benefit with the offering of local products and services.

What happened then has shown that the results of this initiative were as we hoped; in fact, the new discoveries and study season proved to be very interesting, and both the Villa of Horace and Licenza are alive with rediscovered tourism, due in large part to the capability of the town’s administration in organizing initiatives and events, linked to our territory’s great cultural heritage.

In this sense, we think that the experiences and the discoveries collected in this volume are of great significance, and that this book represents a personal reward for those who gave of themselves to bring about the excavations. I refer not only to those responsible but to all the workers, and to Licenza itself. Our town, although small in area and population, has shown that it knows how to collaborate, not only to protect and make the most of the precious inheritance of the Villa of Horace, of inestimable historic and archaeological value, but also to construct an important presence in the tourist life and culture of our times, whether on the national or international level.

I think that the work accomplished and collected in this important volume represents a milestone from which to move forward initiatives that give appropriate prominence to the territory of Licenza, so rich in archaeological discoveries.

Our hope is that the territory will develop as a cultural park in the near future.

Luciano Romanzi
Mayor of Licenza (RM)
during the Horace’s Villa Project
Preface

From 1997 to 2001 new fieldwork and excavations were undertaken at the Roman villa site near Licenza (Rome) known since the eighteenth century as “Horace’s Villa.”

The project had the institutional sponsorship of the American Academy in Rome, UCLA, and the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio (formerly Soprintendenza per i Beni e le Attività Culturali del Lazio, now Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici del Lazio). During that period and for two years thereafter, related archival and archaeological research was conducted to analyze our new finds and to put them into the larger context of previous investigations of the site (for more details about the project, its aims, methods, and organization, see C.1). I was the Director and Principal Investigator of the project; Co-principal Investigator was Kathryn Gleason. Members of the Scientific Advisory Committee included: Anna Maria Reggiani, Maria Grazia Fiore, and Bernard Frischer. Field Directors were Gianni Ponti (1997-99) and Monica De Simone (2000-01). This volume was assembled through the efforts of a small editorial committee including myself as editor-in-chief, Jane Crawford, and Monica De Simone. That this could be done efficiently and with dispatch is in no small part thanks to the commitment, professionalism, and complementary talents of the latter two.

Major financial support was generously given to sustain various aspects of the project by the Steinmetz Family of Los Angeles, the Vincenzo Romagnoli Group, the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, the Comune di Licenza, and the Creative Kids Education Foundation. Funds for the publication of this report were generously given by Ann and Tony Tonkins, Elizabeth Macaulay, and John and Hannah Krill. My own research on the site was made possible by fellowship and research support from the American Council of Learned Societies, the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts (CASVA), the Loeb Classical Library Foundation, the American Academy in Rome, and the Academic Senate of the University of California (Los Angeles Division). The Western Regional Office of Alitalia graciously offered free transportation between Los Angeles and Rome in 1997 and 1998. Gifts and services were kindly donated by Liliana and Francesco De Angelis, Gianni Felice, Mary and John Fort, W. Edward Johansen, G. Franco and Ester Macconi, and John Rae. Descendants of the earlier excavators and scholars of the site were extremely responsive to our requests for information, and we are very grateful to the following for their help: Vicomte Roger d’Ailhaud de Brisis, Elisabeth Price Gorsuch, Henrique Price Grechi, Pier Maria Lugli, and Giorgio Pasqui.

Helping us in a hundred ways on the site was the small staff of custodi, ably led by Antonio Muzzi. His wife, Rossella, was equally helpful whenever we had to go up to the local museum in Licenza to study the older finds from the site. Nearly one hundred volunteers from twelve countries participated (for a list of names, please see C.1, n2). The countries represented included: Algeria, Austria, Canada, Germany, Great Britain, Israel, Italy, The Netherlands, Russia, Spain, Turkey, and the United States of America. In 1999, the volunteers were recruited by the University of California Research Expeditions Program. The UCLA Institute of Social Science Research (ISSR) and the American Academy in Rome (AAR) ably provided administrative support throughout the project. I would especially like to thank the following individuals for their help: Caroline Bruzelius (AAR), Francesco Cagnizzi (AAR), Adele Chatfield-Taylor (AAR), Madelyn De Maria (ISSR), Denise Gavio (AAR), Christina He (ISSR), Christina Huemer (AAR), Lester Little (AAR), Wayne Linker (AAR), Pina Pasquantonio (AAR), David Sears (ISSR), and Tana Wong (ISSR).

Many specialists have helped with this study and with the analysis of our finds. They include: Dean Abernathy (architectural database); Franca Allegrezza (the history of the Licenza valley); Claudia Angelelli (ceramics and marbles); Christer Bruun (waterpipes); Theodore Buttrey (coins); Stefano Camaiani (database creation and management; trench reports); Laura Cerri (trench reports); Monica Cola (new state plan); Luisa Del Guidice (folklore); Monica De Simone (building techniques, wall census, trench reports); Giorgio Filippi (analysis of roof tiles and stamps); John Foss (soils and geology); Roberto Gabrielli and Francesca Colosi, (accuracy of previous plans, new state plan); Steven Lattimore (sculpture); Elizabeth R. Macaulay (flower pots); Zaccaria Mari (topography of the Anio and Licenza Valleys); Stephen Mols (wall painting);
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In putting together this scholarly team and in producing this report, crucial help and advice has been received from the following scholars, who gave selflessly of their time and knowledge whenever asked to do so: Cairoli Fulvio Giuliani, Elisabeth Fentress, Adriano La Regina, Paolo Liverani, Daniele Manacorda, Giuseppe Pucci, Russell Scott and Mara Sternini.

I express my heartfelt gratitude to our sponsors, collaborators, advisors, and—last and certainly not least!—our wonderful volunteers for making the Horace’s Villa Project possible.

This has been an exciting journey of archaeological training and intellectual discovery. We set off with a certain mental map of the terrain we would traverse—a map provided by the findings of the classic monograph on the site published by Giuseppe Lugli in 1926—and with the hope of making very specific progress in answering the age-old questions about “Horace’s Villa.” As this volume attests, we learned that many of our preconceptions about the villa, based on earlier research in the twentieth century, had to be qualified and, in some cases, abandoned. A new story began to emerge from our new finds in the ground, in the storage rooms of the Archaeological Superintendency in Tivoli, and in the archives.

For me, personally, this shift in perspective has constituted no less than a palinode—something very

Horatian, as the readers of Odes 1.16 will attest. When, as a newly minted Ph.D. in Golden Latin literature, I first visited “Horace’s Villa” as Assistant Professor in the 1975 American Academy Summer School in Roman Topography, I vividly recall that I came away with more questions than answers. Was this really Horace’s Villa? Were the structures and decorations such as mosaics attributed to Horace’s lifetime correctly dated? Was the site completely studied, or was there still more fieldwork to be done here? In the 1970s, I had no time or (to confess the truth) interest in pursuing these matters myself. I hoped that someone else would take the bit between his teeth. In the meantime, I—like almost all other scholars of the site—could only accept the results of the earlier excavators, at least as a working hypothesis.

In the 1980s, I studied different aspects of Horace’s poetry and was particularly concerned about the relationship of reality and imagination in his works. In writing about the Ars Poetica, I pondered the disconnect between the poetic theory professed in that poem and the poetic practice actually encountered in Horace’s works. Why didn’t Horace practice what he preached? Why did virtually no twentieth-century literary critics find the precepts of the Ars Poetica useful points of entry into Horace’s poetic creations? Could the Ars be not the sincere statement of principle that it had almost always been taken to be, but rather the send-up of an academic theory with which Horace himself did not, in fact, agree?

Such a view cannot, of course, be proven in the way a theory is tested in the natural sciences. At most, it can generate a new reading of the poem that (like all interpretations of a work of art) needs to be judged on the basis of its power to enhance our aesthetic appreciation and of its compatibility with the features of the work itself and with what we know of its immediate cultural context. These two criteria are, of course, interrelated.

An important part of the cultural context of the Ars Poetica was Horace himself. If I was positing an interpretation based on the idea that the speaker of the poem was not Horace but a mock-narrator, someone Mario Labate aptly calls an ineptus doctor, then I was necessarily assuming some disjunction between the aesthetics expressed in the Ars Poetica

and those held by Horace himself. Such a disjunction had, in fact, been noted by earlier scholars, notably L. Ferrero; but Ferrero limited himself to comparisons among Horace’s poems. Since the Ars Poetica begins with the speaker’s condemnation of the painting of a monster with the head of a woman, the neck of a horse, the wings of a bird and the tail of a fish, I thought that it might be useful to see what we knew about the taste in the visual arts of Horace and his circle during the time when the Ars Poetica was composed (i.e., the period between ca. 23 and 8 B.C.). This was, of course, the period of the transition from Second to Third Style wall painting, and one of the key discriminators between the two was precisely a shift from realistic representation in the Second Style to fanciful representation in the Third. The transition between the two styles is not surprisingly reflected in thematic material: monsters are much more dominant in late Second Style and Third Style painting.

In view of these facts and my interest in setting off the “real” Horace from his fictional creation, the narrator of the Ars Poetica, who condemns a painting of a monster in the very introduction to his harangue on poetic theory, I thought that it would be interesting to see whether we had any remains of wall painting from the Augustan Age at “Horace’s Villa” (in the 1980s more commonly known simply as Horace’s Villa, reflecting the scholarly consensus that the site probably really was owned by the poet). So, in the spring of 1989, I arranged to visit the local museum in Licenza, where the finds from the Pasqui excavations of 1911-14 were housed in a dimly lit series of dank rooms. I quickly found what I was looking for: a series of fresco fragments that included several figures of female monsters. But, upon returning to the libraries in Rome, I also learned that the paintings from Horace’s Villa had hardly been studied by the experts on Roman art; and that between the two who had given brief comments on my monsters there was diachronical opposition about their date: for Lugli, they were Augustan; for Borda, Flavian. I showed my slides of the fragments to two scholars who had not published anything about the Licenza fragments, but who were highly qualified to give an opinion: Irene Bragantini and Volker Strocka. They both agreed that the monsters were Flavian. In retrospect, this was the first sign that the standard view about “Horace’s Villa” was going to be revised as soon as the old finds could be studied anew by experts.

Of course, I was hopeful that the monster paintings could still be assigned to the Augustan period, and I therefore was happy to read the long study by Rosanna Cappelli, who agreed with Lugli’s dating. That appeared too late to be cited in my own book on the Ars Poetica, in which I mentioned the monster fragments but cautiously noted the disagreement about their date and about the identification of the villa as Horace’s.

Clearly, the monster paintings from “Horace’s Villa” had potential importance for supporting my interpretation of the Ars Poetica, and just as clearly there was disagreement among the experts about whether they could properly be used to illustrate an Augustan poem. Progress would depend on finding out more about the archaeological context of the fragments. If their provenance on the site could be determined, then we could resolve the issue of their date. It was in search of documentation for the fresco fragments that I started to work in earnest on “Horace’s Villa” in the early 1990s (see E.4 for what I ultimately learned).

Out of this research came the realization that, in addition to the potential discrepancy between the taste in painting of the Ars Poetica speaker and Horace himself, there were contradictions between Horace’s description of his Sabine villa and the actual remains on the ground at Licenza, at least as dated and interpreted by Lugli. Whereas in the poems, Horace emphasized the modest size and décor of his property, the structure attributed to the

5. As n. 3.
Augustan phase by Lugli was seigniorial in scale: a two-story house of over 20,000 square feet to which a large quadriporticus garden was annexed. Yet, in Odes II.15, Horace had decried the degeneracy of his age, when the rich spent their money not on public works but on sumptuous private villas with long porticoes (Odes II.15.10-16). Many floors of the house were covered with black and white mosaics— despite Horace’s observation that grass is not inferior in fragrance or beauty to floors paved with mosaics (Epist. 1.10.19).

In interpreting these and related contradictions, I took as my point of departure the correctness of Lugli’s findings: Horace misled his readers, but he did so for the understandable reason of contributing to the moral renewal of Rome pushed by his friend, the Emperor Augustus. If the poet was a bit hypocritical, it hardly made any difference—poetic license, and all that. Of course, there were always two other (not mutually exclusive) possibilities: the Roman villa at Licenza was never owned by Horace; or, Lugli was wrong in his phasing of the remains, and what he thought belonged to Horace’s period really should be assigned to a different date.

Only new fieldwork could move matters forward. That I was privileged to direct the effort was owing to the kindness of Dott.ssa Maria Grazia Fiore. I first met her in November of 1996, when I went to the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio in order to request permission to publish a photograph of a reconstruction of the villa in the local museum in Licenza (now splendidly remodeled on the occasion of the bimillennium of Horace’s death in 1993). Dott.ssa Fiore replied to my request by inviting me to follow her to the photographic archive of the Superintendency, where she showed me all the documentation on the site and asked, “Why don’t you publish everything… and reopen the excavations?” After I recovered from my shock at receiving this unexpected proposal, we quickly came to an agreement about how such a project might be undertaken as a partnership between the Superintendency and two institutions with which I was associated, the American Academy in Rome and UCLA. A major financial sponsor miraculously appeared several months later in the person of Vincenzo Romagnoli, and fieldwork commenced in the summer of 1997.

As will become clear from the report that follows, it has turned out that Lugli’s monograph was not a reliable point of departure. It is worth pointing out here that this “unreliability” was not the result of deception or incompetence. Giuseppe Lugli wrote his report ten years after the great excavations of 1911-14, which were conducted by Angelo Pasqui. Pasqui died before he had been able to write a final report. As Lugli himself states, his report is an attempt to present the material as Pasqui would have done, had he been able. The way Pasqui and Lugli interpreted the site reflected discoveries and hypotheses that had been accumulating since the eighteenth century (see B.2 for details). For them to have transcended the inherited opinio communis would have required methods and comparanda that only appeared in the last decades of the twentieth century. It is those methods and discoveries that made a re-reading of “Horace’s Villa” worthwhile and timely. I think it fair to state that the undertaking has not been without its surprises and rewards. Without anticipating exactly what those are, I will say that we have removed the contradiction between the Licenza villa and Horace’s description of his villula; and we have resolved the controversy about the dating of the monster fragments.

This publication is simply a final report on our seven-year project, and it certainly does not claim to be the last word on the site. There is still much fieldwork to be done here, and—in view of the prestige of the site—it seems inevitable that research will resume after an interval that one can only hope will not be too long. Looking forward to that day (and preparing for the possibility that our team will not be involved), we have tried to make this report a handy collection of materials and information that will make it easier for our successors to pick up where we have left off. Some parts (e.g., the catalogue [G]) that might seem dry to a reader will (I trust) be invaluable resources to an excavator. Expertus scio!

I conclude by expressing my thanks to the helpful comments and suggestions of the anonymous readers who wrote reports solicited by a university press that accepted our book for their list but which, in the end, we did not choose to let publish it. Thanks also to John Fort for his help in translating into English the contributions, originally written in Italian, of
Franca Allegrezza, Claudia Angelelli, and Monica De Simone. I would also like to thank Sarah Wells at IATH for her assistance in transforming these volumes from electronic files into physical form. I must also express my deep thanks, on behalf of all the co-authors, to my two co-editors: Jane Crawford and Monica De Simone. Certainly from my point of view, without them this volume—and indeed the whole Horace’s Villa Project—would simply not have been possible.

They join me in dedicating this volume to the memory of Mary Fort. Mary and her family owned some of the property adjacent to the villa. From the start of our project, she helped in every way imaginable—providing housing and meals to our volunteers, recruiting her teenage sons to help with the digging, and helping us solve our quotidian and bureaucratic problems. But she was much more than an incredibly competent Mrs. Fix-it. Mary’s love of the archaeological site, of Horace, and of Italy was profound. She never flagged in her enthusiasm for our project and was an endless source of comfort and support to us all. We shall miss her.

Bernard Frischer
Director, “Horace’s Villa” Project, 1997-2003
Director, Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities, University of Virginia

Rome, October 2006
A. Introduction: History and Goals of the “Horace’s Villa” Project

By Bernard Frischer

“Horace’s Villa” is the name given to the site of a Roman country house near the hill town of Licenza (Roma), which is located approximately thirty miles from the center of Rome (for a fuller description of the site, see Frischer, B.1). We denote the site “Horace’s Villa,” using quotation marks, because, as will be seen, the identification is traditional and possible, but by no means certain.

That a villa answering to the description Horace gave to his beloved country estate ought to be found here was implied in the seventeenth century by Holstenius (for details, see Frischer, B.3). The first exposure of ancient remains below the modern surface level dates to the late eighteenth century, as do the earliest studies (see Frischer, B.3). A consensus was soon reached that the site did indeed correspond to Horace’s Sabine villa. In the mid-nineteenth century, some distinguished dissenting voices were heard (see Frischer, B.3), which was not surprising in view of the complete absence, even today, of unequivocal evidence proving Horatian ownership. Nevertheless, because of the villa’s traditional association with Horace, beginning in the 1890s the General Directorate of Archaeology and Fine Arts of the Italian Ministry of Education was pressured to undertake major excavations. Work commenced in May of 1911 under the direction of Angelo Pasqui, Director of the Ministry’s Office of Excavations for Rome, Ancient Latium, and the Province of Aquila, and continued with interruptions until October of 1914. Pasqui died in 1915 before writing his final report. Giuseppe Lugli, who did not participate in the fieldwork, was given the task of writing a provisional report in the 1920s (see Lugli 1926). Later, Lugli teamed up with the American landscape architect, Thomas D. Price, to execute further excavations in 1930-31 (see Gleason, B.5 and C.3). After 1931, the main activity on the site prior to the new fieldwork of 1997-2001 was conservation (for details on archaeological activities in the twentieth century, see Frischer, B.4).

The Horace’s Villa Project, 1997-2003 was initiated with the main goal of adding to our knowledge of the site in terms of time and space. The importance of the site, especially to students of Horace’s poetry but also to scholars of late-Republican villas in the Roman hinterland, was disproportionate to the amount of reliable information available about it when the project was conceived. Certainly the greatest contributions to the understanding of the site were those made by Pasqui, but the impact of his work was markedly reduced by the fact that no final report was ever produced. The publication by Lugli left many questions unanswered, especially about the context of many of the finds, which were simply listed, not described and analyzed in depth. In any case, the excavations were not—and for historical reasons could not have been—stratigraphic. For decades, Pasqui’s material barely merited mention in the archaeological, art-historical, and literary scholarship of the mid-twentieth century. This was undoubtedly a reflection of the limitations of Lugli’s 1926 publication and of the difficulty of viewing the material in the local museum in the Palazzo Orsini, which was overcrowded, poorly lit, and for many years accessible only by special appointment.

3. Hence, we refer to the site as “Horace’s Villa” and, throughout this volume the term should be understood to be merely conventional, even if, for the sake of variation, the term is sometimes used without the quotation marks. In the Conclusion, the issue of Horatian ownership will be raised.
4. Thus M. Borda, in his handbook on Roman painting, briefly characterized the fresco fragments as examples of the Fourth Style (La pittura
The situation changed in the early 1990s. Important studies emerged in connection with the celebration of the bimillennium of the death of Horace in 1992 (cf. Atti del convegno di Licenza [Venosa 1994]; In Sabinis. Architettura e arredi della Villa di Orazio [Rome 1993]). Notable among these were the useful survey, in the manner of the Forma Italiae, of the Licenza valley by Z. Mari, and the new study of the fresco fragments by R. Cappelli. Velocci Rinaldi noted the provisional character of the latter and called for a more profound comparison of the Licenza painting fragments with comparanda from Rome and the Bay of Naples. Other signs of renewed scholarly interest in the site were M. G. Fiore Cavaliere’s account of the history of the Licenza valley in late antiquity and the Middle Ages; and A. M. Reggiani Massarini’s short biographical study of Pasqui with special reference to his work atLicenza. Moreover, Pasqui’s finds were given a new display in remodelled and vastly upgraded rooms in the Palazzo Orsini, which was opened to the public on a regular basis.

The Horace’s Villa Project, 1997-2003 is the logical continuation of the new work on the site initiated by the bimillennium celebrations of 1993. There were two main areas to be investigated, which could be called the meta-archaeological and the archaeological. The meta-archaeological issues entailed looking afresh at the published work of Lugli on the 1911-14 Pasqui excavations and of Price on the 1930-31 Lugli-Price fieldwork (see Frischer, B.4.1-5). Here, the most pressing questions were clearly:

- Was there still good stratigraphy to be found on the site?
- How valid were the earlier twentieth-century restorations of the structures on the site?
- Could new, unpublished (or undiscovered) documents be found that might throw light on Pasqui’s and the Price-Lugli excavations, which had never been the subject of final reports?

These questions could only be addressed by searching the archives for documents and by re-examining the site to better understand not only the site itself, but also the methods and policies applied by the earlier twentieth-century archaeologists.

Beyond meta-archaeology, there were clearly new archaeological investigations that could be undertaken. In 1993, Mari had pointed out that

It should be noted that the plan that emerged from the excavations is incomplete: the baths are still partially buried; the entrance (fauces) to the villa is not clear; the pars rustica connected to the agricultural plantation mentioned by Horace is completely lacking.  

Autopsy of the site and archival research revealed other issues worth investigating. For example, the fountain in the small peristyle (Area 8) was not centered symmetrically within the space of the peristyle, as one would expect, but abutted and even pierced slightly through the northern wall. An account of the site dating from 1834 reported a mosaic under the surface that was not found in the earlier twentieth-century excavations, raising the possibility that it was still to be found on or near the site (see Frischer, catalogue G.1.8.17; cf. G.1.8.14). In 1848-49 an official investigation was undertaken in response to a farmer’s accidental exposure of a mosaic on property to the north of the present archaeological

---

park (see G.1.8.22). This suggested that the residence might have extended farther to the north, beneath the modern public road and into the field beyond.

In 1996 the American Academy in Rome and the Archaeological Superintendency of Lazio agreed to reopen the excavations as a joint project. A Scientific Committee was established to oversee the work. The members were A. M. Reggiani (in the meantime promoted to Superintendent of the Archaeological Superintendency of Lazio), M.G. Fiore (Inspector for the valley of Licenza and other areas under the jurisdiction of the Superintendency), and B. Frischer (Professor of Classics, UCLA). Former and present Mellon Professors at the Academy, including Russell Scott, Elisabeth Fentress, and Archer Martin, served as consultants to the project.

The actual work began in August, 1997 under the directorship of Frischer, who had in the meantime found a financial sponsor in the Vincenzo Romagnoli Group, whose primary activity was as a general contractor for large-scale construction projects in Italy and elsewhere in the world. The Romagnoli Group signed a contract with the American Academy in Rome to provide funds for the project, which was originally expected to run for four years. The first three years (1997 to 1999) were to be devoted to fieldwork; the fourth year to a study season.

From the start, it was clear that the Horace’s Villa Project, 1997-2003 could not undertake a definitive study of all the problems connected with the villa: the funds and the time available simply did not suffice for anything that ambitious. The project therefore had more modest goals, all predicated on the assumption that the earlier work, as published by Lugli and Price, provided a fairly reliable point of departure; and that the purpose of new work would be, as Mari had already independently suggested in 1993, to fill in some of the most important remaining missing pieces of the puzzle.

The Scientific Committee therefore identified a limited number of new research topics as worth pursuing. These included:

1. Providing a close reading of the Licenza valley through the early medieval period based on an archaeological survey and on archival research
2. Establishing the natural property lines of the Villa of Horace as well as the ancient access road from the Via Licinese
3. Looking for evidence of the pars rustica of the villa
4. Verifying the state plan of existing structures and reexamining the different construction phases of the villa
5. Exploring unexcavated areas of the complex, including the garden area in the peristyle and the western hillside
6. Publishing a final excavation report integrating the earlier studies since the 18th century.

Fieldwork techniques and operations were to include:

1. Field survey and collection of surface finds
2. Magnetic and electric prospections to identify new features below the surface
3. Borings, soundings, and excavations using the stratigraphic technique
4. Palaeobotanical studies.

By far the greatest share of our human and material resources went into achieving the fifth goal, that of new excavations of areas such as the garden and western hillside, as well as cleaning operations to verify the presence or absence of features recorded in the documentation (published and unpublished) of the earlier excavations. This report will amply document that as the project advanced, we discovered that the earlier studies of Lugli and Price did not, in fact, provide a solid basis on which we could build. Gradually, the project was transformed from one designed to fill the most important of the last remaining gaps in the archaeological record into a feasibility study about the possibility of recovering new information from the areas and material previously excavated.

Given the limitations of time and material resources, this shift in emphasis inevitably meant that some of our initial objectives came to have a lower priority and others were ultimately not met. These included a cluster of research topics that would have required fieldwork in the surrounding countryside outside the bounds of the Superintendency’s archaeological park:
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The sixth objective was met in part: many classes of earlier finds were studied anew and the results integrated with our new finds. These include architectural terracottas, architectonic elements, coins, fresco fragments, mosaics, and stamped bricks and roof-tiles, reports on which are found in this volume. Floor and wall marbles make up the bulk of the earlier finds now in storage in Tivoli; of these, only a small, random sample could be studied. Owing to limitations of time and resources as well as some practical considerations, earlier sculptural finds were not re-examined at all, nor were pottery, glass, and small metal objects.

As the project proceeded, several new investigations and activities were added to the initial list and successfully completed, including, for example, a complete wall census; a census of the principal textual and graphic documentation for the site from antiquity to 1990; study of lead in the soil of the site; study of the folklore and customs of the region that relate to the villa; creation of a Internet site for students and the general public; creation of video documentary about the project; installation of a “green” retaining wall to protect the western slope of the site in an environmentally friendly and aesthetically pleasing way; and installation of new signs and benches on the site to make visits to the villa more rewarding and enjoyable for tourists.

The most important departure from the original plan was the substantial enlargement of the workload dedicated to fieldwork. This was necessitated by the unexpectedly large scope of the investigations we undertook, and was made possible by the identification of additional material resources that could be brought to bear. Originally, 1080 man days of fieldwork were planned over three years (1997: 216; 1998: 432; 1999: 432). In the event, this was increased to 2450 man days spread over five years (1997: 216; 1998: 432; 1999: 1440; 2000: 170; 2001: 180). The study season was accordingly postponed from 2000, as originally planned, to 2003, when most of the reports that follow were given their final form by an Editorial Committee that consisted of B. Frischer (Editor-in-chief), J. Crawford, and M. De Simone (see Frischer, C.1 for a fuller account of the organization, strategy, and history of the fieldwork).
B.1. General Introduction to the Area

By Bernard Frischer

“Horace’s Villa” is situated in the small Licenza valley, about 30 miles northeast of Rome, at ca. 400 meters above sea level. It sits on a saddle of land between the limestone Colle Rotondo (984 meters) and a tufaceous hilltop called the Castagneto (the “Chesnut Wood,” 428 meters) to the east. Beyond the Castagneto to the east is the Licenza river, which, after running ca. 8 km., debouches into the Anio river near the present-day railroad station of Mandela (for a topographical map, see fig. 1). The Licenza river, which is a torrent, is fed by springs on the slopes of the mountains on the west side of the valley. On the east side of the valley run a series of hills and mountains, dominated by Mt. Mandela.

The landscape of the Licenza valley consists primarily of alluvial sediments in the valley floor, colluvial deposits at the base of the slopes of the valley, and sedimentary rocks (especially shales and limestone) forming the uplands. The Colle Rotondo is formed of marly limestone. On the villa site, limestone-derived colluvial and alluvial soils overlay older shale-derived soils. The bedrock on the site is shale, which undulates across the site with sudden changes of quota. The overburden atop the ancient Roman levels averages ca. 1.8 meters in depth (for details, see Foss et al., E.1).

Since 1989, the Licenza valley has been part of the 18,000 hectare-large regional park of the Monti Lucretili. This has limited growth in the valley and helped to maintain its low-density and agricultural character. Crops are mainly raised today on the well-watered western slopes of the valley; they include grapes, olives, chestnuts, and fruit. Truck farming

The valley, which is typical of the zone to the north and northeast of Tivoli, is delimited on the north by Pizzo Pellecchia (1324 m), Colle Ara del Pero (1054 m), Civitella (735 m), and Licenza (510 m); on the west by the Colle Rotondo, Monte Morico (1073 m), Colle Spogna (1147 m), and Monte Ariaoni (1059 m). Between the Colle Rotondo and the Monte Ariaoni, 700 meters to the north of the villa site, is a ravine called the Fosso delle Chiuse. About 500 meters to the south of the villa is a shallower ravine called the Fosso delle Mogli. Today, and presumably throughout history, these fossi provide a natural boundary for the property (or properties) on either side of them.

On the east, the range of hills is less steep and much dryer; running from north to south, they are called Montanello (736 m), Collefranco (462 m), Marmore, Colle Prioni (595 m), Colle di Menichetta, Colle dei Cerri (834 m), Colle Luccio (642 m), and Monte Mandella (681 m).1


2. This information is based on the Carta Tecnica Regionale of the Regione Lazio Assessorato Urbanistica, Assetto del Territorio, Tutela Ambientale, Sezione numero 366110 Licenza. For further information about the Carta Tecnica of Lazio see http://www.sirio.regione.lazio.it/urbanistica/sit/ctr.html (seen December, 2002). Many of the features mentioned above are handily illustrated in a series of labelled photographs on Tav. II of Lugli 1926.

is a major activity on the lower slopes of the valley, especially on the western side of the valley. In the uplands, there is good pastureage provided by wild broom (Spartium junceum), blackthorns (Prunus spinosa), bramble (Rubus ulmifolius) and wild roses (Rosa sp.). The herding of sheep and cattle on both sides of the valley has always been a major economic activity, though it has tapered off since the end of the Second World War. In the uplands, maple (Acer obtusatum, Acer pseudoplatanus), turkey oak (Quercus cerris), and the holm-oak (Quercus ilex) are the predominant trees, providing little timber, but offering food (acorns) and habitats for wild boar, martens (such as the weasel), squirrels, wolves, foxes, and, above 800 meters, large rodents such as the porcupine.

**B.1.1. Settlement of the Licenza Valley in Antiquity**

The literary, epigraphical, and archaeological evidence on which a history of the Licenza valley in antiquity could be written is very scarce. Apart from the poet Horace and his scholiasts (see Frischer, B.2 and B.3), the literary evidence is nonexistent. The epigraphical and archaeological remains are mostly the result of sporadic finds, which have been catalogued by Lugli and Mari. The only sites that have been excavated and published are the villa at Prato La Corte (Vicovaro) and “Horace’s Villa” near Licenza. A third site is known to have been excavated in 1858, but the results were never published.

Settlement of the Licenza valley appears to have developed along the ancient road corresponding to

---

5. The excavations at Prato La Corte are reported in Lugli 1926, cols. 511-516. Lugli states that they were undertaken by “il sig. Hege, già ispettore onorario di Vicovaro.” He means Eberardo Ege, the honorary inspector for Vicovaro, San Polo dei Cavalieri, Castel Madama, Sambuci, and Ciciliano; see Bollettino Ufficiale del Ministero dell’Istruzione Pubblica, Anno XXXIX Vol. II. Num. 34 (Roma, 13 Luglio 1912) (Numero Straordinario) 2228-29.
6. The site is located on the parcel known as “Pian a Otto,” which was excavated in 1858; see ASR, Ministero Lavori Pubblici, Busta 400, fase. 6.

---

the modern Via Licinese, which runs between San Cosimato, on the Via Valeria, and Trebula Mutuesca (Monteleone Sabino) on the Via Salaria. The Licinense starts near the twenty-eighth mile of the Via Valeria, which dates to the years 307/6 or 289/286 B.C.; these roads were constructed on ancient tracks long in use by travelers in the area. The Via Valeria runs through the Anio river valley and beyond to the Adriatic. An important transportation corridor, it penetrated the barrier of the Apennines and linked the Tivoli region to the area which in antiquity was inhabited by the Sabines, Aequi, Marsi, and Samnites.

**B.1.2. Archaic Period to the Roman Conquest**

Settlement in the area is attested from the Palaeolithic and Neolithic through the Iron Age. In the archaic period, the valley delimited the territory of the Sabines (west side of the valley) from that of the Aequi (east side). Ceramic remains from the historical period begin to appear in the archaeological record in the Mandela area during the sixth-fifth century B.C. The site of “Horace’s Villa” has also produced some residual gray bucchero dating from the same period (see Angelelli, D.2.2). It has also revealed evidence of cultivation datable to 2550 +/- 40 years BP (see Foss, et al., E.1.3.1).

With the Roman conquest of the Aequi and Sabines, the area fell under Roman control by the early third century. A first result of Roman rule was a partial

---

7. Mari 1994, 18. The information in this section is mainly derived from Mari’s account at 17-49.
8. For the dating of the construction of the Via Valeria, see Mari 1994, 18.
11. For a map showing the approximate line of demarcation between the Aequi and Sabini, see Mari 1995, Table II.
B.1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE AREA

don reduction of the native population, in part attracted to Rome and other Latin cities. By 272 B.C., the area was pacified enough to permit construction of the Anio Vetus aqueduct, whose source was near Vicovaro. In this period, before the development of the villa system, the form of social organization was paganic-vicanic; this is characterized by a series of small villages (vici), normally located along the roads, grouped together into larger administrative units (pagi). The nearby town of Vicovaro derives its name from vicus Varia; just to the east of that was the pagus Mandela, mentioned by Horace (Epist. 1.18.105). The uplands show traces of huts, which were used as summer shelters by shepherds engaged in transhumance on routes between the Apennines and the vias Liciniae and Valeria. Villas begin to appear in the second or first century B.C. At Vicovaro, a number of cults are known from inscriptions (Ceres and Liber, Flora, Hercules); in the rest of the territory, the only religious sanctuary of which we hear is a temple of Victoria, of uncertain antiquity and location. It was restored by Vespasian and was probably situated in the area of Roccagiovine, where the inscription mentioning it has been known since the seventeenth century.

B.1.3. SECOND AND FIRST CENTURIES B.C.

In the zone between the Via Valeria near Mandela and Vicovaro and the hilltown of Licenza, traces have been found of some twelve to sixteen villas. The earliest date to the second or first century B.C. Of the twelve sites identified as villas with certainty by Mari, eight are in the area of Mandela (Mari 1994, catalogue nos. 3, 4, 11, 18, 19, 20, 26) and Vicovaro (no. 23); two are near Roccagiovine (nos. 22, 30), and two are near Licenza (nos. 33, 34 = “Horace’s Villa”). The clustering in the Vicovaro-Mandela area is plausibly explained by Mari as a reflection of the fact that the fields are flatter and lower-lying here than in the Licenza valley proper. Other factors may include proximity of the Vicovaro-Mandela properties to the various aqueducts running through the area, as such clustering has been noted elsewhere. Finally, there is the general tendency that villas become fewer in number, the farther one goes from Rome and, one might speculate, from Tivoli. The latter city was the dominant regional center and experienced a boom of civic building throughout the first century B.C. The early villas were small villae rusticae (“Catonian villas”) with no pretensions to elegance and presumably employing only a limited number of slaves. They sit on terraces with retaining walls built of polygonal blocks or opus incertum. Mari listed two examples (Mari 1994, catalogue nos. 20, 43).

Mari 1994, 32 (who gives the number as fourteen, without explanation) but cf. his catalogue entries nos. 3 (p. 51), 4 (p. 51), 11 (p. 54), 18 (p. 57), 19 (p. 59), 20 (pp. 59-60), 22 (p. 60), 23 (p. 60), 24* (p. 24), 26 (p. 61), 30 (p. 65), 33 (p. 66), 34 (pp. 66-68), 35* (p. 68), 39* (p. 70), 43* (p. 71-73). Note that items marked with an asterisk (*) have a question-mark in Mari. For a map, see Mari 1994, 30, fig. 10 (and note that Mari has not consistently applied the symbol for a villa to each item he so identifies in the catalogue).

Mari 1994, 31 n34.

Tomei, 73, 74.

Tomei, 64.


No. 43 is in Mari’s class of possible, not certain, villa sites (Mari 1994).
to which we can now add the first phase of “Horace’s Villa”, as a result of the excavations of 1997-2001 (Mari 1994, catalogue no. 34). Here were found three structures in opus incertum\textsuperscript{26}: an impluviate atrium in the future area of the baths (rooms 38, 39, 40); the first phase of the wall running along the western side of the future imperial quadriporticus; and the basin and related structures beneath room 12 that may have had a utilitarian, rather than decorative, function (see De Simone, C.2.1).

The Augustan age marks an increase in the prosperity of the area, which was assigned to Region IV (Samnium).\textsuperscript{27} Under Augustus, the existing two aqueducts passing through the zone (the Anio Vetus and Aqua Marcia) were restored. At this time, too, the nearby town of Trebula Suffenas was thriving, as is attested by inscriptions and monumental remains; the same can be said of Varia.\textsuperscript{28} At Tivoli, the senatorial elite began to build large villas of the otium type (see below); the largest of these (the villa of Quintilius Varus) ended up as an imperial property.\textsuperscript{29} A trend for writers to own property in the Tivoli area—perhaps attracted by the excellent library housed in the Temple of Hercules Victor—began in the Augustan period and continued for a century. Early examples include Quintilius Varus, Catullus, Tibullus and, of course, Horace.\textsuperscript{30}

The impression of regional prosperity is reinforced by the appearance of a series of tombs in the area of the Doric type. As Torelli’s classic study has shown, these date to the Augustan age (more precisely from ca. 43 B.C. to the early first century A.D.) and are associated with local elites supportive of the principate.\textsuperscript{31} Mari’s survey turned up two definite and several other possible examples (catalogue nos. 42, 43 and possibly 21, 25, 29; spolia from such tombs are also to be found out of context at Licenza [no. 38] and Vicovaro).\textsuperscript{32}

B.1.4. First and second centuries A.D.

By the first century A.D., several luxury villas had been built, or rebuilt, on the site of earlier country houses. These include five examples located between Rocca Giavone and Mandela-Vicovaro (Mari 1994, catalogue nos. 11, 18, 22, 26, 30) and the mid- to late first century A.D. phase at “Horace’s Villa.” The latter site, then, is the northernmost example of this class. It is separated from its neighbor, no. 33, by the Fosso delle Mogli, suggesting that each was a separate property. If, in the absence of other signs of villas or farmhouses in the area, we assign to “Horace’s Villa” all the land from the base of the Colle Rotondo to the Licenza river (500-600 meters) and from the Fosso delle Mogli to the Fosso delle Chiuse (600-700 meters), it will have comprised an irregularly shaped parcel, ca. 3.5-4.0 square kilometers in size (=ca. 80-100 acres).\textsuperscript{33}

The appearance of villas suggests that the Licenza valley was now viewed as a suitable place of villeggiatura by the elite residing in nearby towns (e.g., Tibur, Trebula Suffenas, and Varia) and, as we will see, even in the capital itself (cf. Rudich, E.2). The area had also become an appropriate place of burial, as is attested by a circular tomb at km. 39 of the Via Valeria,\textsuperscript{34} and by the altar-tomb of C. Maenius Bassus, dating to the period 35-50 A.D.,

\textsuperscript{26} Classifiable as Mari’s opus incertum type II, which dates to the II-I B.C.; see Mari 1991, 36.

\textsuperscript{27} As is clear from Pliny, NH 3.5.12 (107). It is true that Strabo, 5.3.11 (238), lists our area among the towns of Latium (Region I), but, as R. Thomsen, \textit{The Italic Regions from Augustus to the Lombard Invasion} (Copenhagen 1947) 72, notes, there is no reason to suppose that Strabo’s account was influenced by the Augustan regional organization.

\textsuperscript{28} Cf. Mari 1994, 42.

\textsuperscript{29} Mari 1991, 42-43; on the Villa of Quintilius Varus as part of the imperial \textit{fiscus}, see ibid., 42 n255 and 43.


\textsuperscript{32} Mari 1994, 41 (the example in Vicovaro is not in Mari’s catalogue). As Mari notes, other examples are found farther north along the Via Licinese, beyond the area surveyed for his article; see Mari 1994, 42.

\textsuperscript{33} Cf. the similar conjecture of 40 hectares in Mari 1995, 33.

\textsuperscript{34} Mari 1995, 34, who describes it as an example of the Caecilia Metella type.
which is located on the Via Valeria just west of Varia (km. 42.3). Bassus was a local notable at Tivoli and also held two high military offices. Here it should be noted that the prestige value of the valley should not be exaggerated: even the largest of the known pleasure villas, “Horace’s Villa,” pales in comparison with the large early imperial villas of the western zone of Tiburtine territory. So, how might it be characterized?

In Mari’s terminology, there are three basic types of villas in the countryside of Tivoli and the Anio valley: the humble villa rustica (or Catonian villa); the “large residential villa” (or “otium villa”), and a tertium quid, the “rustic-residential” type. The villa rustica consists of a small residence with utilitarian installations such as wine and olive presses, millstones, etc. The otium villa lacks such installations, has a large residential block, usually sited on an artificial terrace, and is adorned with high-quality decorations such as mosaics, marble wall revetment, frescoes, and sculpture. In the late first or second century A.D., otium villas often were improved with bath complexes. Such concern for refined luxury and a lack of investment in economic exploitation of the property also characterizes the grounds around the residence, where nymphaea are common, as are topiary gardens.

In its imperial phase of the first and second centuries A.D., “Horace’s Villa” is not easy to classify, both because of a lack of sufficient archaeological data and because of its apparent ambiguity. It is not a platform villa, and its residence—though by no means small—is smaller than what we generally find in the clearcut examples of the otium villa at Tivoli. Of course this statement is based on the present archaeological record, which is incomplete and possibly misleading. On the other hand, the architecture was decorated with fine examples of opus sectile flooring and marble wall revetment (see Angelelli, D.6), Fourth Style frescoes (see Mols, D.9), and sculpture (see Lattimore, D.10). There was a symmetrically arranged pleasure garden (see Gleason, C.3.4.2, Period II), an impressive bath complex (see Camaiani et al., C.5) and a feature near the middle of the eastern arm of the quadruporticus that could be a nymphaeum (see De Simone, C.4.5 and C.4.6). Up to now, excavations at “Horace’s Villa” have not revealed practical installations such as wine or olive presses, millstones, etc. dating to the first or second century A.D. This may mean that, like an otium villa, the complex lacked a villa rustica, or else that the working farm area has simply not yet been found and excavated. Taken together, then, “Horace’s Villa” in the first and second centuries A.D. more nearly resembles an otium villa than a rustic or “rustic-residential” villa, with some important qualifications. We might call it a “small otium villa,” adapting Mari’s terminology; or, if we wish, we can follow a scholar like Neville Morley in questioning the utility of a rigid villa typology such as Mari presents, stressing instead how each case is unique.

In the middle decades of the first century A.D., Claudius commissioned the building of the Aqua Claudia and the Anio Novus, both of which run through the Mandela-Vicovaro area. When Nero built his enormous pleasure villa at Subiaco, traffic through our area intensified and its importance increased. Vespasian, as noted, restored the old temple of Victoria that was probably located in the territory of Roccagiovine. Under Nerva, the Via Valeria was restored. As will be seen (cf. Rudich, E.2), in the mid- to late first century, the property of “Horace’s Villa” passed into the possession of two close relatives of imperial freedmen. Ownership by members of this class is well-known in the Tiburtine


36. For details, see Tomei, 74-75; Mari 1995, 35-36; for a map nicely distinguishing the zone where villae rusticae predominate from that where villae urbaneae are prevalent, see Giuliani (as n. 23), table V. As an example, we may note that the residence of the Villa of Quintilius Varus covered 15 acres (6 hectares), whereas the residence of “Horace’s Villa” is only ca. 0.40 hectare.

37. For the terminology, see Mari 1991, 36, 39-41.


39. Cf. Mari 1991, 40, on how the lack of such installations is characteristic of the otium villa.


41. Tomei, 81.
region. By the early years of the second century A.D. “Horace’s Villa” had come into the hands of a controversial senator or of one of his close relatives (see Bruun, D.13 and Rudich, E.2).

In the conclusion (see Frischer, F.3), we will raise the question of why there was so much interest in our valley on the part of the imperial court during the mid- to late first century A.D. To anticipate, we may here signal a geographical advantage that our area enjoyed, once Nero had built his enormous pleasure villa at Subiaco and Vespasian had fallen into the habit of spending his holidays at Aquae Cutiliae, his boyhood home near Reate: the Licenza valley was at the center of a triangle formed by Rome, Rieti, and Subiaco and, because of the preexisting road system, was an easy day’s ride from each of the corners of the triangle.

In the second century A.D., the villas existing in the valley continued in operation and were in some cases even remodelled or enlarged, as Mari’s survey results indicate. Traffic on the Via Valeria dependent on the imperial court’s use of Subiaco should not have diminished, since later emperors continued to frequent and even restore Nero’s resort. Moreover, Trajan added another vast villa complex at Arcinazzo. Thus, as far as can be inferred from the archaeological record, our area, like the nearby Tiburtine region, did not participate in the alleged second-century crisis of the villa economy that has been observed elsewhere in Italy, and we can, indeed, add support to Morley’s thesis that the crisis, if it existed at all, was limited to specific regions and products. Perhaps the reason the Tivoli-Licenza valley area was not affected is that its estates were relatively small, useful more for otium than for large-scale agricultural production. The results of the 1997-2001 excavations at “Horace’s Villa” conform to the general picture, as the following reports show.

B.1.5. Third to Fifth Centuries A.D.

The third and fourth centuries saw a general collapse of the villa system in the Roman hinterland, and the Licenza valley was apparently no exception: Mari notes the rarity in surface finds of late African red slip ware, something also observed in the western part of Tiburtine territory. In the more densely built-up ager Tiburtinus, Tomei counted 27 villas of Republican date, 80 dating to the first century A.D., 72 to the second century, 32 to the third, 24 to the fourth and fifth, and just 12 to the sixth century or later. She characterizes the mid-fifth century as a time of “nearly complete abandonment of the countryside, owning to the danger of invasions and sacks by the barbarians.”

At “Horace’s Villa,” burials were placed within the imperial bath complex, indicating that this part of the villa was no longer in service as a bath. Radiocarbon dating puts this activity to 318 A.D., with a standard deviation of 58 years. Hence, we may be fairly confident that the burials occurred between 260 and 376 A.D. Based on the picture of occupation that emerges from the numismatic record, which is strong through the mid-fourth century A.D., the later date is more probable (see Buttrey, D.11). Whatever the exact date, after this period evidence is lacking for the occupation of the “Horace’s Villa” site for several centuries.

With the general abandonment of individual villa sites in central Italy there was a parallel consolidation of the properties into larger estates called massae. A massa generally took its name from its owner or from

---

42. Tomei, 64-65.
43. See the description in Mari 1995, 49-52.
44. For the scarce details, see Mari 1994, 42.
45. On the restorations of the second and third centuries, see Mari 1995, 50.
47. On the “crisis” theory generally, see Pucci (as n. 14), 20-21; for (exceptional?) conditions in the Licenza valley, see Mari 1994, 40. For the second century A.D. as the peak of villa building in the Tiburtine region, see Tomei, 64.
48. Morley (as n. 40), 135-142.
49. Mari 1994, 45; for Tivoli, see Mari 1991, 47.
50. Tomei, 61.
51. Tomei, 67 (my translation).
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53. CIL XIV.3482: VAL.MAXIMA MATER / DOMNIPREDIA VAL / DVLCISSIMA FILIA / QVE VIXIT ANNIS XXX / VI MEN II D XII IN PRE / DIIS SVS MASSE MAN / DELANE SEPRETORVM / HERCVLES QVESQN PACE. The inscription was first published by D. De Sanctis, Dissertazione sopra la villa di Orazio Flacco (Rome 1761) 36. For details about its discovery, see Crielesi 1995, 28; Mari 1994, 45-48 (with a photograph). Since Mari’s account was published, Brancato (as n. 17), 498-499, has published a note correcting in a convincing way the problematic readings in the inscription that have stymied scholars since the text was first published in the eighteenth century. He would emend lines 5-8 to read: “…in pra- / diis suis mass<s>a>e Man- / delan<s>a>e s<s>a>e-epetorum Herculis.” Kalle Korhonen, in a personal communication, sees the letters RE of the inscription’s SEPRETORUM not as an intrusive scribal error, as did Brancato, but as an unintentional transposition from the last line, which should read “HERCVLIS <RE>QVIESCAT ((or: REQVIESCET)) IN PACE.” I thank Kalle Korhonen for bringing Brancato’s article to my attention and for his helpful comments.

54. Mari 1994, 48 and n79. Mari bases the identification of the site on an equation of Laninas with Statio ad Lamnas of the Tabula Peutingeriana.


57. Mari 1994, 48 n78.
58. See Allan Ramsay in Frischer and Brown, 114 (=Ramsay, 8). Ramsay cites as an authority for the toponym Lo Stazio an unpublished manuscript by the Abate Giuseppe Petrocchi, notary of Vicovaro and antiquarian, on whom see G. Petrocchi, Orazio, Tivoli, e la società di Augusto (Rome 1958) 36 n6.
59. On the name of the church, see A. Ramsay in Frischer and Brown, 115 (=Ramsay, 9). In the period 1996-2001, the church was locked and on the verge of total collapse. In 2002, it was partially restored by the Comune di Roccagiovine. The identification of this church with the Fundus Duas Casas was accepted by Lugli 1926, col. 503 n1; Fiore Cavaliere, 90.

50. a nearby town. CIL XIV.3482, dating to the fourth or fifth century, preserves the name of one massa in our zone, the Massa Mandelana, and that of Valeria Maxima, the owner of a præedium within it. Another, the Massa Laninas, is known just to the east of our area; it was located down the Via Valeria at the present-day turn-off for Cineto Romano and was donated by Constantine to the Lateran Baptistry. Other fourth-century properties in the area are recorded in the ninth-century Liber Pontificalis, where they are reported to have been donated by Pope Sylvester (314-335 A.D.) to the Roman church of Equitius near the Baths of Domitian. These include the fundus Valerianus, which has been associated with the Massa Mandelana because of the mention of Valeria Maxima in CIL XIV.3482; the fundus Statianus, which may refer to the toponym Stazzano on the opposite side of the Lucretii mountains, about 2 km north of Palombara Sabina or to a now vanished toponym, Lo Stazio, reported in the eighteenth century by Allan Ramsay as the name of a place “about a mile” up the Licenza River from San Cosmito; the fundus Duas Casas, which could be related to the small church of S. Maria delle Case near Roccagiovine; and the fundus Percilianus, which ought to have been located near the modern town of Percile, just north of Licenza on the Via Licinense. The continuing importance of the area, particularly to churches in Rome, and the parallel continuation of urban vitality at Tivoli, helps to explain why the Via Valeria was restored at least twice in the fourth century.
B.1.6. Sixth through ninth centuries A.D.

For several centuries, the documentary and archaeological records of the area become quite scarce indeed. Local tradition links Saint Benedict (ca. 480-547) to the grottoes of the cliff face on which the monastery of San Cosimato sits, but this association is doubtful. The monastery itself is sited atop a Roman habitation (Mari 1994, catalogue no. 12); since its archive has been lost, the earliest extant documents that mention it date to the tenth century. Judging from its dedication to Saints Cosmas and Damian, it could have existed as early as the second half of the sixth century A.D., when the cult of Saints Cosmas and Damian spread thanks, indirectly, to Justinian I (526-565), who believed that the saints cured him of a fatal disease. The Goths under Totila in 545 raided our area, as did the Longobards under Autari and Agilulf in 589-590 and perhaps again in 545. raided our area, as did the Longobards under Autari and Agilulf in 589-590 and perhaps again in 601. Gregory the Great reported distress in the countryside and a large flood of refugees into the city of Rome. At Tivoli, these developments were felt too: the remaining population abandoned the suburbs and was settled inside the city walls.

For the long period, ca. 600-850, sources are lacking that could throw light on developments in the Licenza valley and the territory stretching to Subiaco. Judging from pottery, masonry, and human remains dating from Period IV of the bath complex, “Horace’s Villa” was reoccupied in the eighth and ninth centuries (see Camaiani et al., C.5), but we cannot say anything about the nature of the settlement (e.g., whether it was lay or religious). The old theory that there was a monastery here dedicated to Saint Peter (supported mainly on the evidence of the toponym of the site, Vigne di San Pietro) has been debunked by Fiore Cavaliere. The sudden efflorescence of life at Licenza in this period is consistent with (though, of course, not necessarily directly related to) the upturn of urban life attested by new archaeological finds from Carolingian Rome.

B.1.7. Tenth through fifteenth centuries A.D.

For at least thirty years from the late ninth to the early tenth centuries, the territory was occupied by the Saracens, who were defeated and driven out in crucial battles in 916, but only after years of oppressive rule in which the population declined sharply and the churches were desecrated. After the expulsion of the Saracens, the countryside had to be reoccupied and rechristianized. At the instance of Alberic II, Patrician and Senator of Rome from 932-954, the...
monasteries of San Cosimato, Farfa, and Subiaco were made bastions of the new order. To that end, they were restored and enriched with landholdings taken from the vast massa Giovenzana.\textsuperscript{70} That San Cosimato became a major regional landowner at this time is clear from a papal brief by Pope Marinus II (942-946) written in 945 to Uberto, Bishop of Tivoli. Among the properties now owned by San Cosimato is the fundus Lama, probably the old Massa Laninas (=Statio ad Lamnas on the Peutinger Table) and also many fundi and massae mentioned for the first time. Many of these are impossible to localize, and those that can be identified do not concern our immediate area.\textsuperscript{71} The monastery of Farfa was given land to the north. The Licenza valley fell into the middle of the holdings of the two monasteries and, before too long, became a possession of Farfa.\textsuperscript{72} By the late tenth century, San Cosimato was in decline, ceding lands to its two rival monasteries.\textsuperscript{73} In 1081, it had been reduced to a possession of the Roman monastery of San Paolo fuori le Mura.\textsuperscript{74}

By the late tenth century, San Cosimato’s old holdings at Anticoli, Roviano, and Arsoli were given to Subiaco;\textsuperscript{75} by the mid-eleventh century, Farfa’s realm, which included the podium Burdella in the old territory of Mandela, reached right to the walls of San Cosimato.\textsuperscript{76} But the power vacuum left by the decline of San Cosimato was not entirely filled by Farfa and Subiaco; lay families were also coming into possession of the lands in and around the Licenza valley. Here, the Crescenzi Ottaviani became the dominant group, owning the land along the east side of the valley all the way from San Cosimato to Percile. The first record of their presence in the general area comes from the Regesto di Farfa, which tells of the Crescenzi’s donations in 1011 of two parcels of land to the monastery.\textsuperscript{77} One of the parcels was located at a place called Macla Felcosa, which might be equivalent to the modern toponym Ara della Macchia located to the northwest of Percile.\textsuperscript{78} The donation of the podium Burdella to Farfa was in fact also made by a member of the Crescenzi family. In the deed of gift, permission was given to the abbot of Farfa to build a castle on the hilltop of Burdella, if he wished. By 1130, a castle had been constructed.\textsuperscript{79}

In our area, this is first documentation of incastellamento, a phenomenon familiar in central Italy between the mid-tenth and twelfth centuries. Incastellamento refers to the construction of hilltop fortresses by powerful local families or by monasteries.\textsuperscript{80} As Allegrezza recounts (E.3), the castles at Licenza, Civitella, and Roccagiovine were built in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries by members of the Orsini family, which starting in 1191 were granted feuds in the area of Vicovaro and Burdella by their illustrious and powerful family member, Pope Celestine III (Giacinto di Pietro di

\textsuperscript{70} See Delogu, 30-31.

\textsuperscript{71} For text and discussion, see Crielesi 1995, 41-42 with the pertinent notes on 45-46.

\textsuperscript{72} See O. Amore, “Per una storia della valle delLicenza nel medio evolo. L’eredità medievale della regione tiburtina,” Atti e Memorie della Società tiburtina di Storia e d’Arte 52 (1979) 219-238.

\textsuperscript{73} Crielesi 1995, 42-45.

\textsuperscript{74} Caraffa, 192.

\textsuperscript{75} Delogu, 34.
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Bobone, 1191-1198). By the late thirteenth century, after a second Orsini pontificate (that of Nicholas III, 1277-1280), the Orsini feuds and castles had been extended to Licenza and Civitella.

As Allegrezza notes, the process of *incastellamento* and laicization in the Roman hinterland during the eleventh through thirteenth centuries brought an increase in population and agricultural production. The Licenza valley was obviously a participant in these related processes, but, as Allegrezza is quick to point out, the castle at Licenza was a “modest” affair, and it would be surprising if the cultivation needed to sustain its tiny population reached as far as the site of “Horace’s Villa.” But there is some limited building activity on the site, if we may assign the Period V (late Middle Ages) of Camaiani et al. (C.5.5) to sometime in the period 1200-1350. In general, the colorful description of Mari for the Tiburtine region applies equally well to the Licenza valley: “of the ancient villas, nothing more remained than mastodont ruins and toponymic echoes.”

The fourteenth century, especially the latter half, saw a dramatic demographic decline all over Lazio, owing first to the Black Death and then to the papal schism (1378-1417). The fifteenth through seventeenth centuries saw continued neglect and abandonment, “with an increase in the uncultivated land and the transformation of tilled land into pasture.” Not surprisingly, then, there are no finds at all from these centuries at “Horace’s Villa.”

**B.1.8. Sixteenth through Eighteenth Centuries A.D.**

The documents surviving in the Orsini Archive in the Archivio Comunale di Roma permit us to follow in some detail the transference of Orsini properties in the Licenza valley from generation to generation. But the documents do not throw light on everyday living conditions, population, and economic activities. To have attempted this, at least in a general way, is the merit of Allegrezza (E.3).

In the eighteenth century, the documents become more informative about activities in and around the future archaeological site of “Horace’s Villa,” on which this account will now more narrowly focus (for its locations, see **figs. 3 and 4**). Some of the most interesting documentation grows out of legal disputes between the Orsini and the Borghese family, to whom the Orsini had gradually sold the bulk of their holdings in the Licenza area between 1612 and 1817. In a Borghese document dated to ca. 1788, the Orsini of Licenza could be described in 1632 as “a noble but impoverished family.” In another document in the same series (see Frischer, G.1.8.8), we read:

…In that time [i.e., 1632], the Castle of Licenza had but few residents, and consequently a small number of families, which did not surpass ca. 50. Thus the territory was, for the most part, uncultivated and filled with maquis. There were no plantings of fruit trees, grapevines, pears, or olives. The number of homes was small. But after ca. 1725 the number of families began to grow, and the population and cultivation of the territory increased by a great amount in such a way that today [i.e., ca. 1788] one sees the same area covered with trees, grapevines, olives, pears, and other fruit trees, and completely cultivated. There are also a great number of houses that did not exist before. This account results from the sworn deposition of two old men of Licenza, one who is eighty years old, the other who is 73, who have heard it told by their ancestors and who are certain that the increase of the population and of the cultivation occurred when they were young….

---

82. See Delogu, 53, for a sketch of how Orsini power spread from Vicovaro outward toward Castel S. Angelo (=Castel Madama) to the west and northwards through the Licenza valley to Orvinio.
84. See Allegrezza, E.3.
85. For details and documentation, see Silvestrelli (as n. 64), 266-274.
86. Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Archivio Borghese, busta 497, fasc. 61, no. 1.
Other documents are less colorful but no less informative. In 1782, the Papal States compiled the first cadaster of the area. The original survives in three volumes preserved in the Archivio di Stato, Rome.\footnote{Catasti dello Stato Pontificio, Licenza, A.R. buste 3704, 3705, 3706.} The relevant section is the Vigne di San Pietro (fig. 2), which is the area of the future archaeological park. The records mention 37 individual properties, which are briefly described in words (unfortunately, there is no map) that relate the name of the owner; a description in terms of its boundaries, its agricultural use, its size and its value. Twenty-one of the parcels were owned by the Church; the rest were owned by the Borghese or Orsini.\footnote{The name is given only once (Conte Orsini); otherwise we find just the title “Sua Eccellenza” or “Sua Eccellenza Principe.”} The plantings include olives, grapes, walnuts, chestnuts, pear and various other fruit trees.

By 1761, at the latest, this new agricultural activity had turned up traces of the Roman remains on the site, as we know from the reports of antiquarians. Since the ancient level is ca. 1.0 to 2.0 meters below the modern level, it is likely that this happened in connection with the digging of pits for planting fruit and nut trees. As noted below, an example of just that is recorded for the year 1849.

It was thanks to the antiquarians that artists started to show an interest in the area, and by the late 1770s Jacob More had produced a series of watercolors and drawings in pen and ink, based on sketches by Allan Ramsay, that give us precious glimpses of the agricultural exploitation of the Licenza valley (see Frischer, G.2.2.3 through G.2.2.5.16).\footnote{On the illustrations of Ramsay and More, see Andrew, 51-72.} A typical watercolor is G.2.2.5.7, which shows, in the foreground, agricultural crops along the river floor and the river with the town mill. In the middle ground can be seen the Via Licinense and the chestnut trees of the Castagneto; beyond, on the hillsides, more fields planted with crops can be seen. In the background are clearly illustrated the Colle Rotondo, Fosso delle Chiese, and Monte Araioni. At the foot of the Colle Rotondo, More indicates the site of the Fonte Ratini by two cypress trees. The vantage point, which is on the Colle Franchisi on the east side of the valley, does not include the Vigne di S. Pietro in its viewshed. The watercolor provides an apt illustration of the text quoted from the Borghese Archive (see Frischer, G.1.8.8).

Once the site had been published and had come to the attention of the public and the authorities, it is reasonable to believe that no large-scale undocumented excavations took place, since in the period from 1761-1870, archaeological excavations in the Papal States could only be undertaken with a proper permit. No such permits are recorded in the archives for the Vigne di S. Pietro at Licenza. Whether any such activities took place between ca. 1725, when the Licenza valley started to be resettled, and 1760 is unknown.

At any rate, thanks to the artist-antiquarian Allan Ramsay, we know in some detail what could be seen on and below the surface of the villa site at this time, which was very little. Ramsay writes (G.1.8.6.1):

It is by this line [scil. sat. 2.6.2: et tecto vicinus jugis aquae fons, “and a spring of never-failing water near my house”] that we are enabled to discover very nearly the precise station of Horace’s house, for it informs us that it was close to a perpetual fountain. Of those indeed there are several in the valley of Licenza but none in a place very proper for houses or gardens except one. This is called by the country people ‘Fonte Ratini.’... It rises in the side of Mons Lucretilis, now Monte Gennaro, under the most southerly of the two summits called the Campanile, and its situation is at present pointed out from a distance, by the means of two cypress trees, the only ones on the hill which grow very near it. Running down aslant the hill it passes near the ruins of Horace’s house, and crossing the Highway it falls into the Licenza about a stone’s throw to the north of the Mill belonging to the village of Licenza, after being rejoined by another stream, an artificial branch of the same fountain, which issues from the hill a little to the northwest of Horace’s house.
and of which the former Counts Orsini have made a Cascade by cutting down part of the rock perpendicular. Besides the general circumstances of the ground, what proves fully its being a fit place for setting down a house or Villa is, that there are actually still to be found there the ruins of two ancient dwellings or of two parts of a large one…. The two remains of building stand at the distance of about 100 yards from one another. That to the east consists of a mosaic pavement of very elegant foliage, and expensive workmanship beyond what was to be expected from the simplicity profest by Horace….”

Ramsay’s words are nicely illustrated by a drawing in black chalk that is in the National Gallery of Scotland (G.2.2.3). In it we can see that the site to which Ramsay refers is the same as the present-day archaeological park, located behind (i.e., to the west) of the Castagneto. The drawing shows the view from the Orsini Palace (i.e., from the north on the crest of the hilltown of Licenza). Ramsay’s sketch indicates “[point] a. the field in which is [sic.] the mosaic pavements;” and “[point] b. the place where stands amongst the bushes the remains of some old walls.” Linking these two features is a road lined with trees. Additional detail is provided by Jacob More, who worked up Ramsay’s view in a series of preserved watercolors and drawings in pen and ink (G.2.2.5.1, G.2.2.5.3). In More, we can see that the fields around the site on either side of the road are planted by low-lying crops, but unfortunately, we are not given any glimpses of the “old walls” at point b. If Ramsay’s measurement of “about 100 yards” is accurate, and if (as is likely) point a corresponds to room 1 or, more likely, 4 (a fragment of whose mosaic Ramsay illustrated in his text), then we can say that the walls observed by Ramsay at b no longer exist. In general it should be noted that the distance from room 1 to room 27 (the two most distant east/west remains on the site along the general line of the road seen in the eighteenth-century illustrations) is only about 50 meters.

### B.1.9. 1780-1910

The fact that the site was not excavated between the late eighteenth century and 1911 does not mean that it was completely protected. To the contrary, in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries we have records of degradation of the ruins in the Vigne di S. Pietro which, however minor in each episode, doubtless caused some serious damage in the aggregate.

Nibby in 1837 reported the destruction of some ancient walls on the site by a resident of Licenza named Valentino De Angelis (see Frischer, G.1.8.18). From the 1859 cadaster (ASR 3714), we know that Bernardo De Angelis, fu Valentino De Angelis, owned the parcel that used to be denoted as 1213. This corresponds to a modern parcel in the southern half of the modern archaeological park (cf. figs. 3, 4). Since the only structure above ground in modern times here was the so-called Church of St. Peter, which de Chaupy reported was made of spolia of ancient building materials (see Frischer, G.1.8.4), and since no other building was ever reported on the site, we may infer that it was this structure that De Angelis demolished. If so, the demolition was only partial. We have two photographs of how the area appeared in the early twentieth century: the first, a view in 1910, before Pasqui’s excavations (cf. C. Loomis Dana and J. Cotton Dana in Frischer, G.2.3.2; fig. 5); secondly, an early photograph from the Pasqui excavations of 1911-14 (cf. SAL E 661=fig. 6).

The worst intervention known to us occurred in the 1840s and 50s when a new parish church was built in Licenza. The local priest, Marco Tulli, dug up building material on the site and made lime out of the marble fragments he found. In principle, he ought to have had an excavation permit from the Papal government, but, if he did, no record of it survives in the Archivio di Stato di Roma, the appropriate archive in Rome. Efforts to enforce the law are, however,
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90. It is the mosaic in room 4 that Ramsay illustrates in his text; see Ramsay in Frischer and Brown, 147 figs. 6.4 and 6.5.

91. T. Berti, La Villa di Orazio (Rome 1886) 9-11.

92. For the laws governing archaeological excavation in the Papal States, see A. Emiliani, Leggi, bandi e provvedimenti per la tutela dei beni artistici e
attested at other times. In 1849 an official inquiry into a possible illegal archaeological excavation turned out to be a false alarm: the owner of the property, Vincenzo Onorati, had simply been digging pits to plant trees when he happened upon a mosaic pavement (G.1.8.22), which he immediately reburied. A similar inquest occurred in 1885 when the Ministry of Public Instruction investigated a report that the civil engineer Tito Berti (cf. G.1.8.26, G.1.8.27) had illegally excavated the site. After a flurry of activity, the case was dropped (G.1.9.1.1-6).

The most common risk to the site came from visitors who started to come in small numbers as word of the discoveries of De Sanctis, Saint’Odile and Ramsay spread. Because in the latter decades of the period the railroad was built from Rome to Tivoli and Vicovaro, and the main roads in the Roman Campagna were paved (including the ViaLiciniese in the 1880s), tourism began to develop, as witnessed by the inclusion of Horace’s Villa in Baedeker’s guidebook (G.1.8.32).

As always, tourism brought advantages—e.g., increased attention paid to the site, ultimately leading to the large-scale excavations of Angelo Pasqui; and an occasional opportunity for the inhabitants to earn some extra money from tourist services—as well as disadvantages. Foremost among the latter was the damage that tourists could willy-nilly cause to the site, especially by encouraging the farmers to uncover the mosaics of rooms 1 and 4. The latter was first seen in 1777 by Ramsay (G.1.8.6.3) and then again by Ramsay’s son, John, in 1783 (G.1.8.7). A measured drawing of a fragment of the mosaic in room 4 was included on the map published in the 1780s by Jakob Philipp Hackert (G.2.1.23). Other visitors who reported seeing a mosaic in room 1 and/or 4 include: J. Landucci, 1792 (G.1.8.9); A. Manazzale, 1796 and 1817 (G.1.8.10; G.1.8.12); R. Bradstreet, 1810 (G.1.8.11); G.A. Guattani, 1827-30 (G.1.8.13); W. Gell, 1834 (G.1.8.17); A. Nibby, 1837 (G.1.8.18); R. Frezzini, 1840 (G.1.8.19); G. Dennis, 1842 (G.1.8.20); J. Donovan, 1844 (G.1.8.21); F. Gori, 1855 (G.1.8.23); T. Berti, 1885 (G.1.8.26; G.1.8.27); the Bishop of Clifton, 1888 (G.1.8.28); A. Mazzoleni, 1891 (G.1.8.29); [anon.], 1899 (G.1.8.31); R. Lanciani, 1909 (G.1.8.35); W. Merrifield, 1909 (G.1.8.36); C. L. Dana and J. C. Dana, 1910 (G.2.3.2.1). The Danas’ publication includes the first photograph of a part of the mosaic in room 4, which gives a nice illustration of what tourists had been seeing during the preceding 130 years (fig. 7).

The published reports hint at the presence of mosaics in rooms other than rooms 1 and 4, where they still survive and can be seen today. Sebastiani reported that Gell had seen a mosaic with small griffins (cf. G.1.8.14). In 1842 Dennis reported that the owner of the property with rooms 1 and 4—Giuseppe Onorati—stated that, about fifty years earlier, he witnessed the uncovering of mosaics in a total of six rooms. They were covered up again “as nothing was found to tempt to further excavation” (G.1.8.20). This report is also valuable because it records an otherwise unknown excavation of the residential part of the site. Where could the other four rooms with mosaics have been located and, hence, where can the excavation have taken place? The following rooms have mosaics, or fragments of mosaics: 1, 4, 11, 16, 17, 26, 27, 37, 40, 42. Other mosaics may have been located in rooms 14-15, and there is a fragment in the Superintendency’s storehouse in Tivoli of unknown provenance (on all these mosaics, see Werner, D.8).

Of course, most visitors never published an account of their visit, but we can safely assume that the viewing of the mosaics was a standard feature of a visit to the site in the long period from ca. 1780 to 1911.93 Sometimes they were even offered tesserae as souvenirs (cf. G.1.8.31) or gathered them themselves (cf. Webster Merrifield’s published account of a visit in 1909 [G.1.8.36], in which he admits to gathering “a handful of the little peg-shaped tesserae”).

Not surprisingly, by the late nineteenth century, we begin to read complaints about the damage to the site caused by the tourists and farmers (cf. G.1.8.27). In the edition of the newspaper Fanfulla, published on 22-23 September 1885, an article exhorted the local farmers to protect the ruins (G.1.8.26). In another newspaper, the Cronaca di Roma of 23 September 1899, the
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93. Cf. Nibby’s statement (G. 1.8.18) that “si scopre e ricopre ad ogni curioso che lo visita.”
local inhabitants are criticized for reusing bricks and architectonic elements in new buildings (G.1.8.31). In 1908 Latinist Vincenzo Ussani published a letter to the editor of Il Giornale D’Italia in which he called upon Corrado Ricci, the Director of Archaeology and Fine Arts of the Ministry of Education, to initiate the excavation of the site in order to prevent more losses caused by tourists and farmers (G.1.9.13). Shortly thereafter, Ricci initiated a series of actions that in a few years led to the excavations of Angelo Pasqui (cf. G.1.9.14ff.).

Of course, while any damage to an ancient monument is to be regretted, we should not lose our sense of perspective: the mosaics in rooms 1 and 4 survived fairly well intact, and perhaps visitors’ attention to this area of the villa spared the rest of the ruins, which remained safely underground until exposed by Pasqui’s state-sponsored excavations that were begun in 1911.

**B.2. Identification of the Vigne di S. Pietro as Horace’s Villa: the Ancient Evidence**

Interest in the site, culminating in its excavation, resulted from the mid-eighteenth century identification of the Vigne di San Pietro as the location of the Sabine villa of the poet Horace. This identification was, and remains, speculative: it relies not on indisputable evidence such as the poet’s name inscribed on a tile or waterpipe found on the site, but from a combination of circumstantial evidence. While it would have been welcome to find important new evidence in favor of or opposed to this identification, the new fieldwork of 1997-2001 turned up nothing that could be so described.

Because the name of Horace is so closely associated with the Roman villa in the Vigne di San Pietro, we lay out here what is known about the place from the ancient sources as well as some considerations in favor of and against the identification of the villa as Horace’s. In the next two sections, we give an account of the scholarship on the problem from the Renaissance until Pasqui’s excavations in 1911-14.

The best source that Horace owned a villa in Sabine territory is the poet’s own words. In a number of works written in the middle of his poetic career, he gives us information about the nature and location of the place (see Frischer, G.1.1.1-G.1.1.16). These can help us to understand where the villa was located, how it was furnished, and what Horace did while staying there—always, of course, assuming that we take the material in the poems as factual information and not as poetic invention. Of course, the scholars who from the fifteenth to the twentieth century have attempted to match up elements in Horace’s descriptions of his estate with observable features on the ground have perforce assumed that Horace’s information is reliable.

If, for the sake of argument, we grant that this is a valid assumption, then what picture emerges of the villa? In Odes 1.17, we learn that it was located near Mons Lucretitis (G.1.1.1) and a valley called Ustica (G.1.1.2; this is presumably the “opaca valle” mentioned in G.1.1.15). Unfortunately, neither is identifiable with certainty on the map of modern Italy. In Odes 1.22 we are told that the villa is bounded by a forest (G.1.1.3), and in another poem we are told that Horace had a neighbor (“vicinus”) named Cervius (G.1.1.10). Once again, this does not help us to localize the site, since forests are common; nor do we know who this Cervius was or where his country house was located. If anything, Horace’s reference to Cervius is a negative factor in identifying his property, since it means that if we find a site dating to Horace’s lifetime but with no remains that would permit us to attribute it to a specific owner in the Augustan age, then we must always bear in mind the possibility that we have to do with Cervius’ villa, not Horace’s.

Other toponyms mentioned by Horace in the area of his property are fanum Vacunae (G.1.1.12), Varia (G.1.1.13), Mandela and the Digentia river
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94. I speculated that he is the Cervius of Satires 2.1.47 in B. Frischer, “Fu la Villa ercolanese dei Papiri un modello per la villa sabina di Orazio?” Cronache Ercolanesi 25 (1995) 211-229, at 225. Most scholars take the two Cervii as two distinct individuals. Whichever position we take on the matter, the fact remains that we do not know where his Sabine property was located.
B.2. Identification of the Vigne di S. Pietro as Horace’s Villa

(G.1.1.16). They are rather more promising, and the latter three have been convincingly identified as equivalent to the early modern place names Vicovaro, Burdella-Cantalupo, and the Licenza river. Vicovaro is at the eighth milestone on the Via Valeria from Tivoli, just where Acro states that Varia was situated in his gloss on Horace Epist. 1.14.3 (see G.1.4.13). In the poem, Horace tells us that Varia was the place to which five heads-of-household who made their homes on his land were wont to go—presumably to take the produce of their fields to market. From this we can infer that Varia was the closest market town to Horace’s Villa.

In a late-antique funerary inscription discovered in 1757 just north of the monastery of San Cosimato, the area is called Massa Mandelana. Massae were collections of properties in a single territory, and their name often included reference to the territory or nearby town. Massa Mandelana thus implies the existence of a town near San Cosimato called Mandela. Horace further states that Mandela “drinks from the icy Digentia river” (G.1.1.16). In the area of Mandela there are two rivers, whose modern names are Aniene (or, alternatively, the Teverone) and Licenza. Since the Aniene was the ancient Anio, and Horace would have referred to it as such had he intended to mention it, he must have been referring to the Licenza river when speaking of Mandela’s water supply, and Licenza is an easy linguistic shift from Digentia.

We are thus able to place onto the modern map of central Italy two towns and a river that Horace tells us were in the immediate vicinity of his villa. Of course, this still leaves a large territory where the property might have been located in the 7-kilometer long valley through which the Licenza river flows from San Cosimato to the hilltown of Licenza.

To narrow down the search, localization of the fanum Vacunae would be helpful, since Horace closes a poetic letter (G.1.1.12) with the information that he was dictating it “post fanum putre Vacunae,” presumably on the grounds of his nearby villa. But, in contrast to Varia and Mandela, the fanum Vacunae (G.1.1.12) has never been identified on the basis of solid evidence. Vacuna was a common Sabine goddess and presumably was worshipped in several places in Sabinis. But her cult has been archaeologically attested only by inscriptions found in the area around Rieti, which is far away from Varia and Mandela. Since the seventeenth century, scholars have suspected a connection between the aedes Victoriae vetustate dilapsa restored by Vespasian (CIL 14.3479) and the fanum Vacunae, which the poet called “putre.” The two sanctuaries have been thought to be identical because of Varro’s interpretatio romana of Vacuna as Victoria. As the passages from the ancient scholars on G.1.1.12 indicate, the assimilation of Vacuna to Victoria was but one of several interpretationes romanæ, which also included Bellona, Ceres, Diana and Minerva.


98. See CIL I.1844=CIL IX.4636=ILS 3484; CIL IX.4751=ILS 3486; CIL IX.4752=ILS 3485; ILS 9248; L’Année Epigraphique 1907, no. 212; 1981, no. 199; 1990, no. 332. It goes without saying that Horace’s Villa should not be localized in the Rieti area because of these casual epigraphical finds. Had Horace’s Villa been located in that area, the tenant farmers of G.1.1.13 would have taken their produce to market there, not Varia; nor would Horace speak of the refreshment given him by the Digentia river near Mandela (G.1.1.16). For such an erroneous identification of Horace’s Villa at Vacone, see Carlo Bartolomeo Piazza, La gerarchia cardinalizia (Rome 1703) 200-202 (=G.1.7.26). Piazza’s case rested on an inscription he allegedly found near Vacone where Bandusia, Maeceas, and Octavian were mentioned. This hoax was exposed in the late 1760s by Bertrand Capmartin de Chaupy, vol. 2, 466-477.

(G.1.3.11, G.1.4.11). The identification of Vespasian’s aedae Victoriae vetustate dilapsa with Horace’s fanum putre Vacunae is thus not convincing, and it would be risky to assert anything definite about the location of Horace’s Villa from such an identification, not least because the find spot of CIL 14.3479 is not known.100 It is now located on an exterior wall of the Castello Orsini at Roccaagiovine, but in the eighteenth century it was seen over the door of a house in Roccaagiovine, so we are not entitled to guess from the inscription’s present location that the fanum was located atop the hill now occupied by the medieval castle.101

In conclusion, if we take the testimony of the poetry seriously as reflective of the circumstances of the poet’s life, then the Sabine villa of Horace must have been somewhere in the area of the Licenza river valley. But we have no compelling reason to pinpoint its location as the Roman villa we excavated in the Vigne di San Pietro.

**B.3. Knowledge about Horace’s Villa from the Imperial Period to 1911**

That at a distance of two millennia we cannot be more precise is not surprising if we look at the ancient scholarly tradition on Horace as reflected in the Suetonian biography of Horace and in the Horatian scholia. Study of the topographical notes in these sources shows that knowledge of Horatian toponyms became quite vague within two centuries of his death. In the second-century Suetonian life of Horace we have the intriguing report that Horace “usually lived on his Sabine, or Tiburtine estate,” and that his house (domus) was shown “near the small grove of Tiburnus” (see Frischer, G.1.2.1). This passage has been interpreted in two ways. The first is that Horace lived at one time in Sabinis and at another in the area of Tivoli. Opposed to this is the view that Horace’s estate was far enough away from Tivoli toward Sabine territory to be called “Sabine or Tiburtine” (cf. Catullus 44). The latter view seems to be confirmed by the following clause, since the writer goes on to state that Horace’s house was shown at one spot, not two. Unfortunately, we cannot identify the spot referred to as “the small grove of Tiburnus.” Most likely we have to do with a typical biographer’s back-formation: an apparent fact about a poet’s life is inferred from his works.102 In Odes 1.7, Horace praises Tivoli in a priamel, and he introduces the city with several toponyms, including the “Tiburni lucus” (Odes 1.7.13).

It is surprising that Suetonius’ precise identification left no traces among the later ancient and early medieval commentators on Horace’s works, since the biography was quite frequently included in late-antique editions of the poet’s works. Nevertheless, Porphyrio can only write that Horace’s fundus was “in Sabinis” (G.1.3.1; G.1.3.4); the Mons Lucretelis and Ustica are “in Sabinis” (G.1.3.2, G.1.3.3; cf. Pseudo-Acro, G.1.4); Varia is a “locus in Sabinis celeberrimus” (G.1.3.13); and Mandela is a “pagus...in Sabinis” (G.1.3.14; cf. Pseudo-Acro, G.1.4.18). In at least one instance, when he attempts to be more precise, Porphyrio’s geography is demonstrably incorrect: he calls Gabii a “vicus in Sabinis iuxta Lucretilem montem” (G.1.3.12).103 The omnium-gatherum collection now known as “Pseudo-Acro” fares only a little better. According to it, Gabii is also in Sabinis (G.1.4.12), and it is not certain whether Ustica is the name of a mountain or an island (G.1.4.2). It mistakenly situates the Fons Bandusiae of Odes 3.13 on the grounds of Horace’s Villa (G.1.4.6), whereas we know that it was located near Venusia, where Horace was born.104 On the other hand, it does give more precise information about the location of Varia as “rising over the Anio” and places it, correctly, at the eighth milestone on the Via Valeria beyond Tivoli (G.1.4.13).

Not surprisingly, the medieval commentators mark no progress toward greater topographical
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103. Dessau noted this error at CIL vol. XIV, 279 n2.
B.3. Knowledge about Horace’s Villa from the Imperial Period to 1911

In 1550, Leandro Alberti wrote that Horace had villas in the hills near Tusculum and near the fanum Vacunae, which he thought was located at Vacone (G.1.7.5; fig. 9, top left). In the 1570s, the Dutch commentator on Horace, Jacob Cruquius, followed Biondo’s identification of Horace’s Sabine villa (G.1.7.9, G.1.7.10, G.1.7.12) and also tried to identify Horace’s Mons Lucretilis (cf. G.1.1.1 and G.1.7.6) as the mountain from which the Farfa river took its source (the modern-day Mt. Ode, 932 meters; see fig. 9, center). He followed Biondo in locating Mandela at Montopoli (G.1.7.14; fig. 9, left of center). He furthermore realized that Horace’s reference to Varia (G.1.1.13) implies that a town with this name was the nearest market to the villa. Not finding any town near the Farfa valley with this name, he emended the text from Variam dimittere to Vatiam dimittere (G.1.7.11), noting that Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in his Roman Antiquities, recorded a town named Vatia near Reate (modern-day Vazia, 5.8 kilometers to the east of Rieti, just past Rieti–Cittaducale; cf. fig. 9, upper right). Of course, the conjecture is wrong: the distance from the Farfa valley, where Cruquius puts Horace’s Villa, to Vazia is over 35 kilometers. There are several market towns closer to the alleged site of Horace’s Villa than is Vazia. Nevertheless, despite the absurdity of his conjecture, Cruquius is right to prefer Varia to the Baria mistakenly transmitted in some Horatian manuscripts. That Varia is equivalent to Vicovaro is something that was not yet known when Cruquius wrote, since the identification was first made by Laevinus Torrentius (1608; G.1.7.16). And Cruquius’ concern with putting together pieces of the topographical puzzle created by various off-hand geographical references in Horace’s poetry is something not seen in Biondo and marks a definite methodological advance. With Cruquius, there is clearly an understanding that Horatian place names


108. See F. Biondo, Blondi Flavi Floriluensis de Italia illustrata (Turin 1527) foll. 68r, 78r, 148v.

109. I thank Sig. Flamin, Surveyor of the Comune di Poggio Mirto, for this information.


111. A Mapquest search of the route between Fara in Sabina and Rieti yields a distance of 36.41 kilometers, primarily on the SS 4, a modern road paralleling the Via Salaria (see www.mapquest.com, search performed July 2, 2003). The distance from Rieti to Vazia is an additional 5.8 kilometers, according to Guida d’Italia del Touring Club Italiano (as n. 9) 451.
cannot be arbitrarily equated with places on the modern map of Italy, but they form a system of relationships that can provide a mechanism of control for a scholar trying to make identifications.

In 1580 we have the first attempt to place Horace’s Villa at Tivoli. In a brief passage about the ancient villas at Tivoli, Giovanni Maria Zappi mentions Horace’s Villa, in addition to those of Augustus, Cassius, Quintilius Varus, and Manlius Vopiscus (G.1.7.15). In 1608, Laevinus Torrentius, in his commentary on Horace’s works, claimed that the villa was located at a place called Camporazio near Vicovaro (G.1.7.16). He was to be followed by Fridericus Rappolius, in his commentary on Horace’s works published in 1675 (G.1.7.25).

Zappi’s claim about Tivoli was accepted by Marzi (G.1.7.20), and it was elaborated in 1611 by Del Re (G.1.7.17). He thought that Horace had a number of villas in Tivoli, Praeneste (cf. Biondo in G.1.7.1), and in Sabinis. The Tiburtine villa he identifies as the monastery of San Antonio where, as Del Re noted, ruins of a Roman construction were visible (and still can be seen today).112 Two years later, Ianus Rutgersius, in his notes on Horace (G.1.7.18), disputed the idea that Horace had both a Tiburtine and Sabine villa. Instead, he argued for a single villa near the boundary between Sabine and Tiburtine territory, quoting Horace’s words unicis Sabinis (G.1.1.5) and comparing Catullus 44: O funde noster, seu Sabine, seu Tiburs, / (nam te esse Tiburtem autamant, quibus non est / cordi Catullum laedere: at, quibus cordi est, / quovis Sabinum pignore esse contendunt) / sed seu Sabine, sive verus Tiburs….

The last major scholar to favor Del Re’s thesis that Horace had two villas—one at Tivoli, the other in Sabine territory—was Athanasius Kircher (G.1.7.22 and G.1.7.23). Writing in 1669, Kircher put the Sabine villa on the slopes of Montelibretti because of an alleged linguistic shift from Mons Lucretilis (G.1.1.1) to Montelibretti (fig. 9, lower center). In 1744, Volpius refined Del Re’s analysis of the remains at San Antonio by distinguishing two building phases: an earlier, Horatian phase, of which no traces survive; and a second, more luxurious phase in the time of Manlius Vopiscus (G.1.7.27). Finally, the candidacy of Praeneste, which Del Re advocated following Biondo, was supported by Cecconi in 1756 (G.1.7.30) and was last discussed in 1795. In that year, Pietro Antonio Pietrini made the cogent point that just because Horace says in Odes 3.4.23 that he visits Praeneste does not require us to think that he had a villa there.113

In his Italian geography published in 1624, the Leiden geographer Philippus Cluverius put Horace’s Villa on the slopes of Montelibretti, which he equated to Horace’s Mons Lucretilis (G.1.7.19). This identification was challenged by one of his students, Lucas Holstenius, in his annotations on Cluverius (G.1.7.21). Published posthumously in 1661, Holstenius’ work was to be a turning-point for the history of the Licenza site, for in it Holstenius—who after studying with Cluverius went on to become the Vatican Librarian and a very distinguished geographer—was the first to equate the aedes Victoriae of CIL XIV.3479 with Horace’s fanum Vacunae (G.1.1.12). Noting the location of the inscription at Roccagiovine, Holstenius also identified Horace’s Digesta (G.1.1.16) with the modern toponym Licenza.

Holstenius’ ideas were to reemerge in the second half of the eighteenth century and lead to the discovery of the site in the Vigne di San Pietro. But at the very beginning of the century we encounter an amusing alternative identification of Horace’s Villa that

112. The identification of the monastery of San Antonio as Horace’s Villa is often seen in Tiburtine antiquarian writings; cf. G.1.7.20; G.1.7.27; G.1.8.10. The most thorough publication of the site is given by its owner, George Hallam, Horace at Tibur and the Sabine Farm (Harrow, England 1927). Hallam’s identification was accepted by Thomas Ashby, The Roman Campagna in Classical Times (London 1927) 114. Note that Hallam also accepted the identification of the Vigne di San Pietro site near Licenza as Horace’s Sabine villa. The most recent argument in favor of a Horatian villa at Tivoli is G. D’Anna, “È veramente esistita una villa di Orazio a Tivoli?” Cultura e Scuola 130 (1994) 34-42.

113. Pietro Antonio Pietrini, Memorie prenestine (Rome 1795) 48: “non è...certo, ch’egli avesse una villa nelle nostre vicinanze, benché alcuni abbian ciò creduto lusingati dalla denominazione di Campo Orazio, che ha da tempo antichissima una tenuta annessa al nostro territorio.”
involved the concoction of fraudulent inscriptions. The perpetrator of the fraud was Bartolomeo Carlo Piazza, who in a book published in 1703 tacitly agreed with Leandro Alberti (G.1.7.5) in placing the fanum Vacunae near Vacone (G.1.7.26). To strengthen the association of the place with Horace, Piazza quoted two inscriptions mentioning Maecenas and Augustus that he reportedly saw in the parish church of Vacone. Piazza’s arguments in favour of the identification were refuted by De Sanctis (G.1.8.1), and the fraud was exposed in the 1760s when the Abbé Bertrand Capmartin de Chaupy (G.1.8.4) visited the church and could find no sign of the inscriptions.

Holstenius’ work put the Licenza valley into the spotlight, and starting from the 1750s tourists and antiquarians began visiting the area to search for actual remains that could be associated with Horace’s Villa and the nearby places mentioned in his poems. In their efforts, they were aided by the publication of two new maps that showed the area in higher scale and with greater reliability. The first was published in 1739 by Diego de Revillas (G.2.1.15); it was based on trigonometry and included a scale, and was the first map of the Tivoli area with these important features. The second was published in 1755 by the Jesuits Maire and Boscovich (G.2.1.18). Theirs was the first map of the entire province of Lazio to be based on scientific principles of surveying.

The earliest visitor on record to study the area was the Scottish painter, Allan Ramsay. He came in September of 1755 “to go in search of Horace’s farm in the Sabinia” (G.1.7.29). Using de Revillas’ map, Ramsay found and made a sketch of a spring (G.2.1.17) that a farmer showed him and which he identified as the Fons Blandusiae. Ramsay’s short initial visit was to result in a thirty-year project to identify and comment on the villa, which the painter-writer pursued in fits and starts during his trips to Italy in the 1770s and 80s. His work on the villa took the form of a short treatise, An Enquiry into the Situation and Circumstances of Horace’s Sabine Villa, which was finished in 1784 but that he did not live to see published. The text was finally published in 2001 (cf. G.1.8.6).

In the last years of the pontificate of Benedict XIV (†1758), George Nicolaus Heerkens, a Dutch physician and poet, went to Licenza to look for the site of Horace’s Villa, about which he gave a lecture to the Accademia degli Arcadi in Rome (G.1.7.31). The lecture, in which Heerkens argued in favor of situating Horace’s Sabine villa in the Licenza valley, met with some opposition from people who pressed the claims of Tivoli, Praeneste and even Baiae. Heerkens countered that, although Horace writes quite often about his Sabine villa, he never mentions a villa elsewhere.

In his account of the lecture, Heerkens stressed that even though some Arcadians objected to his theory, others seem to have been persuaded. De Revillas, who was a member of the academy, prepared a second edition of his map of the Tivoli area, and on it he placed the ruins of Horace’s Villa (labeled “Rudera Villa Horatii”) approximately in the Vigne di San Pietro near the hilltown of Licenza. In 1761, the abbot Domenico De Sanctis, another Arcadian, published his Dissertazione sopra la villa di Orazio Flacco (G.1.8.1), in which he echoed Heerkens’ thesis without citing Heerkens.

The thrust of De Sanctis’ short book is an examination of the passages in Horace’s poetry where the poet mentioned his Sabine villa. He gives only a very brief description of the site at the end of his book, but the information that he reports is precious, since he gives us our only account of the excavation (scavamento) of the Baron de Saint’Odile, the Tuscan ambassador to the Holy See (cf. G.1.8.1). De Sanctis states

114. Cristoforo Maire and Ruggero Giuseppe Boscovich, Carta geographica dello stato della Chiesa. This map is illustrated and discussed in A. P. Frutaz, Le carte del Lazio, vol. 1, xxix-xxx, 90-92; vol. 2, carta XL c. See also M. Pedley, “‘I due valentuomini indefessi:’ Christopher Maire and Roger Boscovich and the Mapping of the Papal States (1750-1755),” Imago Mundi 45 (1993) 59-76.

115. See Frischer and Brown for Ramsay’s treatise on the villa and for discussion of it.

116. Heerkens is vague about the exact date (in Notabillium libri II, [Groningen 1765] 29 ff), stating only that he visited Licenza when Benedict was still alive.

117. On Saint’Odile and his excavation of Horace’s Villa see B. Frischer, “Notes on the First Excavation of Horace’s Villa near Licenza (Roma) by the
that Saint’Odile found the remains of a “comfortable dwelling,” and that near it was found “a conduit for bringing water to the house from the nearby spring.” De Sanctis’ work was reprinted in 1768 and 1784. The reprints contain no new information about the site but the last edition does report that “well-known events have prevented [Saint’Odile] from completing the undertaking he began.” This is a reference to Saint’Odile’s dismissal from his post in Rome under scandalous circumstances in 1774. The later editions also provide evidence of a bitter quarrel that broke out in 1767 between De Sanctis and the Abbot Bertrand Capmartin de Chaupy when de Chaupy published the first of his three volumes on Horace’s Villa. Each abbot claimed priority in identifying the site in the Vigne di S. Pietro. Neither mentioned Heerkens, the true discoverer of the site.

The Abbot Bertrand Capmartin de Chaupy was a religious living in Italy after being exiled from France in the mid 1750s. De Chaupy published his three-volume work on Horace’s Villa—and a host of unrelated and tangential matters—in the period 1767-1769 (G.1.8.4). The work was the subject of a satirical engraving by Piranesi in 1769 (G.2.1.22), who felt that de Chaupy’s work was defective because it was too long-winded and too little based on survey, measurement, and illustration. It appears likely that de Chaupy’s work, besides being inspired by Heerkens (who reported meeting the abbot and explaining his theory about Horace’s Villa to him; cf. G.1.7.31), was also supported for a certain time by the Tuscan ambassador to Rome, the Baron de Saint’Odile (cf. G.1.8.1) but that the relationship between the two broke down by 1767, when de Chaupy published his first volume. In that volume and elsewhere de Chaupy suppresses the name of Saint’Odile, who never himself published anything about his project at Licenza.

Visitors to the Vigne di S. Pietro in this period report that very few ancient remains were visible on the site. Ramsay reserved a verbal and graphic description of the site for a later treatment (G.1.7.29). Heerkens mentioned seeing only ruins identified by the locals as the Fons Vacunae and a spring they called the Fons Blandusiae; he says nothing about remains of the villa proper (G.1.7.31).

We have summarized De Sanctis’ description above (G.1.8.1). De Chaupy gives a longer and first-hand description, stressing how few were the remains that could be seen on the site (see G.1.8.4). The most impressive structure was a ruined building that de Chaupy interpreted as a church built out of spolia of ancient building materials. He thought that the church must have been called “St. Pierre” and had given its name to the Vigne di S. Pietro. He explained the dedication to St. Peter as resulting from Constantine’s donation of land in this area to the church of Saints Peter and Marcellinus in Rome, and was perhaps correct to do so. Covering the surface of the site were many cubilia, or tesserae, the wedge-shaped building blocks of opus reticulatum. From Vitruvius (Arch. 2.8), de Chaupy concluded that a structure built with this construction technique must date from the Augustan age. Closer inspection allowed him to distinguish two separate structures: a large dwelling just “above” the church; and another, smaller building that he thought must have been a bath building since there were lead waterpipes leading to it. Especially because of his recognition of the presence of opus reticulatum, de Chaupy claimed to be the first to prove that the site dated to the Augustan period and hence was almost certainly Horace’s Villa. Be that as it may, a major problem with his work was the lack of any illustrations, and the map he included had a flawed orientation (fig. 10). It had other errors as well, as a comparison of it with Folio 144 of the Carta d’Italia makes clear (fig. 11). If we adjust the scale of both such that Licenza and Roccagiovine line up, and then put the features indicated with numbers by
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118. See Frischer and Brown, 85-87.

119. For details of the relationship of de Chaupy and Saint’Odile see Frischer (as n. 117), 265-289.

120. On the donation, see De Francesco (as n. 52), 48.

121. As noted by Ramsay, An Enquiry, 54 (=144-45 Frischer and Brown).
de Chaupy onto the IGM map, we can see that de Chaupy has more or less correctly positioned the church of S. Maria delle Case of Roccagiovine (his Fanum Vacucae=6) and the Mola of Licenza (his 7). But de Chaupy put the Fonte Ratini (2) too far to the north, thereby making it impossible to know where we are to imagine his site of the Villa of Horace. It is not even clear whether the structure he records on his plan corresponds to any still visible in the archaeological park today. If we compare a highly accurate map such as that published in 1887 by Mazzoleni (fig. 12), showing the brook running down toward the Licenza river from the Fonte Ratini, we can see that the remains visible on the site today (not excavated, of course, in 1887 when Mazzoleni’s map was made, but clustering in the area about his Roman number VIII, where he was able to see the mosaics in rooms 1 and 4) are not as near to the brook as the ancient remains identified as Horace’s Villa by de Chaupy. Moreover, the brook runs on the other side of the ruins seen today (i.e. to the north, as on Mazzoleni’s plan, not to the south, as on de Chaupy’s).

The situation improved somewhat with the next antiquarian student of the Vigne di S. Pietro site: Allan Ramsay. Ramsay was the Principal Painter in Ordinary to George III and son of the famous Scottish poet, Allan Ramsay the Elder, who was a great admirer of Horace. When the painter retired to Rome in the mid-1770, he devoted himself as much to writing as to art, and Ramsay’s short treatise on Horace’s Villa (doubtless inspired by his visit to the Licenza valley in 1755; see G.1.7.29) was a major focus of his interests in this period.122 His verbal description of what he saw on the site (see G.1.8.6) was supplemented by a series of drawings, some of which he had Jacob More convert into watercolors for eventual use by the engraver who would help to bring out his treatise.123 He also encouraged Jakob Philip Hackert to publish a relief map of the Licenza valley (fig. 13), which was published separately in the 1780s.124 In the event, Ramsay died before he could publish his treatise, which (despite the interest it aroused at the time—most notably, in the circle that included Samuel Johnson, James Boswell, Joshua Reynolds, and Edward Gibbon)125 had to wait until 2001 to find its way into print.

Ramsay represents a modest advance over de Chaupy because he recognized that, in documenting a site, it was important to combine text, illustrations, and a map. He dispensed with making his own map of the general area because he felt he could rely on Hackert. His illustrations are mostly general and, however helpful as evidence of the agricultural development of the Licenza valley in the eighteenth century, are useless for understanding what archaeological features he was describing in his text. There is one exception, a drawing in the National Gallery of Scotland (RSA 509; fig. 14) that Ramsay made to show the site as it appeared from a window in the Orsini Palace in Licenza. In letters with associated notes, he specified where key features of the landscape were located. The drawing is laid out on a grid and is very accurate. Ramsay’s note at the top of the drawing states, it was “drawn exactly by me, A.R. by the help of pack thread squares, June 21, 1777.”126 Here, then, we have a very precise illustration of the site, the first we are to have before the state-sponsored excavations of Pasqui in the early twentieth century.

Ramsay’s sketch includes the following features (his letters are used): (a) a field with a mosaic pavement; (b) the remains of some old walls; (c) the Fonte Ratini (whose location is indicated by a cypress); (d) the Mill of Licenza; (e) Roccagiovine; (f) the spot where a farmer reported to Ramsay that he had dug up remains of an ancient gatehouse in opus reticulatum in the recent past; (g) Colle Franchisi; and (h) the monastery of San Cosimato. In the Enquiry, Ramsay

122. For details about Ramsay and his treatise on the villa, see Frischer and Brown, 73-104.

123. On the Ramsay sketches and More watercolors, see Andrew, 51-72.

124. Carte generale de la partie de la Sabine où etoit située la Maison de Campagne d’Horace, suivie de dix Vues des sites de cette Campagne et de ses Environs, nommés dans les Œuvres d’Horace, et relatives aux dissertations que Mr. De Santis, Mr. L’Abbé Capmartin de Chaupy et Mr. De Ramsay ont publié à ce sujet (Rome, no date).

125. See Frischer and Brown, 89.

126. On the drawing, see Andrew, 56.
discusses all these features, of which \( d, e, g, \) and \( h \) are given as reference points only. Since Ramsay illustrated the mosaic in field \((a)\), from which we can see that it is a mosaic that is well-known and still exists in the archaeological park (it is located in room 4) and his reference points are also known, we can use this information to get a good general idea about where his other two points of archaeological interest \((b \) and \( f \)) were located. He gives a verbal description of these features on pages 46-47 of the *Enquiry* (G.1.8.6.1).

It should be stressed that Ramsay’s language is not as precise as was his drawing; he was operating with vague terms such as “a field in which is the mosaic pavements” or “the Mill,” and since he did not specifically refer to the location of the mosaic in room 4 or a certain part of the Mill complex, any measurements based on Ramsay’s sketch necessarily have a large margin of error. This cannot be calculated precisely but 10% would be a reasonable estimate. Thus, the distance, as the crow flies, from the remaining basin of the Mill to room 4 is approximately 262 meters. The distance from Ramsay’s point \( a \) to point \( d \) might therefore be expressed as 262 m +/- 26 m. The distance from point \( a \) to point \( b \) is 94 m +/- 9.4 m, and \( b \) lies to the west of \( a \). Since the precise heading of \( a-b \) cannot be determined from the drawing, it is safest to represent \( b \) on the modern map not as a single point, but as an arc. The area ca. 85 to 105 meters west of room 4 falls into modern cadastral parcels 109, 111, 153, and 150 (see fig. 15). Survey of this area in 1997 did not reveal the walls recorded by Ramsay. It is unfortunate that he did not give us the name of the property owner, since in 1780, the first cadaster of Licenza was compiled (ASR 3704, 3705, and 3706), and we could have narrowed down the position of the walls even more, at which point it would have been worthwhile to search for foundations below the surface. Without autopsy of at least the foundations (which, one might hope, still preserve good ancient stratigraphy and some dating elements), we cannot be certain from Ramsay’s brief description that the walls in question were Roman or later.

Ramsay’s point \( f \) cannot be immediately measured from the drawing, since, unlike \( a, b, \) and \( d \), the point does not lie on the same plane with any of our known points. However, if we use the drawing in combination with Ramsay’s verbal description of the area on pages 46-47 of the *Enquiry*, we can get a good idea of where \( f \) was located (cf. G.1.8.6.2).

The Colle Franchisi is located south of the parcel of land known as Le Mogli, as folio 16 of the contemporary cadaster of Licenza makes clear (fig. 16). Entering the spot mentioned by Ramsay as point F onto the cadastral map, we can see the area where Ramsay saw the *tesserae* of *opus reticulatum*. Survey of the area in 1997 uncovered evidence of additional *tesserae* on the surface. Where Ramsay errs is in the distance from this area to Horace’s Villa. He states that it was about three quarters of a mile (or ca. 1207 meters). In fact, as the crow flies, the distance is only about half that (ca. 606 meters). Of course, Ramsay may not have been measuring as the crow flies. In any case, a bigger problem with Ramsay’s report is that he blithely assumes that the ruined structure found by Bernardo Pomfili was part of the same property as “Horace’s Villa,” over 600 meters away to the north. This is possible, but other theories are equally conceivable. For example, we know that there was a villa in the locality called “I Sainesi” (G on fig. 16), which is less than 200 meters away from area F.127

In Ramsay’s text, the most interesting report is that of the mosaic in room 4, of which Ramsay illustrated details, and of an otherwise unknown mosaic (G.1.8.6.3). About the latter, Ramsay writes: “I had, at other times been shown parts of this mosaic composed of flowering foliages.” Since no such mosaic is preserved, Ramsay’s report could be evidence of a lost floor in a room other than 4. Ramsay himself thought that all the pieces of mosaic he saw belonged to one and the same room—something he could not judge as well as we can, after Pasqui’s 1911-14 excavations.

After Ramsay, the Vigne di San Pietro site was generally accepted as the location of Horace’s villa until the mid-nineteenth century, when the attention of scholars shifted to Roccagiovine. In Noël Des Vergers’ *Étude biographique sur Horace*, published
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127. See Lugli 1926, col. 506 (no. 7); Mari 1994, 66 (no. 33, and note that there is a typographical error of “Sainici” for “Sainesi”). It is interesting in the present context that Lugli noted *tesserae* of *opus reticulatum* on the site.
in 1855, Horace’s Villa was located at a villa site in the territory of Roccagiovine called the Colle del Poetello in the locality Capo Le Volte. This book contained a photograph of the site, which is considered one of the earliest photographs ever published in a printed book. Des Vergers was very influenced by the Rome-based archaeologist, Pietro Rosa, who provided two maps used in the book. Rosa and G. Henzen published articles in 1857 arguing the case for locating the poet’s villa on the Colle del Poetello. The argument was based on the following: (1) they thought that the word “poetello” derived from the Latin word poeta; (2) that the site of Horace’s Villa should be higher up a mountainside than is the Vigne di S. Pietro site because in Satires 2.6, Horace called his country house an arx (G.1.1.9); (3) that the Fonte Ratini was too unimpressive a spring to be recorded in Horace’s poetry; and (4) that the Vigne di San Pietro site was too far (allegedly four miles) from the site of the fanum Vacunae at Roccagiovine to be described by Horace as post fanum Vacunae. Their arguments were accepted by M. Beulé in 1875. In his popular book, Nouvelle promenades archéologiques, published in Paris in 1880 and translated into English in 1896, Gaston Boissier agreed with Henzen and Rosa.

The villa at Colle del Poetello is site number 30 in Mari’s survey of the Licenza valley. In 1886, Tito Berti studied the Colle del Poetello and considered the merits of its candidacy as Horace’s Villa. He rejected it in favor of the Vigne di San Pietro, citing a number of reasons, including most importantly the facts that: (1) poetello derives from the Italian word for poggerello (i.e., hill), not from Latin poeta; (2) there is no spring near the site of the Colle del Poetello (cf. Horace’s description of his villa in G.1.1.8), whereas the Vigne di San Pietro is near the Fonte Ratini; and (3) the Vigne di San Pietro is one mile, not four miles from Roccagiovine. Berti’s views were accepted by Achille Mazzoleni, the author of the best scholarly treatment of the site in the nineteenth century, and by such distinguished scholars as Eugen Petersen, the director of the German Archaeological Institute in 1904, and Rodolfo Lanciani, the Professor of Roman Topography at the University of Rome in 1909. Zaccaria Mari in his late-twentieth-century archaeological survey of the Licenza valley published in 1994 also rejected the identification of the villa at Colle del Poetello as Horace’s estate.

With the candidacy of the Colle del Poetello failing by the end of the nineteenth century, and with increasing concern being expressed about the state of preservation of archaeological remains on the Vigne di San Pietro site, the idea slowly but relentlessly grew for the Italian State, through its Ministry of Public Instruction (MPI), to mount excavations of “Horace’s Villa.” Excavations ultimately were initiated by MPI in May of 1911.

There were several forces at work in exerting pressure on the ministry. First and foremost was the village of Licenza. Had the Town Council of Licenza not passed a resolution on 28 May 1896 urging the government in Rome to sponsor the project (G.1.9.2), and had it not followed up with occasional letters to MPI pressing the case (cf. G.1.9.4, G.1.9.9), it is unlikely that the State-sponsored excavations would ever have taken place. From time to time, others made important contributions. Two Parliamentarians, Augusto Scaramella Manetti (G.1.9.7) and Giulio Venzi (G.1.9.15), took a strong interest in the matter. Vincenzo Ussani, a young Latinist who was later to rise to fame as a Professor of Latin in several universities, made effective use of the press in building public support for the excavations (G.1.9.13=G.1.8.34, and see also G.1.8.31).

MPI handled archaeological excavations through its Directorate of Archaeology and Fine Arts (ABA). Operations for ABA were handled by various

129. M. Beulé, Fouilles et découvertes résumées et discutées (Paris 1875) tome 1, 289.
131. Berti (as n. 91 in B.1), 4-6 (cf. G. 1.8.27). That the Vigne di San Pietro site is only about one mile from Roccagiovine had been noted by the anonymous writer whose letter Henzen (as n. 27) published in Bullettino dell’Istituto 1857, 105.
regional Offices of Excavations. Licenza, as part of the Province of Rome, fell under the supervision of the Office of Excavations for Rome, Lazio Antico, and the Province of Aquila (USRLA). At first, USRLA resisted these pressures. On 16 July 1903 Luigi Borsari, the Director of the Office, wrote to the Minister of MPI raising a series of questions and expressing doubts about the identification of the Vigne di San Pietro site (G.1.9.10). The letter is by no means simply “bureaucratic” in the negative sense. Instead of acceding to the request of the Town Council of Licenza and starting an expensive project of excavation and related land expropriation, Borsari noted that it was by no means clear that the site was really Horace’s; that it was necessary to do soundings to determine whether the eighteenth century excavations had been limited to the mosaics in rooms 1 and 4 or, on the contrary, had already dug up a large part of the site leaving little new to uncover; and, in general, that one should approach any project in Licenza with a careful, scientific methodology. A few months later, Borsari wrote again stating that work could not begin for lack of funds, and also noting that the project should not be limited to the Vigne di San Pietro site but should include other features of interest in the general area of Roccagiovine and Licenza (G.1.9.12).

The attitude of the ministry and USRLA shifted under new leadership. Corrado Ricci was appointed in 1906 to serve as Director of ABA in the ministry. Angelo Pasqui was named the Director of USRLA in 1908. Ricci (b. Ravenna, 1858-d. Rome, 1934) came to his position after a distinguished career as Superintendent of Monuments in Ravenna, Director of the Brera, and Director of the Galleries of Florence. Pasqui (b. Arezzo, 1857-d. Rome, 1915) was a prolific scholar, specializing in the archaeology and topography of Italy from Campania to Etruria. He worked with Gamurrini and Cozza on the creation of the Carta archeologica dell’Italia and the related Forma Italiae monograph series, and later with Felice Barnabei in the creation and organization of the Villa Giulia Museum. Among his many excavations was that of the Ara Pacis in 1903.

Ricci took Ussani’s article of September 24, 1908 very seriously (G.1.9.13, G.1.9.14). We have his copy of the article in the files of MPI, and it is annotated, in Ricci’s hand, as follows: “For Horace’s Villa from Prof. Vincenzo Ussani of the University of Messina, known for his perceptive and loving studies of the Latin poets...”. On October 10, 1908, Ricci wrote to Pasqui, asking for a report estimating of the cost of an excavation of the property in the Vigne di San Pietro (G.1.9.14). By July 28, 1909, Ricci still had not received an answer, and at this point a member of Parliament, Giulio Venzi, intervened to ask what, if anything, was happening in relation to the excavations of Horace’s Villa (G.1.9.15, which contains Ricci’s reply to Venzi’s lost letter). Ricci wrote to Pasqui the next day, asking him to send the report requested the previous October as soon as possible (G.1.9.16). Pasqui finally sent Ricci a letter on the subject on September 3, 1909 (G.1.9.17). He began by stating that he visited the site and studied the scholarship about it. The area where the villa might be located was not very big, and hence “the excavation is not very expensive, and one can estimate the sum of Lire 3,500...”. He then states that the area in question was owned by various individuals, including the heirs of Vincenzo Onorati, Emilio Caponetti, Rocco Foschi, Maria Assunta Foschi (the wife of Domenico Ricciotti), and Antonio Angeletti; and he produced a map showing the area in question (fig. 17). Pasqui proposed not to expropriate the land, but simply to rent it and compensate the owners for their loss of agricultural production. Ricci replied a few days later in a letter approving the excavation and expenditure of Lire 3,500, with the stipulation that the funds should come out of the budget of the USRLA (G.1.9.18). But at the end of November, Ricci was forced to hold up start of the project for lack of funds (G.1.9.20), postponing it “for a more opportune time”—practically the same reply that MPI had given to the Town Council of Licenza after the passage of its resolution of 1896 calling upon the ministry to

133. G. M. Mariani, “Prefazione,” in M. Bencivenni et al., Monumenti e istituzioni, Parte seconda (Firenze 1992) xvii-xxxviii, at xxxi-xxxii.

134. For a brief curriculum vitae, see M. Bencivenni et al. (as n. 133), 161 n40.

undertake the excavation of the site in the Vigne di San Pietro.

This time, however, the ministry was serious, and on February 21, 1910, the minister of MPI approved the use of state funds for the project (G.1.9.21). After a series of further delays and preparations, the excavations commenced on May 8, 1911, as Pasqui informed Ricci by letter (G.1.9.24).

B.4. Interventions in the 20th Century

B.4.1. Pasqui’s excavations, 1911-1914

The excavations ran from May, 1911 through October, 1914. Pasqui died on October 15, 1915 before he could publish his final report. As noted, the report on Pasqui’s work was published in 1926 by Giuseppe Lugli, who was at that time an inspector in the Superintendency for Rome and the Province of Rome. Lugli was ultimately to rise, in 1929, to be the head of the Superintendency and then, in 1934, to be the Professor of Roman topography at the University of Rome, following in the footsteps of his teacher, Rodolfo Lanciani (see fig. 25 for a photograph of Lugli on the site in the 1930s). These circumstances are unfortunate since, despite Lugli’s indisputable merit as a scholar, they mean that what we have known about Pasqui’s finds has been filtered through a secondary source. Fortunately, some contemporary documentation of Pasqui’s excavations survives and permits us to follow their progress at each major phase and to reconstruct, at least in general terms, how he understood the main features that he had uncovered.

The most important pieces of this documentation have been listed in the catalogue (G) and include these classes of material:

1.9.14-1.9.24: official documents dating to the period October 10, 1908 to April 29, 1911 in the files of ABA and USRLA prior to the commencement of the excavations in May, 1911. These mainly concern legal and financial matters.

1.10: official correspondence between Corrado Ricci and Angelo Pasqui dating to the period May 22, 1911 to October 23, 1914 in the files of ABA and USRLA during the excavations. These mainly concern legal and financial matters.

1.11: Pasqui’s private correspondence in the period of the excavations. Very little of this has been found. The Pasqui family of Arezzo and San Sepolcro reports that they are not in possession of any private papers of Angelo Pasqui.

1.12: the surviving documents illustrating the operational aspects of the excavations. These include letters to and from Angelo Pasqui; Nicola De Rossi (b. July 26, 1869; d. June 27, 1951; for his portrait, see fig. 18), the foreman of the workers in Licenza; Giuseppe Verduchi, a restorer in Pasqui’s office assigned to Licenza as supervisor of the fieldwork and restorer of the finds; G. Rufini, the Mayor of Licenza; and others directly involved in the fieldwork. These letters covered the period January 21, 1912 to November 25, 1913. This part of the catalogue (G) also contains the surviving portion of the Giornale di Scavo kept by Nicola De Rossi. The surviving pages cover some, but not all, of the period March 26, 1912 to November 30, 1916, viz.:

March 26, 1912 to July 30, 1912
May 1, 1913 to June 25, 1913
July 4, 1915 to August 30, 1915 (random surface finds)
November 1916 (random surface finds).

De Rossi was a local resident with no archaeological training. His fieldnotes are better than nothing but leave much to be desired. In addition to serving as an official aide-mémoire of the fieldwork, the Giornale

136. The date is given in Pasqui 1916, 11.
137. On Lugli see the obituary of P. Romanelli, “Giuseppe Lugli,” in Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Celebrazioni Lincee 22 (Rome 1969). The dates and details of Lugli’s career up to the university appointment in 1934 can be found in “Relazione della Commissione giudicatrice del concorso per professore straordinario alla cattedra di topografia romana della R. Università di Roma,” Bollettino Ufficiale, Ministero per la Pubblica Istruzione, parte II, del 20 settembre 1934.
also served as a record of the provenance of small finds. These were additionally cross-referenced in two catalogues, one organized by class of material, the other by property owner. These survive intact, and excerpts are included in this part of the catalogue.

1.13: Early published accounts of Pasqui’s excavations in the popular press, as well as Pasqui’s own report in the *Bollettino d’Arte*. As will be seen, these accounts give us a fairly consistent view of how Pasqui interpreted his finds.

2.4: Graphic documentation of Pasqui’s excavations, including plans, sections, elevations and sketches. This collection is housed in the archive of the Archaeological Superintendency of Rome in Palazzo Altemps (AS Pal. Altemps, b. 18 fasc. 10). It ought to be in the archive of the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio. Evidently, a mistake was made in the division of the unified archive of the superintendencies when they were administratively separated in 1970. The existence of this dossier was not known prior to its discovery in 2000 by Dr. Klaus Werner, who thought that the source was Rodolfo Lanciani. Closer study by the present author proved that the source was Pasqui and his staff at Licenza. Much of the work was done by Edoardo Gatti, a surveyor in USRLA assigned to “Horace’s Villa.”

2.5: The photographic documentation of Pasqui’s excavations, which is in the archive of the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio. Unfortunately, no photographic documentation was made of the site prior to excavation, nor was the documentation taken on any regular basis during the fieldwork. Most of the shots show the site as it appeared when work ceased in October of 1914 and may date to late 1914 or 1915.

For the purposes of this report, a full study of Pasqui’s excavations of “Horace’s Villa” is neither necessary nor desirable; it is reserved for treatment elsewhere. In what follows, we focus instead on some matters of immediate concern to the understanding of the site, including:

1. Pasqui’s methods and main archaeological finds
2. The extent to which unpublished information survives permitting us to supplement or correct the record of Pasqui’s excavation as reported in Lugli 1926
3. The constraints of time and space that limited Pasqui’s excavation and which, after his death, had a strong influence on later scholars’ interpretation of the site
4. The nature, extent and legibility of Pasqui’s restorations on the site
5. The extent to which Pasqui’s interpretation of the site corresponds with that found in Lugli 1926.

By the end of Pasqui’s excavations in October 1914, a number of features had emerged that can be seen on the plan drawn by E. Gatti, Pasqui’s surveyor (see fig. 19). From the plan, it is clear that Pasqui had uncovered the features now visible on the site with the exception of Areas 35, 37, 38, 40, 50 and 55, which were uncovered later in the twentieth century, as we will see.

As for method, Pasqui used the approach of “wall-chasing” and *sterro* (“digging out”) so typical of his period in Italy and elsewhere. The excavations started at two known points: structure 53, where some remains could still be seen above the ground; and, a bit later, at rooms 1 and 4, where fragments of mosaic had been shown to tourists and antiquarians for the preceding century and a half. Structures were dated on the basis of building technique, and Pasqui assumed that *opus reticulatum* implied an Augustan date, whereas *opus testaceum* pointed to the period from the Flavians to the Antonines. He had no notion of a stratigraphic excavation and never used materials found in association with foundations or walls to date them. He showed little appreciation for the medieval period, which he dug through and destroyed without leaving a record. Moreover, since he was operating with the preconceived idea that this was Horace’s Villa and the site had been unoccupied before Horace’s time, he did not excavate down to virgin soil, but stopped wherever he found *opus reticulatum* because he assumed that this building technique had to date to the Augustan age. All of these assumptions are open to doubt, and the failure
to reach virgin soil is inexcusable (although it fortunately spared many ancient levels from Pasqui’s destructive methods). There is the accidental fact—for which Pasqui cannot presumably be blamed—that the documentation survived only in small part and then was scattered to various archives without a composite record facilitating its retrieval. But he can be criticized for the fact that the documentation was not very full or professional, judging from the surviving bits. Photographic documentation is practically nil; drawings are few and poorly marked as to date, author, and subject. Moreover, as Director of the USRLA Pasqui had many duties in Rome and elsewhere. He was only occasionally present on the site, as his correspondence makes clear (cf. the letter to Barnabei in G.1.11.1 and to De Rossi and Verduchi, on which see De Simone, D.1.2.1), and in his absence the day-to-day work was entrusted to subordinates whose previous records or future careers do not suggest that they were archaeologists of distinction. The actual work of digging and restoration was done by local workers in Licenza, all of whom were farmers, not archaeologists, by trade.\(^\text{138}\)

Pasqui described the site as follows (cf. G.1.13.3):

\[\ldots\text{a little work of excavation sufficed to make it apparent that the entire upper part of the small valley hid under a layer of cultivated soil the remains of ancient structures, and it was easy to ascertain immediately that a part of these remains comprised a vast construction made exclusively of opus reticulatum, and another part comprised a later construction in opus incertum revetted by a nice covering of brick.\ldots\] Moreover, as the systematic excavations proceeded it became clear that the first reticulate structure belonged to a villa.\ldots\text{ The other building without doubt belonged to a public bath supplied by pipes with the health-giving waters of the Digentia.}\(^\text{139}\)

Pasqui published no plan with his report, but, fortunately, a plan survives that is consistent with his description. It was published by the journalist Robert Vaucher in May, 1913 and can be used to give precise locations for most of the features Pasqui tried to identify (see fig. 20). Much of what Pasqui writes in his short report is echoed in the popular accounts by two journalists who interviewed him in 1913: Robert Vaucher in May (G.1.13.1), and Paolo Giordani in September (G.1.13.2).

Pasqui described the structure he considered the villa as consisting of a garden, rectangular in plan and 34 m wide x 76 m long, enclosed by a “cryptoporticus”. The entrance (no. 1 on fig. 20) was on the short, south side of the “cryptoporticus” (cf. no. 2 on fig. 20). In the middle of the garden was a pool, rectangular in shape and 22 m long, 11 m wide, and two meters deep (no. 4 on fig. 20). Five steps led up to the residence from the two arms of the “cryptoporticus” on the east and west long sides. A corridor ran along the façade of the residence, in the middle of which was a third staircase leading down to the garden proper. The garden façade of the “cryptoporticus” was formed of pillars and panels decorated with precious marbles, including rosso antico and giallo antico. The interior of the “cryptoporticus” was decorated with frescoes. The exterior wall of the “cryptoporticus” continued along the residence and then made a 90-degree turn along the back of the residence. Hence, in plan, the villa was a large rectangle, 41 m wide x 108 m long. In the residence, the rooms on the east were paved with fine mosaics, indicating that they were for the masters (no. 6 on fig. 20), whereas those on the west had a more utilitarian floor in brick, implying that they were used by the slaves (fig. 20, no. 7). Pasqui dated the villa to the Augustan age and attributed it to Horace.\(^\text{140}\)

In contrast, Pasqui compared the bath complex to the structures visible at Hadrian’s Villa and dated it to the Trajanic period. He also posited an earlier, Flavian phase at a “much lower level and decorated with stuccoes and frescoes. This structure, ca. 3 meters lower, was leveled and its large rooms served, without further modification, as the room for the
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138. Photographs survive in the archive of SAL that show the workers busily digging and restoring the remains on the site (cf. SAL E 730 [=G.2.5.15]).


140. Pasqui 1916, 12 (closely translated and paraphrased).
personnel in charge of the bath.”

On fig. 20, this is the area of no. 12, which corresponds to room 33 on our plan of the site. Pasqui described the bath as having the canonical apodyterium, calidarium, and frigidarium. The windows of the rooms were closed with glass, of which large fragments were found in the drains. Study of the fragments showed that they all measured 40 cm x 30 cm with a thickness varying from 2 to 6 mm. Number 8 on fig. 20 is the apsidal calidarium with a suspensura floor. Painted fresco fragments, decorated with patterns and figures, were found here. Pasqui interpreted room 53 on our plan (= no. 13 on fig. 20) as the frigidarium of the bath. At the center of it was a swimming pool (cf. G.1.13.2). Here, in the Middle Ages, was built a small church, whose doorway was made of spolia of the ancient building. It stood on a roadway leading from Varia to the fanum Vacunae. Inside the church, which (as de Chaupy had suggested) was perhaps called San Pietro, many burials were found.

From his brief report, we can see that Pasqui believed that the site consisted of a residence and a separate bath building stretching from our Area 53 to 32/33 and including room 21 and possibly the adjacent rooms 19 and 20. Since 19, 20, and 21 are part of the residence, it is not entirely clear how Pasqui could write about the alleged public bath that it “did not communicate in any point with the villa itself.” As for what Pasqui called “the villa proper,” he appears to have formed the idea that the residential structure on the site had the shape of a regular rectangle, as can be seen in the interview dated May 11, 1913, which was published in a popular magazine by Robert Vaucher (G.1.13.1) and later in Pasqui’s own brief report on the excavations (G.1.13.3). As the work proceeded, features were placed within this preconceived plan, and where the actual remains failed to materialize, they were hypothetically indicated by a broken line, as can clearly be seen with a large tract of the expected, but missing, northern closure wall (cf. fig. 21). A photograph taken in 1912 or 1913 shows that the presence of a tree, which could apparently not be removed for budgetary reasons, hindered work in this area (cf. fig. 24).

By the time Gatti’s plan was published in Lugli 1926—by far the most important twentieth-century publication on “Horace’s Villa”—the hypothetical features were no longer indicated by a broken line but by a solid line, and the fact that they were mere hypotheses was quickly forgotten, especially since, as De Simone makes clear (D.1), the missing features were built by the modern restorer, Giuseppe Verduchi.

Gatti’s plan exerted a strong, and therefore misleading, influence on scholars, including on Lugli himself. It is important to recognize that the plan not only mixes hypothetical with actual features indiscriminately; but it also does not include all the features uncovered by Pasqui. Evidence of this comes from the graphic documentation collected in G.2.4. One sheet shows a rectangular feature made of bricks in the northwest corner of room 6 (fig. 21). It is annotated “reinterrato” (“reburied”), and, indeed, this feature cannot be seen on the surface of the site today. Other features are found in rooms 11 and 12 (see figs. 22, 23). To verify the accuracy and reliability of these documents, we excavated room 12 in 2001 and found that the features recorded on the document of fig. 22 are indeed still to be found in situ (see De Simone, C.2.1). Future investigators will want to see if the walls reburied in room 6 are still to be found.

We know that Ricci summarily ordered Pasqui to cease the excavations on October 1, 1914 (G.1.10.9). On October 23, Pasqui responded with a letter reviewing the history of the project in bold strokes, reiterating his recommendation that the land be expropriated by the State from the property owners, and stating that “the entire plan of the building, which was preserved with its walls to a height of 60 cm. on average, has been uncovered” (G.1.10.10). Whether Pasqui really believed this, or whether he was exaggerating, is unclear. What is certain is that in following Ricci’s orders to prepare the site for the public, Pasqui simplified the archaeological record by reburying some features he had found in the residence and by inventing out of whole cloth others that never existed (for details, see De Simone D.1.2).
B.4. INTerventions in the 20th Century

B.4.2. Luigi’s 1926 account of the Pasqui excavations

At this point, we should contrast what Pasqui actually found with Lugli’s lengthy report of 1926, which was published in the prestigious *Monumenti Antichi* series of the Accademia dei Lincei. From the outset, it should be recognized that Lugli was laboring under two disadvantages: he had not participated in Pasqui’s excavation but had only been present for a short time during the latter part of it, and he did not have access to all the documentation still to be found in the archives of the Archaeological Superintendency and of ABA. These disadvantages meant that Lugli had no idea of how some features had been reburied and how others had been heavily and, at times, fancifully restored—something that would have been clear to him only if he had been able to read Pasqui’s correspondence with De Rossi and Verduchi (see De Simone, D.1.2.1). Indeed, near the beginning of his report, Lugli stressed how reliable were the restorations that Pasqui had commissioned, writing “some have reproved Prof. Pasqui for having restored a bit too heavily the ruined walls and for having brought them all to the same level. But this was the only way to preserving these remains, without doubt worthy of respect, from bad weather and animals which even today get onto the site for lack of a fence, owing to the delay in expropriating the land. It is, however, easy to distinguish the genuine wall from the restored wall—and practically everything with the same ancient material—because the new material has been set back by a few centimeters and has a rougher surface. Only several doorways have not been well considered, but this is a small thing in comparison with the notable merit earned by Pasqui in his excavation.”

Balancing the disadvantages was the great advantage that Lugli had over Pasqui: time. He wrote over ten years after the cessation of excavation and so could reflect on the finds for a long time before writing about them; moreover, in writing up his ideas, he could take as long as he needed to give a very detailed and fine-grained analysis. He was also able to interview Nicola De Rossi, the head of Pasqui’s work crew and, after the end of digging, the guard on the site.

On the basic interpretation of the site, Lugli agreed with Pasqui on some points but disagreed on others. He accepted Pasqui’s view that the residence and quadriporticus constituted the earliest phase of construction on the site, and Lugli, too, dated this phase to the Augustan age. He, too, thought that the site had three major phases—Augustan, second century A.D., and medieval. He accepted Pasqui’s claim that the entrance to the villa was through a doorway in the middle of the southern arm of the quadriporticus (Area 54 on our plan). He disagreed with Pasqui about the nature of the bath complex: for Lugli, it was an integral part of the villa and hence private. It was not a public structure that happened to be built next to a private residence, as Pasqui had thought. Much of the bath complex Lugli dated to the mid-second century A.D., at which time he speculated that the property, in imperial hands since Horace died after having bequeathed the villa to Augustus, was sold by the imperial *fiscus*. This dating was slightly later than Pasqui’s, which, as we have seen, was to the Trajanic period. Like Pasqui, Lugli accepted the old thesis that the property was eventually given to the church of Saints Peter and Marcellinus in Rome, and that a monastery was constructed here in structure 53 in the Middle Ages.

144. Cf. Lugli 1926, col. 461: “…per aver assistito dappresso all’ultima campagna di scavo.”
145. Just to cite one example, right at the beginning of his report, Lugli attributes a great deal of the responsibility for the undertaking of the Pasqui excavation to Vincenzo Ussani, ignoring the other individuals and institutions that were also pressing the case since the 1890s. But these pressures were all exerted behind the scenes through official letters, which Lugli could only have known had he been permitted to study the archives. See Lugli 1926, col. 457. At col. 461 Lugli laments the fact that the only documentation he had at his disposal was the Giornale di Scavo.

146. Lugli 1926, col. 458 n3 (my translation).
147. Lugli 1926, col. 459 n1.
149. Lugli 1926, col. 541.
150. Lugli 1926, cols. 528-29.
151. Lugli 1926, col. 529, where Lugli cites Sebastiani (G.1.8.14) for this theory, which actually dates back to de Chaupy (G.1.8.4). At col. 563 he also
But, as noted, Lugli was able to go far beyond Pasqui in his analysis of the site. Since Pasqui’s finds were mainly communicated by Lugli, a summary of Lugli’s views is necessary here. Lugli hypothesized that some new features were later added to this original core in a second phase, including the fountain in courtyard 8, which he thought was contemporaneous with the bath complex in Areas 32-53. In a third phase, rooms 16 and 17 were damaged; they had originally comprised the tablinum and alae of the residence. Opposite them was the summer triclinium (7) and the winter triclinium (6). The atrium was located in room 12. Rooms 1, 4, 11, 14 and 15 were cubicula. Traces of red plaster were still in situ in room 4 and the northern end of corridor 23. According to Lugli, the rest of the fresco fragments were found scattered over the site and had no specific provenance. On the other hand, as mentioned above, Pasqui had noted that a great many fresco fragments came from room 33.

Lugli paid special attention to features of the villa that Pasqui did not have an opportunity to address. The mosaics in the villa, which he considered to reflect especially fine craftsmanship, came in for extended treatment. Several (especially the one in room 1) he dated to the Augustan period. Others (especially those in rooms 11 and 16) he thought were later. The mosaic of 16 he even dated to the medieval period of the hypothetical monastery of Saint Peter. Water from the impluvium in 12 went by pipe to the main drain of the villa (see De Simone D.1.3.6), as did the outflow from the fountain the middle of courtyard 8. The main drain also received the runoff from the baths. At various points in his report, Lugli returns to the matter of water supply and drainage, laying a valuable foundation for future work.

Lugli agreed with Pasqui that structure 33 had two phases, but he dated 33 and 34 (which he considered a pool [34] and frigidarium [33]) to the Augustan, not Flavian, period. As mentioned, he considered the rest of the bath complex to date to the mid-second century A.D. Like Pasqui, he thought that 33 was remodeled in this second phase, being transformed into a calidarium. Contemporary with this change was a modification of rooms 19, 20 and 21. According to Lugli, we do not know the original function of this area, but in the second phase they became additional hot rooms. The portico (35) was also built to adorn the baths, as were rooms 38-53. Here, too, there were hot rooms (43-49). Pasqui had not excavated rooms 38-41, so Lugli was not able to discuss them. He did, however, spend a great deal of space on room 53, which Pasqui had identified as the frigidarium. Lugli considered it “the most interesting of this period.”

Noting that the form of the structure might suggest that it was a nymphaeum, Lugli went on to propose that it was a vivarium, or an artificial construction for raising fish, although he grants that it might originally have been built as a nymphaeum or fountain. Lugli speculated that from the upper windows visitors to the villa could look down on “the spectacle of fish darting about between jets of water.”

In the third and final phase, which Lugli characterized vaguely as “medieval,” without assigning even an approximate date (as had Pasqui), the main changes were the conversion of structure 53 into a church with a crypt on the lower level where monks were buried; the construction of bedrooms and living quarters for
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159. Lugli 1926, cols. 536-539.
164. Cf. Lugli 1926, col. 560: “the dating of this third period cannot be determined, just as one cannot precisely define the complete plan of the structures” (my translation).
the monks in the area of 33-52; and the reuse of the quadriporticus as the cloister of the monastery.

For all his virtues, Lugli can be criticized for missing some precious information in the published sources of Pasqui’s excavations. This criticism applies especially to the provenance of various small finds, which Lugli treats at length in columns 565-590. At col. 564, he explains that this treatment is derivative of Pasqui’s detailed catalogues, but he fails to note that those catalogues relate information about provenance that he does not include. Even though Pasqui’s information relates only to the parcels of land on which the objects were found, and not to the exact position and depth at which they were found, it is still useful since the parcels of land correspond so well to the main parts of the villa (residence, quadriporticus-garden, baths). It is not at all clear why Lugli thought it desirable to omit this information. Moreover, as various reports in this volume make clear (cf. Buttrey, D.11; Filippi, D.4; Werner, D.8), Lugli made various errors in transcribing the manuscripts of Pasqui’s catalogues. Finally, Lugli did not make any progress beyond Pasqui’s simple listing of objects in a catalogue that was created mainly with the administrative goal of reimbursing the landowners for the finds from their properties. There is no attempt to date, analyze or interpret the objects, only a few of which are illustrated with photographs.

B.4.3. Condition of the site in the 1920s

The only documentation about the site from the 1920s that survives in the archives of the Archaeological Superintendency concerns rental of the land on which the ruins stood and of the rooms in the Palazzo Orsini where the finds were stored. Twenty photographs of the site were published by Lugli in his 1926 monograph (G.2.8.2); several others, taken by Thomas Ashby in 1927, are in the photographic collection of the British School in Rome (G.2.8.3).

From the photographs, we can see that some work must have continued on the site after Pasqui was ordered to close the excavations in October, 1914. In a photograph in the Gabinetto Fotografico Nazionale (G.2.7.3 [undated, but ca. 1915?]), and in two others published by Lugli (G.2.8.2.3) and taken by Ashby (G.2.8.3.1), we can see that the fountain in Area 8 has been reconstructed, although the tree blocking work just to the north of the fountain is still seen standing (fig. 24). From Lugli (G.2.8.2.12) we can see that the zone from 25 to the residence had not yet been replanted (see Gleason, C.3.2.2 on the tree planting here in the 1950s).

B.4.4. Lugli-Price excavation of 1930-31

A small excavation was undertaken in 1930-31 by Giuseppe Lugli of the Archaeological Superintendency for Rome and the Province of Rome (for a photograph of Lugli on the site in 1935, see fig. 25). The only documentation of it that survives is a short article published by Thomas Drees Price in the Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, which was mainly devoted to Price’s reconstruction of the villa (see Gleason, B.5). The excavations focused on the eastern branch of the quadriporticus (55) and the pool (25). They were doubtless inspired by Lugli’s comments in his report of 1926 about how Pasqui’s incomplete excavation in the eastern branch of the quadriporticus left some matters to be clarified, particularly about circulation through this part of the quadriporticus and about the function of the cross wall at the south end of Area 55. Again, the technique of wall-chasing was used (cf. fig. 26, which shows workers digging a trench behind the eastern wall of 55), documentation was even more sporadic than in Pasqui’s time, and Lugli never published his results.

B.4.5. Restorations of 1930-31

Thanks to the generosity of the Vicomte Roger d’Ailhaud de Brisis of Tivoli, we are able to publish some hitherto unknown letters between Lugli and Mrs. George Hallam that concern restorations at the villa in 1930-31 (see G.1.14). The restorations were sponsored by Mr. and Mrs. Hallam, relatives of Vicomte De Brisis and the owners of the ex-monastery of S. Antonio at Tivoli in the early decades of the last century (see fig. 27). George Hallam had published several works on the monastery, which he, along with a long tradition of local antiquarians,
thought was Horace’s Tiburtine villa. His support of this old identification did not prevent Hallam from also agreeing with Pasqui in attributing the Vigne di S. Pietro site to Horace, and Hallam was indeed a frequent visitor to Licenza, who liked to bring family, friends, and distinguished scholars to see the ruins of what he considered Horace’s “other” villa.\textsuperscript{167}

Hallam and his wife donated to the Superintendency Lire 1000 in 1930 and Lire 500 in 1931. As Lugli’s letters to Mrs. Hallam make clear, the purpose of the gift was to permit the Superintendency to restore walls at the villa as well as to co-sponsor the Lugli-Price excavation (G.1.14.1). It is not surprising, given George Hallam’s longstanding interest in Horace’s villas, that the Hallams appear to have asked that their gifts be spent on restoring the “Horatian part” of the villa (see G.1.14.3), i.e., the walls in \textit{opus reticulatum} (see G.1.14.2). The work was done by Nicola De Rossi and his son, Rocco, who was otherwise unemployed (G.1.14.3, G.1.14.4). The letters do not indicate exactly which walls needed restoration, but in view of the fact that the Lugli-Price excavation had laid bare extensive new remains in Area 55 that were largely in \textit{opus reticulatum}, this may well have been the focus of the efforts of Nicola and Rocco De Rossi.

\textbf{B.4.6. WORLD WAR II}

During the long years of World War II, the number of the visitors to the site fell to a handful.\textsuperscript{168} After Italy joined the Allies on October 13, 1944, the German Army occupied central Italy, including Licenza. On March 13, 1944, Rocco De Rossi\textsuperscript{169} wrote to Salvatore Aurigemma, the Superintendent of the Archaeological Superintendency, that German soldiers had taken possession of the local museum, without removing the objects for safekeeping. He asked Aurigemma to intervene with the German commander in Rome to secure the withdrawal of the soldiers (G.1.15.1). We have a draft of the reply to De Rossi and the German Commander in Licenza, which Aurigemma wrote on March 24, the day after the Resistance’s attack that killed 33 German soldiers marching through the Via Rasella and the very day of the harsh German response: the massacre of 335 Italian citizens at the Fosse Ardeatine. Not surprisingly, Aurigemma did not think the moment opportune to speak to the German Commander in Rome. Rather, he decided to send to Licenza a staff member named Guglielmo Di Pietro. Di Pietro was to have the responsibility of reporting on the state of the site and of storing objects in the museum (G.1.15.2). Di Pietro reported on his mission on March 27, writing to Aurigemma that the situation was normal at the site and at the museum. The German commander had acceded to De Rossi’s request to vacate the premises, agreeing with De Rossi that there was no reason for his soldiers to be utilizing the museum. Hence, Di Pietro did not have to see to the packing and storage of the objects in the collection (G.1.15.3; cf. also G.1.15.4, De Rossi’s letter to Aurigemma several weeks later, confirming that the museum was still unoccupied by German troops). In the confusion of the German retreat, some soldiers broke all the glass in the guard’s hut on the site, but otherwise German behavior was exemplary, as De Rossi reported to two investigators sent to

\begin{itemize}
\item As is clear from the visitors’ books that are preserved on the site and knowledge of which I have thanks to the kind help of Antonio Muzi, senior guard of the Licenza villa. Signor Muzi recognizes the historical value of the visitors’ books and ensures their safekeeping. From the books, we can see that Hallam occasionally visited the site in the company of family and friends, whom he apparently brought to see the excavation. Visits are recorded for the following dates: 1914 (with Mary Charles, the first woman member of the Royal Institute of British Architects); July 7, 1925; March 13, 1926 (with Russell Meiggs); April 7, 1927 (with Frances Penrose); and April 16, 1929 (with Thomas Ashby).


\item As study of the visitors’ books makes clear.

\item Rocco De Rossi replaced his father, Nicola, as guard of the archaeological site and museum after his father’s retirement.
\end{itemize}
Licenza later in the year by the victorious Allied army (G.1.15.6).

B.4.7. ACTIVITIES FROM 1946-1996

By the late 1940s, the Archaeological Superintendent’s main concern with the Licenza site was to bring to a conclusion Pasqui’s project to expropriate the land of the archaeological park, on which the State had been paying rent since 1911 (cf. G.1.10.10).

Pasqui’s dream was not to be realized for many decades. In the meantime, conditions on the site were slowly worsening, in part from normal wear and tear, and in part from the absence of a fence protecting the ruins.

In 1951, Rocco De Rossi, the son of Nicola and his father’s successor as guard of the archaeological site, wrote to the Superintendent reporting damage to the mosaic in room 1 (G.1.16.2). The Superintendent applied for funds to repair the damage in 1952, and the work was carried out in 1953 (G.1.16.3, G.1.16.4).

Apparently, at the same time or a little later, minor damage to the walls on the site was repaired (cf. G.1.16.7.2, dated May 11, 1957: “…i muri erano stati restaurati da 3 anni….”). In a series of photographs taken in 1955 by Ernest Nash for the Fototeca Unione, we see chickens grazing contentedly on the site; and we also see the first small signs of damage to the restored walls (cf. G.2.8.7). For example, in photograph no. 2719, we see tesserae of opus reticulatum that have fallen off the facing wall and are lying on the ground or atop the walls (fig. 29). In 1956, inspection of the site revealed that the wood covering the mosaics had to be repaired to prevent a recurrence of the problem. The work was carried out the next year (G.1.16.5, G.1.16.6).

At the instance of the Archaeological Superintendency, a training school for the unemployed in the Licenza area was established in 1957-58 with funding from the Ministry of Labor. The goal of the school was to provide work to improve the archaeological site, which was described as “being partially in a state of abandonment” and in need of cleaning and reorganization (G.1.16.7.1). The walls, too, had recently suffered damage in a severe frost that winter (G.1.16.7.2). Adriano La Regina, described as a student of archaeology at the University of Rome, was hired to supervise the work of restoration and, apparently, also to undertake some new excavations (G.1.16.7.5). La Regina—later to rise to the prestigious post of Superintendent of the Archaeological Superintendency of Rome—did not publish an account of his fieldwork, and no documents survive in the archive of the Superintendency to throw light on exactly where he dug and what he found.

Despite the interventions of 1957-58, conditions on the site continued to deteriorate. In 1964, the Superintendency commissioned a series of photographs (SAL negative nos. 20650-51, 20652-53, 20673-75), “to document the dilapidation of the walls,” as the title of the series of photographs states. A report dated September 10, 1965 called for a series of steps to improve the site, including protecting the site with a fence, rebuilding the guardhouse, and restoring the mosaics (G.1.16.8). In the same year, there was another photographic campaign (SAL negative nos. 22794-97, 28985-28996, 30660-30664). Some of the pictures are aptly labeled “muri fatiscenti” (“dilapidated walls”), others “muri in disfacimento” (“walls in a state of decay”; cf. fig. 30). Apparently, the recommendations of the report were carried out, and the site was fenced in for the first time. In late October of 1968, the Superintendent, Pietro Griffi, wrote a report calling for an intense campaign of restoration of the walls on the site (G.1.16.10), and the work can be seen being carried out in a series of pictures (SAL negative nos. I.1614-1634). These are entitled “lavori di manutenzione e restauro,” and, though undated, appear to document Griffi’s project, which presumably started in 1969 and continued for one or more years. In the mid-1970s, a short note about the project was published by Maria Santangelo, an employee of the Archaeological Superintendency.

The photographs confirm the activities reported by Santangelo. She speaks of how “everything brought to light by Pasqui was restored,” including the walls and mosaics, both in the residence and the baths. The mosaics were taken apart and reassembled;
missing parts were supplemented with marble chips inserted into concrete. In the photographs, we see workers repairing the buttresses of 36 (fig. 28), restoring the southern area of the baths (photograph I.1614 [=G.2.8.8.31]), and removing vegetation and humus around the tops of the walls of the pool (25; photographs I.1628-30 [=G.2.8.8.45-47]). In others we see the finished work, including the residence, where the mosaics have been protected with sand, and where the walls look repointed and recapped (photograph I.1623 [=G.2.8.8.40]). But, despite these efforts and Santangelo’s claims in her published report, funds ran out before the work was completed. In 1975, a British magazine published an article lamenting the sad state of the site and surrounding area. The actor Spike Milligan sent a copy of the article to Giovanni Leone, the President of Italy (G.1.16.14). Leone’s office then must have contacted the Superintendency, which sent Maria Santangelo, still its inspector for Licenza, to the site. She reported that the work initiated in the 1960s under Superintendent Griffò was never finished and that her annual request for funds to recap the walls had never been favorably received (G.1.16.15).

As for excavation, this is attested only by Santangelo’s vague concluding comment that “in the southern zone and toward the slopes of Lucretilis a new exploration was conducted to the extreme limit of the state property. From these works it has become clear that access to the villa, up to now unknown, was from the south.”

If, by the mid-1960s, the state of the archaeological site was less than ideal, the state of the Museo Oraziano in the Palazzo Orsini was positively ruinous, and the competent authorities started campaigning for state funds to remedy the situation (cf. G.1.16.9, G.1.16.11, G.1.16.12). In 1977 the Antiquarium in the Palazzo Orsini was restored, as is documented by a series of photographs (photographic archive of the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio, negative nos. A.77.482-492).172 There is no written record of this work, which, judging from the pictures, seems to have involved repairs to the ceiling and windows. But in the next year, the situation worsened when, in early January, 1978, the Antiquarium was twice burgled. In crimes that have never been solved, numerous coins were stolen (G.1.16.17.1, G.1.16.17.2, and cf. Buttrey, D.11) as well as the following items from Lugli’s catalogue: the sculpted fountain mask of a satyr (F1); the female head identified by Lugli as Isis (F2); the statuette of a rabbit with a bunch of grapes (F11); the similar statuette with a rabbit eating a flower or something similar (F12); and a fragmentary inscription (L2).173 According to the records in the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio, a small bust of a young male that has no Lugli catalogue number was also stolen. This was the head found in 1958, not in “Horace’s Villa,” but in the locality known as I Sainesi (G.1.17.3).

Lugli F2 was identified by Helga Herdejürgen as a piece sold to a private party on the German art market, in “Kopien und Serien. Ein arcaistischer Kopftypus neu befragt,” unpublished manuscript, pp. 4-5. Dr. Herdejürgen kindly gave me a copy of her article and was working on a contribution to this volume about all the sculpture from Licenza in Lugli’s catalogue, when she unfortunately died. According to Dr. Herdejürgen, Lugli F2 does not represent the goddess Isis but is a copy of an archaistic type, datable to the Roman period and known from nineteen other examples. The version of the type corresponding to the example from Licenza is characterized by a diadem decorated with rosettes, the upper part of which is composed of lotus buds and palmettes. Most of the versions date to the period of Claudius, but Herdejürgen dates the Licenza example to 30 B.C., influenced undoubtedly by the identification of the villa as Horace’s and by Lugli’s dating of the phase with opus reticulatum to this period. About our piece, Dr. Herdejürgen wrote:

A copy came to light in 1911 in Horace’s Villa. Stolen in 1978 from the Orsini Palace in Licenza, it reemerged on the Göttingen art market and was published without an indication of its true identity (F. Rumscheid, Archäologischer Anzeiger 1992, 83ff, Abb. 1-6). The provenance that was cited (“purchased by a private collector on Rhodes in about the 1830s”) misled scholars. The

172. These photographs are not included in the catalogue (G) because the catalogue covers only documentation of the archaeological site.

posterior of the head is cut away, the side surfaces are lightly finished—a sign that the sculpture may once have stood in front of a wall or a column. 174

In 1981 extensive restorations and some excavations were undertaken on the site. In contrast to La Regina’s and Santangelo’s excavations, this time the written and photographic documentation is relatively full, though nothing was ever published (G.1.16.19). The person in charge was Margherita Bedello, assisted by Adriano D’Offizi.

The notes (G.1.16.19.4) and the final report (G.1.16.19.5) tell us that the work stretched from June 5 to 26, 1981 and from October 12 to November 3, 1981. The site was protected with a fence. Bedello found traces of white and red fresco from the wall at the last stair from the residence in Area 55, where she was working (see De Simone, C.4.6). She also restored rooms 19 and 20 in the residence. The pool (25) was cleared of weeds and damage to the walls was documented. The western section was restored; on the north, Bedello noted that some of the wall had fallen into the structure, which she documented. On the interior of the walls of 25 she noted no evidence of plaster, and this led her to wonder about the use of the structure.

Other photographs show additional restorations not mentioned in Bedello’s surviving fieldnotes (photographic archive of SAL, “Licenza. Villa d’Orazio, Scavi 1981,” negative nos. 441-451 “visita preliminare agli scavi” [Febbraio 1981; G.2.8.8.77-87]; a-81-656-665, “lavori di restauro e consolidamento di strutture murarie,” [no date; G.2.8.8.88-96]; a-81-676-679, “restauri dei muri disfacenti,” [no date; G.2.8.8.97-100]; 2141-2161, “scavi 1981,” [July; G.2.8.8.101-121]). The date of the fourth series appears to contradict the written record of Bedello, unless it can be taken as evidence that her fieldnotes are incomplete or partially missing, or else that the photographs are wrongly dated. The first three series simply document the condition of the walls before restoration. The areas photographed are in the general vicinity of 5, 21, 33, 35, 53, and 55. The fourth series starts with the area at the bottom of the stairs from the residence into the east corridor of the quadruporius, where Bedello’s notes record the find of fresco fragments (SAL, negative nos. 2141-2144; G.2.8.8.101-104). It continues with some shots of the structure crossing the corridor at the north end of Area 55 (SAL, negative nos. 2145-2146; G.2.8.8.105-106), and then with shots showing the results of digging farther south in the same corridor (SAL, negative nos. 2147-2152; G.2.8.8.107-112). Finally, there is a series of pictures of work in the area of the pool, particularly (as far as one can make out) around the fallen north wall (structure 25; SAL, negative nos. 2153-2161; G.2.2.8.113-121).


These pictures attest a campaign of cleaning in Areas 35, 37-40 (fig. 31), and 50, with removal of the surface soil to expose the top level of ruins, now visible for the first time on record at the site (SAL, negative nos. a83-243 to a83-257 [=G.2.8.8.132-146]). A number of photographs (SAL, negative nos. a83-409 to a83-419 [=G.2.8.8.155-165]; a83-1107 to a83-1113 [=G.2.8.8.199-205]) clearly show the fistula in Area 50 that was studied more intensively in 1997-1999 (see Camaiani et al., C.5.4, activity 34). This was the

one, modest excavation undertaken in 1983, as far as can be judged from the photographs. The main effort seems to have gone into capping (or, in the case of the walls uncovered earlier in the century, recapping) the walls exposed in these areas and throughout the bath complex to its southern limit at 53 (cf. SAL, negative nos. a83-612 to a83-620 [=G.2.8.8.166-174]; a83-622 to a83-629 [=G.2.8.8.176-183]; a83-818 to a83-839 [=G.2.8.8.184-198], which show the walls with cleanly capped tops).

In 1987, a fire swept the area to the southwest of the site, destroying a section of the fence protecting the archaeological park, but otherwise causing no damage to the ruins themselves (G.1.16.20).

In the late 1980s, the situation changed dramatically as the authorities began to prepare for the celebration of the bimillennium of the death of Horace in 1993. The old Antiquarium, dating back to Pasqui’s day and, as we have seen, largely neglected since then, was completely renovated and enlarged. The first step in the project occurred in 1988 when the town of Licenza purchased rooms in the Orsini Palace for the museum (G.1.16.21). Additional funding was contributed by the Superintendency (documentation is lacking in the archive of SAL), and the project was successfully completed in time for the bimillennial celebrations in 1993. The new Antiquarium opened to the public on April 19 of that year. Two series of photographs in the archive of the Archaeological Superintendency record the work in progress inside and outside the Palazzo Orsini (SAL, negative nos. a90-286 to a90-305 and a93-278 to a93-302). The first room contains maps of the territory reflecting the various periods of ancient occupation. In the next room are displayed fistulae, pottery, and instrumenta domestica. In the third room are fragments of sculpture and architectonic elements in marble. The fourth room contains the fresco fragments. Well illuminated, open to the public six days of the week, the new museum represents a notable improvement over the old, especially since the objects are clearly labeled and the site with its surrounding territory is well described.

On the occasion of the opening of the museum, the Superintendency published a volume of new studies on the site; and a scholarly conference was held, whose acts were published shortly thereafter. By 1993, then, there were encouraging signs that the remains of “Horace’s Villa” were finally receiving the care and attention they deserved.

As this book is being prepared for publication, a new project to restore the remains on the site is in progress under the technical leadership of Alessandra Centroni and the scientific supervision of Maria Grazia Fiore. Work commenced in 2005 and is extending into 2006. Thus far, the focus has been on recapping and repointing the walls as well as repaving the floors.

---

175. These photographs are not included in the catalogue (G) because the catalogue covers only documentation of the archaeological site.
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B.5. BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THOMAS DREES PRICE

BY KATHRYN GLEASON

In 1929, the Director of the American Academy in Rome, Gorham P. Stevens, reported that the Italian authorities had offered the Academy and other foreign schools “the opportunity of excavating in ancient Roman lands, including the Kingdom of Italy, and the possibility of apprenticing our Fellows in the classics to Italian archaeologists engaged in the work of actual excavations.” The news was welcome but the Fellows in archaeology were committed to other projects, and so it was the Fellows in the School of Fine Arts who first responded to the opportunity. In 1930, Thomas Price, a landscape architect, collaborated with Giuseppe Lugli on a small excavation at “Horace’s Villa,” while architect Walter R. Reichardt worked with Prof. Gioacchino Mancini, Director of the excavations at Hadrian’s Villa.

Price’s publication of his work in the Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, while not an excavation report per se, provides the only published report on the joint project, with photographs, a revised plan, and a reconstruction of the villa. After publishing this report and a reconstruction of the House of Lucius Tiburtinus at Pompeii, Price seems to have vanished from notice; his name is not among the more familiar ones of the Academy nor is his portrait on the wall of the Bar. Yet he went on to create notable works of landscape architectural design in the 1930s, drawing on his experiences at the American Academy, and perhaps on his work at “Horace’s Villa” as well.

The following biography offers a sketch of the career of this talented designer, and of the education and skills that lie behind his published work in archaeology. His “disappearance” was simply into the little celebrated profession of landscape architecture. Yet there is much we may note in his work. Price was a participant, if not a leader, in the fascinating transitional years between the École des Beaux Arts training and Modernism at the Academy and in the profession of landscape architecture. His professional work included designs in both the classical and modern traditions, usually collaborative efforts, including the Conservatory Garden in Central Park (with M. Betty Sprout and Gilmore Clarke) and the gardens of the Brazil Pavilion for the 1939 World’s Fair (with Oscar Neimeyer, Roberto Burle Marx and Lucio Costa). He had a long career with the architectural firm of Voorhees, Walker, Smith, Smith and Haines in New York. He retired in 1972 and died in Denver, Colorado in 1989.

Thomas Drees Price was born May 18, 1901 in Porto Alegre, Brazil. His parents, John W. and Elisabeth Wittmann Price, were American Methodist missionaries teaching school in the region of Rio Grande do Sul. Price and his two sisters and brother were all born and raised there; Thomas, the second eldest, left at age sixteen to stay with his grandparents in Denver, where, in the spring of 1918, he attempted to enlist in the Army. Too young for the draft in that year, Price fell victim to the great influenza epidemic of 1918. After recovering, he went to Columbus, Ohio to work at his maternal uncle’s brass foundry and to attend Ohio State University for study in animal husbandry. According to his sister, he hoped to return to Brazil and start a ranch.

The author was very fortunate to have been able to meet and discuss Price’s life with Mrs. Elisabeth Gorsuch, Thomas Price’s sister, in Denver shortly before her death. She lived in the house where Price lived his last years, and his room remained much as he had always had it. It attests to the enduring significance of the Academy years and the friends he made there. Her son, John Gorsuch, who is in possession of most of Price’s personal archives, has continued to be of great assistance. Price’s drawings are with his brother’s family in Rio de Janeiro. Thomas Price’s second cousin, Mrs. Josephine Coblentz, who knew him during the many years of his career in New York, offered a very helpful understanding of his temperament as a designer and his general outlook on his career.

Once at university, however, his drawing talents proved greater than his aptitude for scientific study, and by the end of his first year his transcripts note that he had transferred into the landscape architecture program. We have very little information on his college years, except that he belonged to the Tau Sigma Alpha fraternity and worked at his uncle’s foundry. His uncle was to be a great support to him in the following years. Price’s knowledge and appreciation of metal work gained from his uncle is evident later in his travel sketchbooks and his interest in ironwork trellis and balustrade designs. In 1923, just short of graduation, Price moved to Cambridge, Massachusetts, and completed the course work for his degree at the Harvard Graduate School of Design. He transferred the credits to receive the degree from OSU, and then stayed on to complete the Master of Landscape Architecture Degree from Harvard, graduating in 1926.¹

Price’s education in the profession of landscape architecture fell during the waning years of the “Country Place Era.” His academic training was founded upon a classical education and instruction in the method of the École des Beaux Arts in Paris, where many designers had received their training prior to the founding of schools of architecture in the United States during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁷ At Harvard, Price was hard working and skillful, entering and winning the major student competitions of the day. The Charles Eliot Traveling Fellowship, for example, was awarded to him by competition on the basis of a history examination and a design project. He received two honorable mentions in the Rome Prize Competitions, and, in 1929, he was awarded the Prize for his solution to that year’s design problem, “An Estate on a Private Island” (fig. 1). These competitions tested the students on their knowledge of history as well as for their ability to produce excellent designs in the classical manner.

By the time of his Rome Prize Award, Price had graduated from Harvard and was working for the preeminent firm of Olmsted Brothers in Brookline, Massachusetts. The firm’s records indicate that he worked primarily on campuses and private residences. The firm was noted for its attention to detail, an aspect that also characterized the educational program at Harvard (much shaped by members of the Olmsted Office), and, ultimately, Price’s own work and focus as a member of collaborative teams. Price appears to have brought to the American Academy a considerable professional knowledge of site grading and construction detailing, as well as an interest in classical design for private residences, public parks, and campuses.⁸ The interest in private residential design is also clearly evident in his travel itineraries, sketchbooks, and choice of projects at the American Academy.⁹

In September of 1929, Price arrived in Rome as the first Kate Lancaster Brewster Fellow in Landscape Architecture¹⁰ (fig. 2). Like most Fellows, he spent a great deal of the first year traveling. The fall tours with the Professor of Classical Studies included “Horace’s Villa,” which may have led Price to select this site for his required second year project. This, however, did not begin immediately. His first measured drawing project was the Villa Aldobrandini, and the winter months of that year were devoted the notorious Collaborative Project, “A Monument to Mechanical Progress.” This was a highly contentious exercise in which the fellows sought to explore modern ideas of design, only to find themselves in conflict with

5. School of Landscape Architecture, Register 1925-26; the diploma is in Price’s personal records.
7. Admission to Ohio State University, for example, presumed an entrance record of “English, History/Civics, Mathematics, Science, Latin (Grammar, Caesar, Cicero, Virgil, and Ovid), and Greek (Grammar, Xenophon and Homer) German, French and/or Spanish.” Ohio State University Transcript Forms, 1918-23.
8. This conclusion is based upon the frequency of projects in the job records provided by the Olmsted Archives. I have not had the opportunity to examine any plans first hand.
9. Price’s sister noted that, until his retirement, his hands never actually touched the dirt of a garden, and photographs suggest that this was also true at “Horace’s Villa,” where his role was clearly that of the surveyor/landscape architect.
10. This was the first of shorter Fellowships, two rather than three years. Price would be granted a third year on the basis of his excellent productivity.
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of the Trustees, who insisted upon classical solutions, despite the nature of the design problem.11

In October 1930, Price set out to measure the ruins of “Horace’s Villa” as one of the measured drawings required by his fellowship. Encountering difficulty in drawing the remains of the unexcavated northeast corner of the villa, Price joined forces with Giuseppe Lugli.12 The project was conducted in cooperation with the Italian authorities under the sponsorship of the American Academy in Rome with funding from the Bethlehem, Pennsylvania chapter of the Archaeological Institute of America.13 The Soprintendenza provided excavation equipment and engaged, supervised, and paid the workmen. The Academy provided the funds for hiring the workers, at 56 cents for an eight hour day.

On November 17, 1930 they began excavations, which continued until poor weather forced them to stop in the last week of December. When the weather halted the work, Price returned to the Academy and prepared drawings and a model of the existing ruins of “Horace’s Villa” as one of the measured drawings required by his fellowship. Encountering difficulty in drawing the remains of the unexcavated northeast corner of the villa, Price joined forces with Giuseppe Lugli. The project was conducted in cooperation with the Italian authorities under the sponsorship of the American Academy in Rome with funding from the Bethlehem, Pennsylvania chapter of the Archaeological Institute of America. The Soprintendenza provided excavation equipment and engaged, supervised, and paid the workmen. The Academy provided the funds for hiring the workers, at 56 cents for an eight hour day.

On November 17, 1930 they began excavations, which continued until poor weather forced them to stop in the last week of December. When the weather halted the work, Price returned to the Academy and prepared drawings and a model of the existing

conditions at the site.14 He also participated in the second collaborative problem, “A Small Museum for Classical Renaissance Sculpture on the Estate of a Wealthy Collector.” While the result of the overall Collaborative Exercise was dismal, Price’s team appears to have been close-knit; indeed, his teammate David Mattison painted Price’s portrait with the ruins of “Horace’s Villa” and Licenza in the background (fig. 3). Excavations resumed in late February and continued through mid-March of 1931. In photographs taken during the work, we see Price, in his suit and tie, observing the excavation work and showing the excavations to visiting Fellows from the Academy (fig. 4).

The “Horace’s Villa” team consisted of eleven workers under the supervision of Nicola De Rossi, who had worked on the Pasqui excavations of 1911-14. Areas totaling 570 square yards were staked out and the men were divided into two squads to excavate. The photographs and plans provide additional details (fig. 10). It appears from these documents that all areas of interest were opened at once. The foreman and eight workers excavated the northeast quadriporticus, but their number diminished to six as they reached the center of the east range of the quadriporticus. Five men excavated the north side of the pool and various workers opened small test areas around the quadriporticus. On their return in March, the squads simply resumed excavation in those areas. Restoration of walls appears to have taken place sometime during 1932.

11. F. Yegül, Gentlemen of Instinct and Breeding (Oxford 1991) 88. As a side note, it is clear that Price was solidly of the middle class, as were quite a few other Fellows at the Academy during that time. His uncle provided some assistance for travel, but in many ways, Price was simply talented and fortunate to have had such a good situation at the beginning of the Great Depression. All correspondence located to date in the records of the Academy, Harvard, and the Olmsted Brothers concern his debts, both for travel and for excavation expenses. In photographs, however, he appears smartly turned out and urbane: his family explained that white linen suits were worn by every man in Brazil in the hot summers there, and wool suits were required for any man’s position at work in the 1920s. His sister says that, while at Harvard, he had exchanged design work for new suits during his fellowship travels to South and Central America.

12. Price, 137.


14. Price’s own photographs record the process of making the model. Funds for the creation of the model were unsuccessfully sought from the Bethlehem AIA Chapter (Stevens-Wright letter of 1932, as n. 13). Stevens later offered copies of the model to universities at cost, $25.10 (Stevens 1931-32, 23). From Stevens’ report, it appears that only the University of Michigan purchased a copy, but there is no record of the model there today.

15. De Rossi’s son, Rocco, became the custodian of the site in the 1950s and 1960s. Nicola De Rossi wrote to Price in July 1933 to say that Rocco had named his son Orazio.

16. Stevens 1931-1932, 25 reports that, by the end of the project, twenty thousand cubic feet of soil had been removed.
The photographs of the excavations are the primary record of what was accomplished in the two phases of work, which, as Price notes, focused on the northeast area of the quadriporticus and the northern side and northeast corner of the central pool.\textsuperscript{17} Test soundings were carried out throughout the site, either to check theories or to take measurements. It appears that the team did the initial work on the first areas of interest in the fall, returning in the spring to resume work in areas that had proven promising in the first season, or to answer questions that were raised. In the photographs we can see that the northeast quadriporticus was cleared in the drier months of early fall. The soils of the baulk and on the paths are dry (fig. 5). As work moved south, the weather clearly worsened. The small niched pool in the center of the east range of the quadriporticus appears to have been found after the rains, either later in the first campaign or during the second. It is photographed with standing water and wet soils (fig. 6). All four piers of the pool appear in Price’s initial sketches, which were prepared during the winter, so we must conclude that some work was carried out in the pool area during the autumn as well. It appears that this was done after some rain, but it is difficult to judge from the black and white photos—there was apparently enough sun to dry the paths out.

Price does not offer details of the excavation, referring the reader to the photographic plates. The specific discoveries in the quadriporticus and around the pool are discussed elsewhere in this volume (see Gleason et al., C.3). Price summarizes the results of the work as 1) providing new evidence for the manner in which the quadriporticus meets the residence at the northeast corner, although the steps appear to have been located earlier by Pasqui; 2) locating the two piers on the north side of the pool, predicted by Lugli; and 3) gleaning more information about the facades of the quadriporticus facing the garden (fig. 10). Price writes:

This enterprise has amply repaid our efforts by its results since...it unexpectedly furnished a clue to the treatment of the facades of the porticus that faced the garden. The uncovering of an opening, n, in the northeast corner of the porticus, another opening, o, and the beginning of a third opening, p, established the presumption that such openings were repeated around the porticus. The corresponding wall on the opposite side of the garden did not at first sight confirm this, since this wall as restored by the former excavator is continuous.... But since the size and position of the small pilasters which decorated the walls on either side of the garden are symmetrical, the architectural treatment of the two walls must, one would presume, have been identical; this is an alternating treatment of door and solid wall, both between pilasters. And in fact confirmation was forthcoming when we looked below the restored portion. At a level just above the substructure, the cornerstone of most of the openings were found in situ at g, h, and i. This evidence, supported by that furnished by a portion of the wall at f, not only conclusively reveals the principal architectural elements of the facade of the porticus, but also demonstrates that the restored wall in the northwest corner of the garden is not in accordance with the original layout.\textsuperscript{18}

Price’s reconstruction drawings (figs. 11 and 12), though fanciful in their depiction of the garden, presents the team’s conclusions about the architectural façade as described above, based both on their findings and on digging around the restored walls of Pasqui’s 1911-14 excavations. Their work, a new reading of the evidence, thus revised and corrected earlier conceptions about the quadriporticus.

\textsuperscript{17} Many of the significant photographs are published in Price’s report in the Memoirs. His archives contain an important album of photographs taken during the excavation, mainly of walls and miscellaneous artifacts and architectural fragments. If important sculpture, pottery or other finds were discovered, they are not discussed in either Price’s report or in his archives. He did have a sample of window pane glass analyzed. The report is in the archives at the American Academy in Rome.

\textsuperscript{18} Price, 137.
The project concluded with restoration of the walls exposed. This was apparently carried out in 1932 with support from the Director’s Fund of the American Academy, under the direction of Lugli and Nicola De Rossi.19

The American Academy viewed the project as a promising beginning to collaborative projects “… in Italy and Italian provinces but also in practically the entire Mediterranean basin,” according to Stevens’ glowing conclusion to the Annual Report of 1931-32. Price himself was granted another year on his fellowship based upon the success of the “Horace’s Villa” project and drawings, which were displayed at the Exhibition of Italian Gardens at the Palazzo Vecchio, Florence.20 Amedeo Maiuri, the Archaeological Superintendent of Pompeii, granted him a permesso to prepare drawings and a brief publication of the House of Loreius Tiburtinus at Pompeii for the American Academy in Rome.21

On his return to the United States, Price’s connections to the American Academy served him well. After a brief stay in Cambridge, Massachusetts and work at a CCC Camp, Price went to the New York Parks Department, working under Gilmore Clarke, who had become a Trustee of the American Academy during Price’s second year. Clarke may have also nominated him for membership in the American Society of Landscape Architects and the Architectural League of New York, societies in which he would be active all of his years in practice.

At the Arsenal, Price joined a huge team of designers creating simple, formal designs and redesigns for Robert Moses’ new vision of New York’s park system.

He appears to have worked closely with Gilmore Clarke, first on the Central Park Zoo, then on Madison Square Park. The latter was a redesign of the earlier informal layout in a formal geometric design that caused considerable concern in the community, as the artist’s rendering appeared to suggest the removal of many mature trees. Newspapers indicated that the general design was made by Gilmore Clarke, while Price worked out the detailed plan.22

In 1934, Price, again with Gilmore Clarke representing the project publicly, worked on the design team for the Conservatory Gardens in Central Park, one of the few geometric spaces in the Park, built on the site of the demolished conservatory. Plans indicate that M. Betty Sprout designed the lovely and extensive planting scheme which was the main theme of this part of the park; Price is credited with the “design” in later years, when the gardens were restored.23 Price was not a planting designer, so it is likely that he designed the garden’s terraces and structures, the formal stage for the display of plants and art. It is not clear whether

---

20. This important exhibition is currently being studied by Claudia Lazzaro, who is examining the ways in which the Renaissance garden was reinterpreted during the Fascist period, a study that illuminates the ways in which Price went on to design during the rest of his career. On the participation of the Fellows, see Stevens 1931-32, 27. Price kept newspaper clippings of the event.
22. Unidentifiable newspaper clipping in Price’s personal collection: “Plans for Park in Madison Square are Defended…Designer Denies Area will be Too Stiff and Formal.” Clarke is quoted as saying that “Mr. Price was a graduate in landscape architecture at the American Academy in Rome, and, therefore, the plans were not drawn by a mere T-square pusher, as some of the complaintants have charged.”
23. Geraldine Weinstein, in “The Conservatory Gardens: Landscape Restoration in an Urban Environment,” Newsletter of the Horticultural Society of New York (May-June 1979) 1-3, at 2, attributes the design of the gardens to Price. Price’s records contain a newspaper clipping of the initial announcement by Gilmore Clarke of construction of the park (“Four Acres Garden Plan for Park,” unidentified New York newspaper, Wednesday, July 10, 1935). In it, he defines two aspects of the park: its flower gardens, and the construction of three levels of terraces to keep the present grade of the site intact. There is also a letter from Sally Meyer, Chairman of New York Committee of the Garden Club of America to Thomas Price, in which she indicates that Richard Webel has provided the contact. Price was sent invitations and brochures for the opening events on June 22, 1982, and photographs afterwards, as he was too ill to make the trip.
Clarke, Sprout or Price did the conceptual design individually, or if it was a collaboration. In the trellis work, fences and balustrades, one sees Price’s skills with metal work, while his attention to the design of wellheads for the fountain base reflects his interest in such features, as seen in his sketchbooks and in an article written for Landscape Architecture Magazine (figs. 7 and 8).

According to Price’s family, the pinnacle of his design career was the 1939 World’s Fair. As a member of the staff of the 1939 World’s Fair Commission, Price was responsible for bringing Lucio Costa’s conceptual sketch for the Brazil Pavilion into detailed design and implementation. This is one of the great early Modern designs. While it was certainly a departure from anything Price had designed himself, and Roberto Burle Marx appears to have played a role that is yet to be documented, it is clear that Price’s fluency in Portuguese, his exposure to Modern design, and his talent gave him the role of translating the concept sketches into the beautifully crafted built piece. The American Academy in Rome, in a brochure celebrating the role of the Academy’s Fellows at the Fair, credits Price with the landscape of the Brazil Pavilion, but the brochure does not provide details (fig. 9).

After the World’s Fair, interrupted only by service as a translator during World War II, Price spent the rest of his career in New York working for the Fair’s main architects (Vorhees, Walker, Smith, Smith and Haines), creating clean, simple, well-detailed Modern landscapes for the firm’s building projects in the United States and Central America. In 1960, he returned to the American Academy and to visit Licenza. It was his first and only trip to Europe after his Fellowship. In 1972, he retired to Denver.

Price’s career had been marked by skill and hard work, good fortune in his youth, and a kind of solid Welsh work ethic through his later years. Price, says Domenico Anese, who worked for Gilmore Clarke and knew Price over the course of their careers, was “a designer’s designer.” Price was a talented designer of the “bones” of a project—the three-dimensional, built aspects of landscape architecture—and very fine with details. He was an amiable man who worked well with other designers, but he never made an effort to promote his own career or design approach.

Clearly, his career in an architecture firm never brought the acclaim that his youthful projects had, nor the satisfaction. His home was decorated with his portrait at Licenza, a spectacular engraving of St. Peter’s by Cecil Briggs, his diplomas from Harvard, Peter’s by Cecil Briggs, this sash), a Cave Canem tile from Pompeii, ironwork pieces from various countries, and other mementos of his days at Harvard, in Rome, and at Licenza. His huge drawings done at the American Academy were kept, carefully rolled up. All had been published in black and white in the Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, although they were originally in color. The drawings were left to his great-nephew, Henrique Price Grecchi, an architect in Rio de Janeiro, who has kindly provided the images published here (figs. 10-12). Thomas Drees Price died in 1989 and is buried facing the mountains in Fort Logan National Cemetery in Denver.

---

24. Price is listed as a “Designer—Landscape” in the Official Guide Book: New York World’s Fair 1939 (New York 1939) 182, and as a member of the World’s Fair Corporation in the professional supplement to Landscape Architecture Magazine (Spring/Summer 1938) 34. He was invited to the opening of the Brazil Pavilion and the Portuguese Pavilion, and to related events sponsored by the Embassies of those countries. Lucio Costa prepared the conceptual plan for the Brazil Pavilion. However, the scheme has all the hallmarks of Roberto Burle Marx, who was at the time a young protégé of Costa, working with Costa and Neimeyer on the Ministry of Education in Rio de Janeiro. Marx is credited by Lionello Puppi, Oscar Neimeyer: 1907 (Rome 1996) 196, as the designer for the Brazil Pavilion’s gardens, but further work in the Marx archives is needed to clarify the relationships. Marx never mentions this design in his publications, nor do most of his biographers. The author welcomes any knowledge others may have on this matter.

25. R. Walker, Ralph Walker, Architect (New York 1957) 107. The firm today is HLC, which was not able to grant us access to their archives. It is not possible at this time to attribute any particular projects to Price.
B.5. BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THOMAS DREES PRICE
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By Bernard Frischer, Stefano Camaiani, Monica De Simone

The new research project at “Horace’s Villa” took place between 1997 and 2003 thanks to the fruitful collaboration between the Soprintendenza Archeologica del Lazio, the American Academy in Rome, the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA), and the Comune of Licenza. The goals of the project are discussed elsewhere in this volume (see Frischer, A).

C.1.1. Organization

The Scientific Committee overseeing the project was composed of Dr. Anna Maria Reggiani (SAL), Dr. Maria Grazia Fiore (SAL), and Prof. Bernard Frischer (UCLA). The principal investigator of the project was Prof. Bernard Frischer, who conceived the project, found institutional sponsorship and financial support, set the research agenda, recruited the staff and volunteers, and administered the project both during the fieldwork and study phases. Co-principal investigator was Prof. Kathryn Gleason, who was responsible for the excavation of the garden. Field directors were Dr. Gianni Ponti (1997-1999) and Dr. Monica De Simone (2000-2001).

C.1.2. Sponsors

The project was originally to be sponsored from 1997 to its expected completion date in 2000 by the Vincenzo Romagnoli Group (Milan and Rome, Italy). With the death on November 4, 1999 of Vincenzo Romagnoli, the owner of the company, this sponsorship had to be terminated early. In February and March of 2000, the Steinmetz Family of Los Angeles and the Samuel H. Kress Foundation agreed to replace the Romagnoli Group as the project’s prime sponsors. In 1997-1998, Alitalia kindly provided transportation for senior staff from Los Angeles to Rome. The Comune of Licenza co-sponsored the new site presentation scheme that was implemented in 2001. The Creative Kids Education Foundation of Los Angeles donated funds to create a Web site and a documentary about the project.

Institutional sponsors included the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio (1997-2003); the American Academy in Rome (1997-2003); the University of California, Los Angeles (2000-2003); University of California Research Expeditions Program (1999); and the Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities at the University of Virginia (2004-2006).

C.1.3. Staff and Volunteers

An international team of archaeologists was responsible for the various excavations, coordination of the graphic and photographic documentation, running of the laboratory, management of the data processing workshop, and analysis of the finds. Over

1. Bernard Frischer wrote sections C.1.1-C.1.4, C.1.6, and C.1.8; Stefano Camaiani gave input to section C.1.5, to which Bernard Frischer also contributed and which he finalized; Monica De Simone wrote section C.1.7. Gianni Ponti was invited to contribute to this chapter, but, unfortunately, the report had to go to press before the input we requested had been received.

2. A full list of collaborators, in alphabetical order, follows: Dean Abernathy (architecture); Claudia Angelelli (ceramics, floor and wall marbles, site presentation); Pati Armenian (photography); Christer Bruun (water pipes); Theodore Buttry (coins); Stefano Camaiani (trench supervision; information management); Maureen Carroll (territorial survey); Laura Cerri (trench supervision); Michael Charles (territorial survey); Peter Chowne (prospection); Linda Clougherty (registration of finds); Monica Cola (survey and mapping); Francesca Colosi (GPS survey and mapping); Jane Crawford (editing of reports, registration of finds); Luisa Del Giudice (folklore); Monica De Simone (conservation, field direction, wall analysis, trench supervision, site presentation, editing of reports); Giorgio Filippi (analysis of rooftiles and bricks); John Foss (geology and soils); Roberto Gabrielli (GPS survey and mapping); Martin Goalen (site presentation); Maximilian Goriany (mortar analysis, trench supervision); Ali Ait Kaci (trench supervision); Steven Lattimore (analysis of sculpture); Elizabeth Macaulay (garden finds); Valerie Magarian (illustration); Zacaria Mari (trench supervision, photography); Archer Martin (metal objects); William McCann (geomagnetic prospection); Colin Merrony (territorial survey);
seventy volunteers from twelve countries came to the site from 1997 to 2001; without their generosity, effort, and talent, the project would not have been possible (figs. 1-2).

Special thanks should be given to the following scholars, who visited the site and made gave advice helpful in interpretation of the finds: Susan Downey, Elisabeth Fentress, Cairoli Fulvio Giuliani, Daniele Manacorda, Giuseppe Pucci, Peter Rockwell, and Russell Scott.

The professional staff had the following responsibilities:

1997 (3-week season)

Architectural Analysis: J. Burden
Ceramic Analysis: S. Serra
Excavation: S. Nerucci, S. Camaiani, Z. Mari (Areas 50, 51); L. Cerri, A. A. Kaci (rooms 37-40); L. Passalacqua (Area 54)
Information Management: L. Passalacqua, S. Camaiani
Photographic Documentation: Z. Mari
Prospection (resistivity and magnetometry): S. Veronese
Registration: L. Clougherty
Web site authoring: B. Frischer, M. Brown

1998 (6-week season)

Ceramic Analysis: S. Serra
Conservation: Murat Yasar
Excavation: S. Camaiani, A. A. Kaci (rooms 37-40); L. Cerri (Areas 24, 50); S. Nerucci, M. De Simone (Area 23); K. Gleason (Area 24); L. Passalacqua (Areas 25, 55)
Information Management: L. Passalacqua, S. Camaiani
Photographic Documentation: S. Camaiani, L. Cerri, S. Nerucci, M. De Simone, K. Gleason, L. Passalacqua
Registration: L. Clougherty, J. Crawford
Soil and Geological Analysis: J. Foss
Territorial Survey: M. Carroll, C. Merrony, M. Charles
Tree Inventory and Evaluation: I. Lekstutis
Web site authoring: B. Frischer

2002: David Carlisle, John Gilbert, Katia Schörle.

3. We are happy to thank the following volunteers:

1997: Max Brown, Jeffrey Burden, George Fort.
2001: Jennifer Carey, Kelly Hall, Lauren Ianiro, Eleanor Murphy, Robinson Reynolds, Charlie Steinmetz, Laura Steinmetz, Ann Tonkin, Tony Tonkin.
2002: David Carlisle, John Gilbert, Katia Schörle.

1999 (10-week season)

Architectural Analysis: D. Abernathy, P. Stinson
Ceramic Analysis: C. Angelelli
Conservation: M. Yasar
Excavation: K. Gleason (Areas 24, 25); S. Camaiani, L. Cerri, L. Passalacqua (Areas 35, 37-40, 50); M. De Simone (Area 23); L. Passalacqua (Area 55)
Information Management: L. Passalacqua, S. Camaiani
Marble Analysis: C. Angelelli
Mosaic Analysis: K. Werner
Numismatic Analysis: T. Buttrey
Photographic Documentation: M. De Simone, A. Ortolan
Registration: J. Crawford
Sculptural Studies: S. Lattimore
Site Presentation Studies: M. Goalen, D. Fortenberry
Soil and Geological Analysis: J. Foss
Wall Census: M. De Simone
Web site authoring: B. Frischer

2000 (3-week season)

Architectural Analysis: D. Abernathy, P. Stinson
Architectural Terracotta Studies: M. J. Strazzulla
Archival Research: K. Werner
Ceramic Analysis: C. Angelelli
Conservation: H. Leshem (PRS-Mediterranean)
Excavation: K. Gleason (Area 24), J. Schryver (Area 25), M. De Simone (Area 50)
Folklore Studies: L. Del Giudice
Geomagnetic Prospection: P. Chowne, W. McCann (Genius Locii)
GPS Mapping: F. Colosi, R. Gabrieli
Historical Consulting: V. Rudich
Information Management: S. Camaiani
Marble Analysis: C. Angelelli
Metallic Object Analysis: A. Martin
Mosaic Analysis: K. Werner
Numismatic Analysis: T. Buttrey
Palaeobotanical Studies: J. Ramsay
Photographic Documentation: M. De Simone, A. Ortolan
Registration: J. Crawford
Sculptural Studies: S. Lattimore
Site Presentation Studies: M. Goalen, D. Fortenberry
Soil and Geological Analysis: J. Foss
Stamps on Bricks and Roof-tiles: G. Filippi
Wall Census: M. De Simone
Web site authoring: B. Frischer

2001 (3-week season)

Archival Research: K. Werner
Ceramic Analysis: C. Angelelli
Conservation: M. De Simone
Excavation: M. De Simone (Area 12)
Folklore Studies: L. Del Giudice
Historical Consulting: V. Rudich
Information Management: S. Camaiani (data processing workshop)
Metallic Object Analysis: A. Martin
Registration: J. Crawford
Site Presentation Plan and Implementation: M. De Simone, C. Angelelli
Soil and Geological Analysis: J. Foss
Stamps on Bricks and Roof-tiles: G. Filippi
Wall Census: M. De Simone
Web site authoring: B. Frischer

2002-2003 (Study seasons totaling 24 weeks)

Editor-in-chief: B. Frischer
Editorial Board: J. Crawford, M. De Simone

C.1.4. Research issues, methods, and strategy

From the first, this project was conceived as an interdisciplinary research project with many facets. The prime focus was, of course, on archaeological investigation, in which the method of stratigraphic excavation, increasingly common in Italy and elsewhere, was to be used on the site for the first

---

4. On the diffusion of the stratigraphic method in Italy after the exposure of Italian archaeologists to it during the UNESCO-sponsored excavations of Carthage, see A. Carandini, *Storie dalla terra.*
In applying the method, we wished to give pride of place to no particular period (as had been done earlier, with the privileging of the late Republican and mid-imperial phases) but to pay equal attention to all remains coming to light from virgin soil to surface humus. An important second focus was on the previous interventions and excavations, particularly those of Pasqui (1911-14) and Lugli-Price (1930-31), to see if more information could be collected than is available from published sources. We also wished to integrate the new finds of 1997-2001 with the older discoveries, and we wanted to subject the finds, old and new, to the first expert analysis ever performed on material from the site. We were interested in a number of questions that inevitably arise for a site such as this: the history of its ownership (including, of course, the matter of Horace’s connection to the property); the history of its occupation, abandonment and reuse through the centuries; and the degree to which features of this particular site reflect broader regional trends in the Anio valley and the Roman hinterland generally. Finally, we wished to determine the extent to which new discoveries could still be made on the site. We hoped to lay the foundation for new fieldwork by other excavators in the future, and to provide raw materials for further analytical studies (for example, about the design, decoration, and use of the villa in the various phases of its existence), which might be more readily undertaken by other scholars after all the disparate materials of earlier excavations and our own were organized, synthesized, and presented in a coherent and manageable fashion.

C.1.5. ArCHAeoloGiCAl strAteGy

The original plan was to excavate for three seasons (1997-1999) and to study the results in two seasons (2000-2001). In the event, the need and opportunity arose for two additional short seasons of fieldwork in 2000-2001, and so the study seasons were postponed until 2002-2003.

In the course of 25 weeks spread out over the five seasons, an overall surface area of almost 600 square meters was studied with the help of teams composed of 10-15 people, generally a mix of professional archaeologists and volunteers with little or no previous field experience (fig. 3). Considering both the scientific and didactic aspects of the excavation, the ratio of time devoted to excavation and the area studied is extremely favorable, taking into account not only the stratigraphic complexity of a site characterized by a long succession of settlements, but also the thickness of the deposits, which varied between 40-50 centimeters and 1.5-2 meters.

While excavations were underway, the process of documenting, analyzing, and restoring the finds through laboratory work was carried out (fig. 4). An information management system capable of handling all the excavation data was created, and this greatly facilitated the cataloguing of the considerable quantity of data accumulated in the course of the fieldwork.

The first season lasted only three weeks and had the goals of orienting the team to the site, testing the hypothesis that good ancient stratigraphy was still to be found there, and providing the kind of graphic documentation that would be useful as the project continued. The Superintendency’s state plan of 1993 was scrutinized and determined to have some significant flaws (see Colosi et al., E.5). A new zero point was established, and a survey was made, based on the use of a laser theodolite, preparatory to the creation of a new, more accurate state plan. Close study of the site revealed that the most promising area for undisturbed ancient stratigraphy lay on the western side of the site in the area of the baths (Areas 35, 37-40, 50). The hillside abutting this area was cleaned and studied. Excavation was concentrated in an area we denominated Sector I (=Areas 37, 50; for Sectors see fig. 5; for Sector I, see also figs. 6-7). Here there had already been some excavation and restoration carried out in the early 1980s, which had, however, left out an area approximately rectangular in shape (see Frischer, B.4.7).

---


6. One of the goals of the Horace’s Villa Project was to offer training to such inexperienced volunteers.

The objective of this trial excavation was to understand not only the nature and purpose of the rooms along the western limit of the baths, but to add to our knowledge of the whole bath complex. We hoped to understand the relationship between these rooms, where previous work had resulted only in surface cleaning, and those already excavated in previous interventions (32, 33, 34, 36, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, etc.). Because the area had been only superficially altered by the previous interventions, it promised to present intact stratigraphy that could be used to establish the transformations that had occurred here and perhaps elsewhere during the various phases of the villa’s existence.

In addition to this trial excavation, another excavation was undertaken next to the south wall of the villa in Area 54, which corresponds to the short side of the quadriporticus. Our goal was to understand the break in the enclosing wall of the villa and to verify the standard interpretation of this area as the main entrance to the villa.

Geomagnetic and geoelectric prospection (fig. 8) was undertaken on the grounds of the archaeological park and just beyond in order to find evidence of structures beneath the surface that might be investigated in the next two seasons. Promising results were found in various places, but, in the event, for practical reasons only those on the grounds of the archaeological park could be examined. Nevertheless, we note here the desirability of undertaking new excavations just across the street from the park (land parcels 109 and 111 in the most recent cadaster) and on the terrace above the site (land parcels 152, 153, 179, 180, 693, and 694 in the most recent cadaster).

In 1998, a second archaeological study was organized with a larger team and more time at our disposal. Sector I was enlarged to include two additional rooms (38 and 40), which had been excavated in the past by the Superintendency, but not to virgin soil. These previous excavations had not been published and, given their incomplete nature, did not permit any conclusions to be drawn about the date or function of this part of the villa.

A new excavation sector (Sector V=Area 25) was opened in the north-west corner of the big rectangular pool in the garden of the villa. The goals were to describe the stratigraphy, which turned out to be still intact, and at the same time to determine the type of the flooring and wall covering of the structure.

Prof. Kathryn Gleason of Cornell University directed second trial excavation inside the garden (Sector VII=Area 24, fig. 9). The Cornell team excavated close to the access staircase between the residential area and the garden itself, in order to determine the ancient levels and their dating, to see if there were any remains of the garden that could still be found, and, if so, to better understand the garden itself.

Prof. John Foss of the University of Tennessee, a soil engineer, worked closely with the Cornell team. Foss’s involvement was aimed at clarifying nature of the geology and soils of the villa and surrounding territory. He also pursued a specific study of the leaching of lead from the water pipes on the site, something he had earlier done at Hadrian’s Villa. Foss’s main technique was boring with a bucket-type auger to determine the stratigraphy; then various laboratory methods were used to measure the amount of lead in the soil in and around water pipes and in randomly chosen other locations (see Foss et al., E.1.2.2 for details). Foss did fieldwork on the site in 1998, 1999, and 2000.

Another trial excavation (Sector IV=Area 23, fig. 10) was opened on the inside of the western branch of the quadriporticus, in front of the access staircase to the residence. The purpose was to establish the relationship between the outside and the inside of the portico and to identify a probable floor level relating to the earliest phase.

The fifth excavation area (Sector VIII=Area 55, fig. 11) was opened about halfway along the eastern branch of the quadriporticus. The goals were to establish the purpose of several structures that encroached upon the east corridor of the quadriporticus, to verify the consistency and the nature of the stratigraphy in this area, and to study a fragment of a circular structure positioned in the middle of the quadriporticus and located on the line of the main axis of the pool (25). The date and function of the latter had been much debated, and we hoped to shed further light on this matter.
The last trial excavation (Sector IX), to the east of the residential area of the villa, was carried out to verify some anomalies observed in the course of the previous year’s electrical and magnetic prospecting, but it produced no results worthy of note.

The 1999 season saw the most archaeological activity. The excavations were completed in Sector I, with work extending into the new Areas 35 and 39. The goals were to understand the original dimensions and function of Areas 38-39-40, to study their connection to Area 35, and to shed light on the nature and phases of Area 35. At the end of the season, these areas were backfilled, with the exception of Area 39, where the newly found remains were conserved and left exposed for public viewing. A small stratigraphic excavation was undertaken at the southern limit of Area 23 in the western corridor of the quadriporticus. The purpose was to pursue the previous year’s studies in this area with respect to phasing, occupation levels, and building techniques as well as to examine the masonry stratigraphy of this part of the residential complex. The area just to the north of the residence was cleaned, with the goal of determining whether the villa structures continued beyond the point where Pasqui’s excavations had stopped. Finally, several studies were pursued in the garden, including Areas 24 and 25. In Area 25 the southern face of the southeast pier was excavated in an attempt to find dating elements for the pool and to better understand the stratigraphy in this part of the garden. Meanwhile, work continued in Area 24.

In 1999, the wall census project was initiated to create a detailed and accurate catalogue of all the walls on the site. This was advisable because the heavy restorations made by Pasqui had, in the intervening 80 years, weathered or been degraded in other ways, making it difficult in many places to distinguish ancient from modern material and thereby complicating the interpretation of the site. In connection with this project, an extensive collection of mortars was made.

Finally, in 1999 (and in some cases, in subsequent years) a number of experts visited the site, local museum, and storehouse of the Archaeological Superintendency at Tivoli in order to autopsy the material they had agreed to publish. The classes of material studied included architectonic elements, architectural terracottas, bricks and roof tiles, ceramic pottery, coins, inscriptions, marble flooring and wall revetment, mosaics, sculpture, wall paintings, and water pipes.

In 2000 and 2001 (originally planned as study seasons) modest additional archaeological studies were undertaken to finish some work in progress and to fill in some gaps in the new picture of the villa that was gradually emerging. In March, 2000 the work in Area 24 was brought to a conclusion and the trench was backfilled. In June 2000, the area just to the west of 37 and 50, which had been cleaned in 1997 and protected from slides and erosion by a temporary wooden wall (fig. 12), was landscaped and secured with a permanent green wall (figs. 13-14) by the Israeli firm, PRS Mediterranea. In the preparatory work carried out in June, 2000, the opportunity of further cleaning in this area was utilized to record the ancient remains, which turned out to add important new information about the hydraulic system supplying the baths.

In July 2001, a three-week excavation was undertaken in Area 12. Archival research had turned up some previously unknown drawings of plans showing hitherto unrecorded features from the time of Pasqui’s excavations in Areas 6, 11, and 12. If accurate, the plans would provide important, yet previously unknown, evidence of several structures in the area of the residence that Pasqui had found and reburied, but never mentioned in his reports or interviews. Ideally, all three areas would have been excavated to test the reliability of the documents and to record, date, and interpret any features found, but a variety of practical considerations made it possible to do only a limited test excavation in one area. The modern surface of Area 11 has a significant fragment of an ancient mosaic, and work in this area might have put the mosaic at risk. The ancient structure drawn in Area 6 was smaller than that in Area 12; and Area 12 (and the adjacent Area 11) were documented with a section as well as a plan, so that it provided an

---

7. In the backfill here, as elsewhere on the site, we scattered many coins minted in the late 1990s to help future investigators to distinguish our fill from other stratigraphic units.
opportunity to test the validity of the documentation in two dimensions. For these reasons, the test excavation took place in Area 12.

C.1.6. Resources utilized in Archival research

As mentioned, a second goal of the project was to collect information about the history of the site from antiquity to the present day, with a special emphasis on previous archaeological interventions and excavations.

Archaeological materials from the twentieth century excavations were found on the site, in the Licenza Museum, formerly the Antiquarium (including its small storage room), and at the storehouse of the Archaeological Superintendency of Lazio at Ercole Vincitore. The major gap in the collection of archaeological finds comes from the theft in the Licenza Antiquarium in 1978 (see Frischer, B.4.7). For the objects stolen, we attempted to use photographs in the Archaeological Superintendency that were taken before the theft, and, except for the coins, they provided an acceptable makeshift. Unfortunately, the coins were photographed many decades ago at small scale and so could not be interpreted at all from the images (see Buttrey, D.11).

For published sources on the site, good bibliographical information existed, starting with Lugli’s bibliography8 but also including the unpublished comprehensive bibliography of Prof. Charles Henderson, which contains materials printed through 1993 and which the author kindly put at our disposal.

For unpublished, archival materials (including photographs as well as documents), there was no previous research to rely on, and, as with any archival research, the search required persistence and luck. The biggest gap in the archival record is the working papers of Angelo Pasqui, which are still missing, as Lugli noted with regret in 1926.9 Another gap are the professional papers of Lugli himself; upon his death, these were donated by his family to the Archivio Capitolino, but have gone missing.10 They might have

10. By an act of the City Council of Rome, the gift of Lugli’s professional correspondence was accepted and the order given for them to be deposited in the Biblioteca Sarti of the Accademia Nazionale di San Luca, of which Lugli was a devoted member. The text of the act follows:

“1531ª Proposta (Delib. Della G.M. n. 3229 del 7-5-1969)
Ratifica di deliberazione presa dalla Giunta Municipale ad urgenza relativa a: Accettazione offerta di donazione del Prof. Arch. Pier Maria Lugli a favore del Comune di Roma.


Che la biblioteca e archivio predetti comprendono:

a) una importante miscellanea di opuscoli di topografia romana;

b) libri e pubblicazioni varie sullo stesso argomento;

c) un complesso di schede manoscritte disposte per materia;

d) il manoscritto inedito del quarto volume dell’opera ‘Monumenti antichi di Roma e Suburbio’;

e) la corrispondenza privata del prof. Giuseppe Lugli relativa agli argomenti suddetti, da archiviare, previa selezione;

Che il materiale di cui sopra dovrebbe costituire presso la Biblioteca Sarti una sezione romana destinata a facilitare gli studi e le ricerche nel campo della archeologia e della topografia romana;

Che le condizioni apposte alla offerta di donazione per il conseguimento delle finalità culturali sopra citate vincolano l’Amministrazione:

8. Lugli 1926, cols. 593-598.

Bernard Frischer, Stefano Camalani, Monica De Simone

shed a great deal of light on a number of matters,

1) a sistemare decorosamente il ‘Fondo Lugli,’ d’intesa con la Accademia Nazionale di S. Luca;

2) a compilare uno schedario in duplice copia;

3) a completare la classificazione delle schede manoscritte di cui alla precedente lettera ‘C’ nel termine di due anni dalla accettazione dell’atto di donazione;

4) a consegnare tutto il materiale di cui sopra all’Istituto Nazionale di Archeologia e Storia dell’Arte nel caso che la Biblioteca ‘Sarti’ cessasse la sua attività o fosse trasferita fuori Roma.

Ravvisata l’opportunità di accettare l’offerta di donazione di che trattasi;

la giunta municipale

Assumendo, per l’urgenza di provvedere, i poteri del Consiglio Comunale, ai sensi dell’articolo 140 della Legge Comunale e Provinciale, Testo Unico 4 febbraio 1915, numero 148, delibera, salve le autorizzazioni di legge, di accettare l’offerta di donazione del Prof. Arch. Pier Maria Lugli di cui in narrativa, vincolata alle condizioni sopra riportate, esprimendo i sentimenti di gratitudine della Civica Amministrazione al donatore e a la memoria del prof. Giuseppe Lugli.

Le spese notarili e di registro, a carico del Comune come parte accettante, saranno impugnate e liquidate con successivo provvedimento.

L’on. PRESIDENTE pone ai voti, per alzata e seduta, il suesesto schema di deliberazione che resulta approvato all’unanimità.

Non sorgendo osservazioni, l’on. PRESIDENTE pone ai voti, per alzata e seduta, la ratifica della suesesta deliberazione: la ratifica viene approvata all’unanimità.

La presente deliberazione assume il n. 1050.”

According to the resolution, Lugli’s private correspondence (item [e] in the text of the resolution) was to be given, along with everything else, to the Biblioteca Sarti of the Accademia di San Luca. But Pier Maria Lugli, in an interview, states that he personally carried the correspondence to the Archivio Capitolino shortly after May 7, 1969; and he understood that the letters were to be stored there.

The following archives were consulted for documentation illustrating the history of the site:

- Archivio Capitolino, Comune di Roma, Fondo Orsini. Here are to be found several medieval

The archivists of the Archivio Capitolino kindly made a search in the summer of 2001 and reported that the Lugli papers were not in their collection. Lugli’s notes on a variety of archaeological topics are to be found in the library of the Accademia di San Luca, Rome; there was nothing pertinent to Horace’s Villa in the notes; nor is the private correspondence to be found there.

We may here express the hope that Lugli’s private correspondence is someday found since it would undoubtedly (as he himself wrote) shed much light on the period 1920-65, which was so important in the history of Roman topographical studies.

11. Now a distinguished archaeologist working for the National Research Council of Italy, Facenna was an employee of the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio in the late 1940s, with responsibility for Licenza.

12. Now one of the leading archaeological superintendents of Italy, La Regina was an inspector in the Archaeological Superintendency for Rome and Lazio in the 1950s, with responsibilities in Licenza.

13. Antonio Muzi has been the senior guard on the archaeological site for many years, and his wife has been the guard in the Licenza Museum.
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documents for the history of Orsini holdings in the Licenza Valley.\footnote{15} See also below, UCLA.

- Archivio Centrale dello Stato (EUR/Rome).\footnote{16} This archive contains the documents from the Direzione Generale delle Antichità e Belle Arti. Here can be found documentation pertaining to Pasqui’s excavations of 1911-14, including the Pasqui-Ricci correspondence (Ricci’s letters are usually drafts).

- Archivio della Soprintendenza Archeologica per il Lazio. \textit{This archive contains administrative documents} pertaining to “Horace’s Villa” from the early twentieth century until the present day. It includes messages sent to Pasqui by his staff from Licenza during the 1911-14 excavations as well as the Pasqui-Ricci correspondence (Pasqui’s letters are often drafts).

- Archivio di Stato, Roma. This collection contains the archive of the Ministero per Lavori Pubblici of the Papal States, which in the nineteenth century had to give permissions for private archaeological excavations. Excavators were required to file regular reports on their finds. It also has copies of the cadasters of property in Licenza under the Papal government.

- Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Archivio Borghese. Here may be found documents pertaining to ownership of land in Licenza by the Borghese family from the seventeenth through nineteenth centuries.\footnote{18}

- Archivio Storico, Comune di Licenza. \textit{This} archive contains municipal documents, including the minutes of meetings of the city council, from the Risorgimento until the present day.

- Biblioteca Angelica, Rome. This library holds the correspondence of Felice Barnabei, a friend of Angelo Pasqui, in the Archivio Barnabei.\footnote{19} Its holdings also include the Archivio Academia degli Arcadi.\footnote{20}

- Biblioteca Classense, Comune di Ravenna. Here may be found the Carteggio Corrado Ricci,\footnote{21} the archive of Ricci’s extensive correspondence.

- National Library of Scotland, Special Collections. The earliest known version of Allan Ramsay’s treatise on Horace’s villa\footnote{22} may be found here, as well as the diary of his son, John,\footnote{23} from the trip father and son took to Italy in 1783, when Ramsay was putting the final touches on his treatise.

- UCLA Young Research Library, Special Collections. Here are to be found the parts of the Orsini Archive not in the Archivio Capitolino\footnote{24} and the fair copy of Allan Ramsay’s treatise on Horace’s Villa.\footnote{25}

- University of Edinburgh Library, Special Collections. The library owns a copy of Allan Ramsay’s treatise on Horace’s Villa that dates

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{15}{Cf. Fondo Orsini II.A.III.n.9 17. On the Fondo Orsini generally, see Scano (as n. 14) 412-423.}
\footnote{16}{See M. Musacchio, ed., \textit{L’archivio della Direzione generale delle antichità e belle arti} (1860-1890), 2 volumes (Rome 1994).}
\footnote{17}{Sez. I Sfusi, Busta 18, Fascicolo 10: appunti, schizzi, piante c.d. “Villa d’Orazio-Licenza (1911).”}
\footnote{18}{F. X. Blouin, Jr., ed., \textit{Vatican Archives: An Inventory and Guide to Historical Documents of the Holy See} (New York 1997).}
\footnote{19}{On Felice Barnabei (1842-1922) see F. Pellati in \textit{Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani}, vol. 6 (Rome 1964) 418-419; \textit{Le memorie di un archeologo, di Felice Barnabei}, eds. M. Barnabei and F. Delpino (Rome, 1991).}
\footnote{20}{See B. Tellini Santoni, \textit{Arcadia. Accademia letteraria italiana. Inventario dei manoscritti} (1-41) (Rome 1991).}
\footnote{22}{NLS, MS730, on which see Frischer and Brown, 105-107.}
\footnote{23}{NLS, MSS1833-4.}
\footnote{25}{UCLA Bound Mss., Coll. 170/376, on which see Frischer and Brown, 105-107.}
\end{footnotes}
to a time between the copies in the National Library of Scotland and UCLA.\textsuperscript{26}

The following photographic archives were also consulted:

- Archive, British School at Rome. The archive contains the Thomas Ashby photographic collection, including 14 shots of the Licenza Valley taken in 1927.

- Archivio Fotografico, \textit{Corriere della Sera}. The archive kindly made available to us copies of the photographs in its files that were made in 1913 to illustrate the article in \textit{La Lettura} written by Paolo Giordani about the Pasqui excavations.

- Archivio Fotografico, Soprintendenza Archeologica per il Lazio. The collection contains all the official photographic documentation for Licenza taken by the Superintendency (or, its predecessor, the Ufficio Scavi per Roma e la Provincia di Roma e Aquila) from 1911 to the present day.

- Fototeca Unione. The collection includes 13 photographs taken by Ernest Nash on the site of “Horace’s Villa” in 1955.

- Gabinetto Fotografico Nazionale. The collection holds five photographs of “Horace’s Villa” taken in ca. 1914/15 at the conclusion of Pasqui’s excavations.

- Photo Archives, German Archaeological Institute (Rome). The collection was searched for useful photographs of the remains or finds of “Horace’s Villa,” but nothing of interest was found.

- Aerofototeca, Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo e la Documentazione (Rome-EUR).\textsuperscript{27} The holdings include four aerial photographs of “Horace’s Villa” taken in 1970.

\section*{C.1.7. Documentation and Database}

During fieldwork, trench supervisors were responsible for recording data. Given the fact that excavation is destructive, it is necessary to provide for careful and effective documentation so that the greatest amount of information can be captured and saved. The greater the amount of this information, the more complex becomes its management and synthesis. But the act of documenting an excavation is not limited to collecting data in the field; it also concerns the digitization of data in the field or, as in our case, immediately afterwards in the laboratory, with the aid of an appropriate relational database.

\subsection*{C.1.7.1. Data collection}

The Excavation Notes were filled out every day by each trenchmaster (\textit{fig. 15}). Here the archaeologist’s first impressions were recorded, along with all the activities carried out in the work area and including the finding of any noteworthy objects. The Excavation Notes form also included room for sketches and measured drawings. This kind of documentation, written in a discursive style, might seem old-fashioned, but it has proven to be a tool that retains its usefulness today, both for the interpretation of data recorded elsewhere in the information system (generally by various experts), and as an aide-memoire to the trenchmaster for the doubts, second thoughts, and the day-to-day unfolding of the excavation—all of which becomes important to review when the time comes to write a final report.

To register the data pertaining to the stratigraphic units (SU), we used as a model the forms developed by the Italian Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali and approved by the ICCD (Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo e la Documentazione, a unit of the Ministry; \textit{figs. 16-17}).\textsuperscript{28} A similar form was used for registering walls (Mural Stratigraphic Unit, or MSU). For the

\textsuperscript{26} EUL, MS.La.III.492, on which see Frischer and Brown, 105-107.

\textsuperscript{27} See \url{http://www.iccd.beniculturali.it/download/aerofot.pdf}.

Excavation Notes

The responsibility of creating a catalogue of all the stratigraphic units
that the trenchmaster had precise and concise way. Notes informal comments appropriate to the this way, next to the discursive and sometimes rather responsible to fill out all the fields on the records. In satisfies these requirements, obligating the person individual SU he or she found, giving the reference number and position for each.

During the excavation, once a SU had been identified, the trenchmaster prepared an overlay (or single-context plan)\(^\text{30}\) and documented it photographically. Survey was done by a hybrid method utilizing a total station and traditional surveying tools (measuring tape, plumb line, drawing frames). Each photograph was entered into the photo list and annotated when shot. The photo lists were then matched with the photographs once they were developed and contact sheets printed, and an inventory of the photographs was created.

Photography was both chemical and digital. Black and white 35 mm chemical photographs were taken of all stratigraphic units and small finds (Kodak 5052 TMX was the preferred product). Important stratigraphic units and all small finds were also photographed with 35 mm slide film (Kodak Ektachrome was the preferred product). Small finds were also recorded on 35 mm color print film (Kodak Gold 200-6 was the preferred product). During the course of the project, consumer digital photography made great strides. In 1997 and 1998, digital photography was only used for informal shots to be used on the project’s Internet site. By 1999 and thereafter, a Nikon Coolpix 2.1 megapixel camera was purchased and used for supplementary documentation of stratigraphic units and finds. All photographs were digitized at high resolution and included in the photographic database described below.

In 1999, an aerial photographic survey of the site was carried out by a small radio-controlled helicopter, under the supervision of Robert Ajtai of VE.DO.

The registration of all the elements useful for identifying a SU is an indispensable means for being able to reach a comprehensive interpretation of a site, by means of—wherever possible—the recognition of activities. Thus, both in the moment of excavating and in the act of recording the data, particular attention must be paid to the characteristics and stratigraphic relationships so that the sequence of individual actions or activities can be reconstructed in the matrix.\(^\text{30}\) The design of the forms we utilized satisfies these requirements, obligating the person responsible to fill out all the fields on the records. In this way, next to the discursive and sometimes rather informal comments appropriate to the Excavation Notes, the trenchmaster also must record the data in a precise and concise way.

As the excavation proceeded, the trenchmaster had the responsibility of creating a catalogue of all the

numbering system used to identify each SU or MSU, we decided to build into the code an indication of the excavation sector from which the SU or MSU came. The archaeological site was divided into the following sectors: I, bath complex; II, southern branch of the quadriporticus; III, residence; IV, western branch of the quadriporticus; V, pool; VI, central area of the garden; VII, northern area of the garden; VIII, eastern branch of the quadriporticus; IX, zone to the northeast behind the structures currently visible on the site and near the entrance from the parking lot; X, sector used to denote studies of the walls (see \textit{fig. 5}). Each SU or MSU is identified by a number of four figures (five for Sector X) composed of the sector number at the head and then by a progressive numeration of the SU found in it. For example, if the sector is IV, the numeric series will run from 4,000 to 4,999; if VII, from 7,000 to 7,999; if X, from 10,000 to 10,999. Sector I has available all the numbers from 0 to 1,999.

By SU we mean every recognizable action changing the surface of the earth, whether human or natural.\(^\text{29}\) The design of the forms we utilized satisfies these requirements, obligating the person responsible to fill out all the fields on the records. In this way, next to the discursive and sometimes rather informal comments appropriate to the Excavation Notes, the trenchmaster also must record the data in a precise and concise way.


For the Harris matrix, see Harris (as n. 29), 151-170.

\(^{29}\) For the concept of stratigraphic unit, see: E. C. Harris, \textit{Principles of Archaeological Stratigraphy}, 2nd edition (London 1989); P. Barker, \textit{Techniques of Archaeological Excavation} (London 1977); and Carandini (as n. 4).

\(^{30}\) For the Harris matrix, see Harris (as n. 29), 151-170.

\(^{31}\) Roskams (as n. 5), 140.
entered into a related catalogue. For the noteworthy materials, a special form was developed (fig. 18), which reflects the main fields of the so-called “pre-catalogue.” The noteworthy material, after being photographed, was then inventoried according to the rules and procedures of the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio.

C.1.7.2. Data management

Throughout the project, written forms were digitized and included in the project’s information management system. The processing of information from the catalogues, inventories, and forms was carried out with the aid of commercial software such as Microsoft Word, Access, and Excel. In addition, all the slides taken of excavated material were digitalized with the Epson GT7000 scanner at a resolution of 1200 DPI (dots per inch). The scans were saved in JPEG (Joint Photographic Experts Group) format at the medium level of quality. In this phase of the work, our priority was to maximize efficiency in managing data and not to prepare publication-quality images. We knew that, in the end, few of our thousands of images would be published, and those could be digitalized anew in uncompressed format at the highest level of quality in the production phase of publication. All of the overlays were digitalized and then vectorialized with AutoCad.

Luca Passalacqua and Stefano Camaiani, then two laureandi in the Department of Archaeology at the University of Siena, were responsible for our data management and for designing an information system that allows the user to make queries across most of the data categories (fig. 19).

Initial plans called for all the individual databases to be combined in a composite Geographic Information System (GIS) utilizing ArcView. In the event, this part of the data management project was not implemented for lack of personnel and funds. On the other hand, the lack of a GIS interface, while regrettable, did not materially compromise the usefulness of the system, which greatly facilitated analysis and interpretation during our study seasons and, afterward, during the production of this volume (fig. 20).

C.1.8. Disposition of finds and documentation

The small finds were taken to the Archaeology Laboratory of the American Academy in Rome, where they were studied by various experts. At the conclusion of the 2002 study season, all objects were inventoried according to the system of the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio and transported to the storehouse of the Superintendency at Ercole Vincitore (Tivoli). There, they were stored in the same general area as the older finds from Licenza.

Upon publication of this report, all original versions of the written, photographic, and digital documentation will be deposited for long-term storage with the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio.
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C.2. THE RESIDENCE

BY MONICA DE SIMONE AND LAURA CERRI

C.2.1. EXCAVATION IN AREA 12

This excavation (Sector III.12) was conducted in July, 2001, following the discovery of a document (fig. 1), which was identified by Bernard Frischer shortly after it had been found in 2000 by Klaus Werner in the Archive of the Archaeological Superintendency for Rome in Palazzo Altemps (see the contribution of Frischer, B.4.1). Recognizing that the document was extremely important because it contained a plan of the Pasqui excavations showing features never before published and no longer visible on the surface, Frischer immediately requested permission to conduct the excavation, which was kindly granted by the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio. The present writer was the field director of the project.

The plan, datable to the period between 1911 and 1914, shows a situation not otherwise known within Areas 11 and 12 of our plan. Area 12 is commonly identified as the atrium with impluvium; room 11, bordering Area 12 on the east but not communicating with it, currently presents a pavement with a restoration of a portion of the mosaic preserved in the northeast corner of the space. The archival document, in addition to indicating some measurements, shows the following features: in Area 12, a sort of horseshoe-shaped structure running parallel to the walls on the east, north, and west to a distance of about 50 cm; near the southwest corner, a structure with a right angle, which may indicate the presence of another room; and in room 11, a staircase with five steps. To the plan is attached an east-west section (cf. fig. 1b; see letters C and D of fig. 1a), which shows how the features of the plan should be understood to relate to structures below the present surface level (corresponding to the footing of the walls in opus reticulatum) and not, as could be hypothesized by the lack of quotas, to walls demolished during Pasqui’s excavations. A note in the margin of the section indicates that these structures pertain to a not-further-defined “medieval house” (“casa medievale”).

The photographs of the period do not clearly show this stage of the Pasqui intervention, but it is possible to verify in them the level reached by the excavations, as well as the condition of the structures, which were almost entirely limited to the foundations (fig. 2). Particularly striking is the complete absence, at least at the time the photographs were taken, of the present northern wall of Area 12.

Cleaning and stratigraphic excavation in the eastern half of Area 12 (fig. 3) was undertaken in order to verify the document and to clarify the nature and function of the area in question in its various phases.

The excavations of 1911-1914 removed or at least disturbed almost all the ancient archaeological stratigraphy, with the notable exception of SU 3144 (see below). As a result, there were practically no elements that could furnish an absolute date. However, it was possible to find and analyze the features summarily indicated in the archival document, and also to verify the presence of heavy restoration.

The only original portion in opus reticulatum (SU 3117) was identified on the face of the eastern wall in the northern zone of the area. Exactly corresponding to it was revealed SU 3102, belonging to a fragment of the preparation of the floor. That was certainly consistent with the reticulate structure covering the footing of its foundation (SU 3136) and abutting the wall. In contrast, its relationship with another foundation we identified (SU 3103) is more complex. This foundation runs in a north-south direction and is almost parallel to wall 3117. The foundation should be the east arm of the horseshoe-shaped structure of the archival document. But no northern arm was found, and SU 3103 clearly abuts the ancient foundation (SU 3121) of the northern wall (3122, a restoration) of the area. The foundation 3103, consisting of lime and a loose, yellowish mortar, was made in a vertical cut (SU 3115), penetrating through the ancient soil (SU 3110=SU 3114), which was almost completely sterile. In the southern zone of the area, SU 3103 is either partially preserved at a lower level or is almost completely razed. However, SU 3132, 3137, 3141, 3142, and 3143, which are small traces, must relate to its construction. They provide evidence that clearly attests the continuation of the wall toward the south (fig. 4). Obviously, one can say nothing about
the elevation of this wall, nor can one completely exclude the possibility that it was coeval with SU 3117, creating a very narrow service corridor, even if the dimensions of this space would lead one to think otherwise.

The part of greatest interest comprises the structures attested near the southeast corner of the area, identified in Pasqui’s excavations and indicated in the archival document but apparently neglected by the restorers.

No feature that can be related to a “medieval house” was discovered, but what can be recognized is a hydraulic installation, whose use cannot be determined with certainty. Obviously, we are in a phase in which the foundations 3113 and 3125-3127 had not yet been built, nor the wall related to structure 3103. All these features need to be set aside in considering the nature and function of the earlier water system. What remains of the system is part of a basin, presumably square, delimited to the north by SU 3107 and to the west by SU 3123. Its wall structures are covered, on the interior wall of the basin, with a thin layer of cocciopesto (SU 3108 and 3124). The basin was built after the cutting of SU 3110 and the deposit of virgin clay (SU 3145). One wall, 3107, in opus caementicium (grayish mortar and lime), was constructed against earth (controterra); the other wall, 3123, was not. The latter does not, however, show a regular face on the western side. Parallel to the wall 3123 runs a small water channel, made of a thick pavement of cocciopesto. The water, which ran in from a pipe housed in 3107 near the corner with 3123, flowed out only a short distance, thanks to the drain made from SU 3140.

The basin lacks its southern and eastern sides, but two other features may help to clarify the function of the installation. Inside the basin, near the eastern limit of the presently visible part of 3107, there is a column (3111; fig. 5). The column is not completely circular and was made with fragments of roof-tiles and mortar, partially covered with a thin layer of cocciopesto (SU 3112). The column was made after pavement 3131 became operational and was built with a mixture of mortar different from that found in walls 3107 and 3123. The cocciopesto, however, is rather similar. The column could thus represent a later addition or an ancient repair, although we cannot completely exclude a unique construction phase. It is only 20 cm distant from the wall of 3107 and presents, toward the wall, a face that is flat rather than circular, and with no revetment.

Corresponding to it, on the wall of 3107 (revetment 3108), two irregular holes, which were made by puncturing the cocciopesto, are present at a different height. These suggest the existence of a vertical feature, presumably in a perishable material (perhaps a wooden beam?) secured to the basin by nails, which caused the puncture holes observed in the cocciopesto against which the column would have been erected. On the top of the column, as it now exists, a small irregularly-shaped bronze feature, sunk into the mortar, is still visible. The interpretation of the function of this installation must also take into account another interesting feature, namely, SU 3139 (fig. 6). This is a portion of the imprint of what appears to have been another column analogous to 3111, positioned in front of 3123 near the drainage channel 3140. It seems plausible to hypothesize that the arrangement was similar on the two missing sides of the basin, which would also have had vertical elements that stood a little bit in front of the walls, approximately half way (?) down their length.

As noted, the basin was created by a cut (SU 3146) that penetrated the clay deposit (3145), which was partially shaped in relation to wall 3123. Cut 3146 was obviously visible only outside the basin. The regularization continues to the west of the basin, perhaps because, initially, the construction of a second similar basin was planned. This zone, however, was impacted by fill (SU 3144), which was dumped into 3146. It yielded fragments of roof-tiles and cover-tiles (some with traces of exposure to high temperature), small amounts of charcoal, and practically no pottery.

The relative chronology of the southern zone of the trench is fairly clear. After the creation of the basin, which necessitated a regularization of the natural slope (running downwards from north to south), the fill 3144 was made. In the absence of stratigraphy, we can hypothesize a succeeding phase of abandonment or of additional filling that put the hydraulic installation out of use. The foundations that were constructed in the next phase were partially built in the “vertical cut”
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manner up to the point where they reached the part of the basin that is still preserved. This new building phase (MSU 3113, 3127-3125) includes a general raising of the level, now indicated by the restored structures, that is fortunately verifiable thanks to the survival of an original portion of wall 3117.

The relationship between this new phase and the construction of SU 3103 (and related traces of that activity: SU 3132, 3137, 3141, 3142, and 3143) remains uncertain. However, it appears that the discontinuity of wall 3127 must relate to the continuation of 3103 toward the south.

The northern part of the excavation was less thoroughly studied. Here the first excavators did not dig as extensively, touching only the surface layers and the probable residuum of a floor bedding (SU 3134). Once SU 3134 was removed, it was ascertained that the ancient stratum SU 3110 (=3114=3130) was still preserved in this area. The stratum was partially removed in the central zone of the excavation and turned out to be completely sterile. Only a small part of SU 3102 was removed, in order to investigate SU 3114.

Near the western limit of the trench, another structure (SU 3133, fig. 7) was identified. It was probably a foundation and was built of small, medium, and large stones bonded by clay, not mortar. It is hard to establish its relationship with SU 3121 (the ancient foundation of the northern wall of the room), since only the top was investigated. The structure runs south for a short distance, where it was probably partly demolished when the brick wall 3119 was erected. Wall 3119 constitutes the eastern side of the small rectangular basin (the so-called impluvium), which is slightly off-center within Area 12. It lacks a foundation and was built directly on SU 3110. The wall seen during the excavation has modern mortar, and one may entertain strong doubts about its antiquity, at least at this point.

Despite the practical limits of this excavation, the project brought to light new data and has furnished new evidence of the drastic nature of the restorations made from 1911-1914. We can now exclude the existence of a wall running parallel to the northern limit of the space, as was indicated on the archival document. The foundations 3103 and 3133 show a further phase, in which the complex presented a different arrangement, although it had almost exactly the same orientation. It is clear, however, that the structures indicated on the document near the southwest corner are not related to the medieval period but to a phase earlier than that represented by the structures in opus reticulatum.

Besides attesting a previous phase than what is presently seen on the site, the basin offers various points of interest (fig. 8). If it can be established that its function was practical, it would be the only feature heretofore found of the pars rustica of the villa in any phase. This it would mean that the villa had a far different functional design in the early period than it came to have in the phase exposed to view since the time of Pasqui. But even if its function turns out to have been ornamental, the fact that the structures of the next phase obliterated it attests a complete reworking of the layout of the villa in this part.

C.2.2. Soundings North of Areas 6, 17, and 26

In the course of the archaeological investigations undertaken in 1999, three soundings were executed in the northern zone of the villa (Sector III) between the wrought-iron security wall delimiting the archaeological park on the north and the wall running east-west that, today, appears to close off the residence on its northern side (cf. C.1. fig. 5). These explorations were made to determine the correctness of the plan of the residence published by Lugli and later scholars, which, for a variety of reasons, can be doubted. First of all, there is a disproportion between the size of the garden and quadriporticus, on the one hand, and of the residence, on the other: the residence ought to have been larger. Moreover, the brick fountain situated in Area 8 oddly juts out beyond the alleged northern closure wall of the residence. Equally unexpected is the fact that, if the alleged closure wall is ancient, then the fountain was not placed symmetrically in the middle of Area 8, as might have been expected in the case of so monumental a structure.

The soundings we undertook confirmed our suspicions. The removal of the surface level of humus in three soundings brought to light wall remains that supported our hypothesis that the residence ought to
have continued beyond the alleged closure wall to the north.

Sounding adjacent to Area 26: Sounding 1 was opened near the northwest corner of the residence. The removal of the surface level of humus permitted us to identify the foundation of a wall with a north-south orientation. The limited scope of our investigation did not allow us to determine either the width of the wall or whether the presence of stones mixed with mortar to the east of it should be attributed to the presence of another structure, oriented east-west, or to the collapse of the wall we found.

Sounding adjacent to Area 17: Sounding 2 also allowed us to identify the continuation northwards of the north-south wall of the villa, perpendicular to the alleged closure wall. In this trench two walls came to light: one to which we have already referred, oriented north-south (fig. 9), which constitutes the prolongation of the wall already identified and restored by the Archeological Superintendency; and a second wall, oriented east-west, which is perhaps related to the presence of the stones and mortar discovered in Sounding 1. Both walls were preserved only at the foundation level; they were made of stones and tufa, bonded with a yellowish mortar of a crude quality and friable consistency. Noteworthy is the fact that a stone cubile was found in the north-south wall, which is probably to be attributed to the elevation.

Sounding adjacent to Area 6: Sounding 3 was made at the northeast corner of the residence, adjacent to Area 6. A pavement in cocciopesto was revealed that was only partially preserved. It extended north of the northern wall of Area 6 and represents another confirmation of our hypothesis of additional structures north of the alleged northern closure wall.

The data obtained in these three soundings, even if limited and not stratigraphic, provide an important point of departure for further investigations of this part of the villa. This could lead to discoveries in an area not affected by preceding archaeological and conservation interventions. In this connection it should be noted that the road immediately behind the metal fence has not yet been paved, and thus the levels underneath it could be fairly easily revealed. Since, as Bernard Frischer has informed me in a personal communication, the road was built immediately after Pasqui’s excavations on land that had, up to that time, been used for farming, its subsurface should contain intact ancient stratigraphy. The same may be true of the field immediately to the north across the street, which is presently a small truck farm with no deep ploughing.

The limited space within which the interventions were carried out constrained us to undertake only small sondages. Moreover, the presence of a newly installed electrical cable running just inside the wall along the northern limit of the archaeological park prevented us from extending the work right up to the wall. Research in this part of the villa was restricted to removing the surface level of humus and to the identification of the tops of structures below the surface. Time did not permit a stratigraphic investigation, which, it is hoped, a future campaign will be able to undertake.
C.3. THE GARDEN

BY KATHRYN GLEASON, JAMES C. SCHRYVER, LUCA PASSALACQUA

C.3.1. INTRODUCTION

The excavation of the gardens at “Horace’s Villa” has produced some of the most successful results of the AAR/SAL excavations.\(^1\) Preserved, systematically excavated ancient gardens outside of the region of Mt. Vesuvius are rare, but include the excavations of E. Salsa Prina Ricotti and W. Jashemski of the gardens at Hadrian’s Villa in nearby Tivoli and the joint Italian-Danish project on the gardens of Livia at Prima Porta.\(^2\) Given the importance of Horace’s poetry about the Sabine landscape and his villa, Frischer consulted Jashemski on the feasibility of undertaking a garden archaeology project, and she recommended a small team of specialists to do the work. He assembled the group for a feasibility study in August 1998. All participants were encouraged by the results of their investigations that year.\(^3\)

Gardens and designed landscapes are excavated for a number of reasons, and, contrary to expectation, the goal is not the discovery of the species of plants that grew there. This is not possible in most instances.\(^4\)

Rather, the objective of archaeological exploration is to recover the basic physical layout of the garden (the
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1. My warmest thanks to Maria Grazia Fiore and Bernard Frischer for inviting Cornell University to join the project; to the entire staff of the AAR/SAL excavations, and in particular to Gianni Ponti, Stefano Camaiani, Luca Passalacqua, Laura Cerri and to the teams of students who worked on the garden project. In 2001, we dedicated the first presentation of the garden excavations to Wilhelmina Jashemski in appreciation for her role in bringing together the garden team and in honor of her 90th birthday. James Schryver, who took responsibility for the excavation and interpretation of the medieval levels, prepared the preliminary reports and shaped the discussion of the medieval levels of this report. Special thanks go to Elizabeth Clemence, Daniel Costura, and Misako Murata, who prepared the visual analyses, and to Elizabeth Macaulay and Kelly Cook, for their assistance in the preparation of the report. The work was supported with funding from the Center for the Humanities, The Hirsch Fund, and the Department of Landscape Architecture at Cornell University. I am also grateful for the generous support and interest of the Romagnoli and Steinmetz Families, and for the participation of my own family: Mary Ellen Gleason, Noah, and Jeff Zorn.


3. Frischer et al. 2000. The 1998 team is discussed in the preliminary report. In 1999, the staff included: Kathryn Gleason, John Foss, and James Schryver, with student volunteers Peter Hedlund, Elizabeth Macaulay, Mary Pearsall, Deni Ruggeri, and Giovanni Malfatti, with timely assistance from the University of California Research Expeditions Program volunteers throughout the season. The March 2000 team added Ann Kuttner, Betsey Robinson, and Aicha Malek, as well as students of archaeology and landscape architecture at the University of Pennsylvania, Penn State and Cornell: Pamela Brown, Daniel Costura, Sarah Cupperberg, Michael Dells, Laura Gawinski, William Gruen, Andrew Hahns, Brian Jencek, Margaretha Kramer-Hajos, Alexandra Minkovich, Millicent Moran, Paula Rosenbue, Beth Ryan, Outi Salminen, Joseph Teel, Maki Uchida, Alisia Vilonen, and Kim Wilczak. Their excavation records and drawings form the foundation for this report. During the summer of 2000 Jennifer Ramsay analyzed the garden soils collected by our team.

boundaries, the paths, the edges, and the features that structure the space and the experience of the visitor), as well as to understand the garden within the context of the overall property and landscape, both built and natural. Evidence is derived both from the built architectural features of the garden, located through geophysical survey and excavation, and from the location of the plants, detected through excavation. The small holes, pits, and sometimes even flower pots indicate the presence of plants of different sizes, even though we usually cannot provide botanical identification without other records. For this project, Horace’s poems constitute such a record. Although he does not specify the plants in his garden, he mentions many of the plants of his estate, which illuminate the broader context of our study. The “external” landscape setting of a Roman garden is as essential to the garden design as the internal features. Whether or not we are speaking of Horace’s Sabine Villa, we gain much from the record his writings provide on the landscape of a farm in the Sabine hills. For instance, during the recent excavations, our archaeological botanist reported sorrell among the carbonized seeds from SU 7044, where it was deposited in antiquity in the fertilizer of the Flavian garden (see Ramsay, D.14). A common weed in wet areas, Horace suggests it was gathered from his land for medicinal purposes (Ep. 2.51-58).

Taken together, the archaeological evidence gives us the basic infrastructure of the garden: its water system, its planting beds and patterns, its paths; from these we can extrapolate the overall framework for the visual experience of the garden. Onto this structure we may drape such evidence for art and daily life as the remaining archaeological and textual records provide. It is also possible to judge other, often ephemeral, qualities of the garden from the evidence of the habitats it produced for other forms of life: for example, snails, insects, amphibians, and rodents that prefer sun to shade, moist to dry, high vegetation to low. Even without the details, this basic infrastructure of visual space allows us to glimpse the ways in which visitors saw the garden as they moved around it, sought cool as opposed to sunny places, or looked at the garden while they dined. The painstaking observation and recording of fine soil changes, as well as the recovery bits of bone and plant remains, are but the raw data leading to the larger understanding of the experience of seeing and being in the garden, or in the larger landscape of the villa.

This report presents a garden of the first century A.D., whose features we may interpret. We located a cultivated soil layer of the late first century B.C., but not its features. We begin with a brief review of the elements of the designed landscape already known at the beginning of the project: the elements that make this villa such an important contribution to garden history. We then present the methodology employed before turning to the full report on the excavation of the quadriporticus garden, which was the focus of three brief seasons of work between 1998-2000. Although this excavation is only a series of small test sites within the larger area of the garden, some of the preliminary results of the work allow us to present theories about the visual structure of the garden. Some conclusions are already quite evident, while other, more speculative, observations may guide future work at the site. The report concludes with questions and suggestions for such an effort, which is certainly warranted.

C.3.2. Landscape Setting and Description of the Villa’s Gardens

From a landscape architectural perspective, the overall siting and design of the villa take advantage of a variety of topographic features to create the architectural settings popular in gardens of the first centuries B.C. and A.D.: terraces, cryptoporticoes, and viewing pavilions (diaetae). Although Horace does not describe the contents and layout of the gardens of his villa, his poetry is set in the steep natural topography and such cultivated landscape as the rugged hills afforded (fig. 1). This is the landscape celebrated in the remarkable siting of the villa. The response of the architecture to the spectacular vistas
marks the villa as a type of “view villa,” popular in the first century B.C. and highly developed a century later.\(^6\) The original building must have been sited, at least in part, for the views, though we have few certain architectural remains from which to judge how the scenes were experienced. For the Flavian period, the peak of “view mania,” the siting and the archaeological discoveries at Licenza suggest that the architecture was designed to take full advantage of the site.

The siting of the villa’s residential and bath complex is unusual. The land was terraced to form a saddle between a small knoll to the east, known today as the Castagneto, and the lower slopes of Monte Rotondo to the west. As observers have noted, the setting was quite strategic both for views and for pleasant climatic conditions. Horace describes it as an arx enclosed by montes (Sat. 2.6.16), which well describe the site of current excavations. By terracing the saddle, the designer created broad level surfaces for gardens and working areas connected to the architecture, while providing extraordinary views from these terraced gardens to the north and south (fig. 2).\(^7\) The gardens will be described in detail below.

The Castagneto is a knoll rising about 50 m above the villa. At the summit, the 1998 survey team noted a remarkably level surface with a clearing in the woods. Today, the overgrown spools of coppiced chestnuts obscure the view, but in winter it is possible to appreciate a 360° view of the countryside surrounding the villa from this clearing (fig. 3). The knoll’s lower slope has now eroded over the east wall of the villa, and the overburden has prevented excavations of buried walls off the east portico. There can be little doubt that the architecture of the east side of the villa was carefully planned in relationship to this topographic feature, as the slope would have required retention. A retaining wall and a means of egress to the knoll could have been combined with either interior architectural features or exterior ones.

Villas of the first centuries B.C. and A.D. around the Mediterranean often featured such viewing knolls. For example, Herod the Great’s palace at Jericho had an artificial knoll with a pavilion at its summit (fig. 4). The pavilion provided views of the estate with its famous palm and balsam plantations. Closer to home, the Villa dei Papyri at *Herculaneum* and the Villa Liovis on Capri had viewing pavilions. It is difficult to believe that this knoll at Licenza was not incorporated into the villa’s architectural scheme; remains of a pavilion, however, have yet to be detected. Cores in the area demonstrated that the soil layers there have been very stable for tens of thousands of years (see Foss et al., E.1). This preliminary evidence suggests that the knoll may have had a gently rounded crest naturally, rather than a constructed terrace. It is likely that any disturbance for an architectural structure may thus be represented archaeologically as a minimal intrusion into the natural soil horizons, as with posthole construction. In March 2000, a ground penetrating radar survey was conducted on the knoll’s summit, but lack of time prevented a sufficient number of transects to be run. Further survey is warranted in this area to determine if there are archaeological remains of a diaeta or other structures associated with the villa.\(^8\)

On the north and south, the saddle, with its terraced platform for the villa, drops away about 50 m, quite steeply to the north, more gradually to the south. The view to the north, of the prominent hill at Civitella, is almost directly on axis with the villa. This view will be explored in more detail below, but it is worth suggesting here that when the as yet unexcavated northern side of the villa is investigated, archaeologists may consider the possibility of a garden, an ambulatio, and/or diaetae that address not only this hill, but the extraordinary panorama of the valley. The view to the south is no less impressive, though less visible now. Today the panorama begins with the view of S. Maria Delle Case on the slope below Rocca giovine, where the Temple of Vacuna may have been visible in Horace’s day (Epist. 1.10.49).

---


7. The vistas from the villa are best portrayed in a series of panoramic photographs taken in 1926 by Lugli (Plate I). New forestry projects from the mid-twentieth century have matured, obscuring views, especially to the east and south.

8. GPR equipment was kindly provided by Professor Larry Brown of Cornell University. It was operated by student Joshua Goldman. No report was produced, as unfortunately it was not possible to complete the survey assessing the presence of walls to the north of the villa.
On the west, the long slope rising 530 m to the summit of the Colle Rotondo has also eroded, burying this side of the villa. How this slope was integrated into the villa is a more complex issue. It is possible that a peristyle at the northwest opened onto a courtyard that is now substantially buried under the eroded slope. Coring of the accessible portion of this courtyard has not produced garden soils; however, too little of the overall area is available for study to be sure that it was not planted, if only with shade trees. Also on this side of the villa, the recent excavations identified an atrium of the late Republican period (See Camaiani et al., C.5).

C.3.2.1. Gardens within the building: small courtyard garden (Area 8, Lugli’s cortile A)

Lugli describes the garden at the northern end of the villa as one of two courts that furnished light and air to the rooms around it; the second is the so-called atrium roughly on axis to the south. Lugli regards Area 8 (his cortile A) as opening onto the countryside to the north; room 12 (Lugli’s cortile B) was an interior court with a water feature, but recent excavations revealed an earlier phase beneath it (fig. 5; and see De Simone, C.2.1)

Lugli reports that the original appearance of Area 8 is not known, but that changes were made to the courtyard itself in the imperial period. Within the courtyard space is a low, rectangular construction, with small semicircular niches in the middle of each side. The construction consisted of a channel surrounding the central space, which was evidently occupied by a garden. This highly architectonic form of garden bed or planter was popular by the mid-first century A.D., as seen in the Domus Augustana in Rome, the Templum Pacis in Rome, and further afield, at Conimbriga in Portugal.

Recent investigations have shown that the north enclosure wall of the building was reconstructed incorrectly by Pasqui’s team: the boundary wall visible today should not be regarded as the north wall of the villa and the complex clearly continues northward (see Frischer, F.1). The implication of this discovery is that Area 8 was an introverted space, not facing the north view as indicated by Lugli, although the doors onto it along the north-south central axis may have formed part of a series of frames through it to the vista of the valley beyond.

Lugli also suggests that the entire area around this feature was a garden (un cortile fiorito) that surrounded one of the rooms (room 7) projecting onto it, which he interprets as the summer triclinium. The present ground surface of the area disguises any hint of a garden, and cores of the central feature revealed that the early excavators had removed all of the original soil before refilling and replanting it. While the area clearly bears further examination, we did not make it a priority for the feasibility study.

C.3.2.2. The quadriporticus garden (Sectors V, VI, VII)

The garden excavations focused entirely on the area within the large quadriporticus, discovered during the 1911-1914 excavations by Pasqui and further investigated by Lugli and Price during the American Academy in Rome excavations of 1930-1931 (fig. 6). The architecture of the quadriporticus itself was the focus of further work during the 1997-1999 seasons and is reported separately (see De Simone et al., C.4). Lugli reports the dimensions of the quadriporticus garden as 34 x 76 m. It is comparable in size to the peristyle of the Villa dei Papyri (28 x 94 m), the House of Octavius Quartius at Pompeii (30 x 86 m) or the central peristyle of the Villa at Sirmione (50 x 80 m). Lugli thought that the garden was at the front of the building, with the entrance to the villa at the south end of the quadriporticus. Excavations in 1997 showed the south wall to be buttressed in such a way as to make an entrance here unlikely (see Passalacqua, C.4.2).

12. If this was done by Pasqui, the plantings had disappeared by the time of the Lugli/Price excavation (unpublished photograph in the collection of Thomas Price). It is likely that any plantings were done in the years after the latter excavation.
13. Lugli 1930, 39 and 58.
Within the quadriporticus was a spacious garden focusing on a large piscina in the center. Lugli describes it as follows:

“The garden was] surrounded on all four sides by a crytoporticus or corridor with large windows opening on the garden. In the center is a large tank with two pilasters on the southern side, which perhaps supported statues, and with a drain for the outflow. Edible fish were probably kept in this tank, while the xystus or garden was laid out with avenues of box and borders of flowers, and rustic benches were conveniently placed in the shade of the fruit trees.”

This is the image that guided Thomas Drees Price’s 1932 reconstruction and has influenced the plantings installed at the site since the 1950s, as well as the reconstructions shown at the Museum in Licenza today. No actual archaeological evidence, however, was reported for fish-raising features in the pool, for walks, planting patterns, or benches. A flower pot was found during the Pasqui excavations and exhibited in the Museum, but its findspot is not known, nor is it clear if its function was recognized. Lugli and Price undertook excavations primarily in the northeastern area of the quadriporticus, where they discovered a niched basin within the portico. It was placed, apparently in a later phase, to terminate the east-west axis through the piscina. It is possible that the basin was visible from the garden, and its construction compromised the passage through the porticus at that point. This suggests that the facade was opened up to the garden. The Lugli-Price team also excavated the northeastern corner of the piscina wall and along the north edge, revealing that it had four piers rather than two as described above. No other results from their excavation in the area are known.

In summary, the features of the quadriporticus garden securely known archaeologically at the start of our project were:

- the central piscina with its four piers, a tank and conduit leading to the drain in the southwest area of the quadriporticus;
- a set of steps leading into the garden on the central N/S axis;
- a flower pot from the Pasqui excavations;
- the surrounding porticus with the articulation of its facade, seen to be a series of alternating doors and panels separated by pilasters. Within the porticus was a fountain feature on the east side of the E/W cross-axis through the pool;
- an understanding of the slope of the garden (Price calculated a slope of 0.9% east-west, 1.2% north-south).

The challenge for the new excavations was to locate features within the garden soil itself, under the unexcavated central area of the quadriporticus.

C.3. Methodology

To detect the fine features of a relict garden, as well as to reconstruct as much as possible the plantings, decoration, activities and habitats of ancient garden areas, we planned an integrated and coordinated series of specialist activities.

C.3.3. Preliminary survey and assessment techniques within the residence and quadriporticus

A geophysical surveying (remote sensing) team, a pedologist, and an archaeologist began the study of the quadriporticus garden and other gardens within the building complex. First, the remote sensing team located possible subsurface features. In 1997, a geophysical survey was conducted using a magnetometer. Further studies with resistivity and magnetometer equipment were conducted in 1998, and the area was checked with soil cores to test the readings (see Foss et al., E.1). By and large, debris blocked the cores taken for this purpose. Studies were also done of the larger area of the villa to describe
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15. His reconstructions are more valuable for their reconstruction of the architecture than for their portrayal of the garden.
the geological, geomorphological and pedological conditions at the site (see Foss et al., E.1).

Ideally, field work on the larger landscape of the villa estate goes hand in hand with garden excavations, especially with this type of villa. A team from Sheffield University worked at the site in 1998, conducted some promising preliminary field work, and proposed a feasibility study that would have integrated the environmental retrieval studies with an assessment of habitat and resources in the area. The project would also have identified, through systematic field walking, any archaeological remains of outlying features of the villa, such as other gardens, roads, and outbuildings, providing important information for the interpretation of the garden, villa views, and environmental evidence from the excavations. Unfortunately, the funding for this study was not available. Nevertheless, this is an important dimension for future work at the site.

C.3.3.2. Assessing preservation of cultivation soils

Cores, useful for the detection of garden soils, revealed which levels were formed through erosion, redeposition of fill, cultivation or natural processes of soil formation. Many of J. Foss’ initial cores were blocked by debris, but, after stratigraphic excavation through rubble, new cores “periscoped” down, permitting more accurate removal and readings of the fine soil layers and features of the garden by the archaeologists. This coordinated effort is worth planning into any garden or landscape project from the onset. In 1998, it permitted us to determine the presence of two levels of ancient cultivated soils, although only one could be reached by the archaeologists in the time available that season. Without the cores, the feasibility of a garden excavation project at the site would have appeared less promising.

Garden soils are identified on the basis on several characteristics. Roman soils were typically cultivated with fertilizer, which consisted of debris gathered from kitchens, barns, and even privies (if Virgil is to be believed). This material was gathered into large piles, in order to be used later and worked into garden soils and fields. As a result of this deposition process and continued cultivation, the artifacts from cultivated layers are highly abraded, often preventing identification. Finds within the soil include potsherds, bones, carbonized plant and wood remains, and other artifacts, all randomly scattered.

C.3.4. Excavation of the quadriporticus garden (Area 24, Sectors VI.1, VI.2, VII; Area 25, Sector V)

A team dedicated to the excavation of the garden soils is typically needed on Mediterranean sites. K. Gleason planned and carried out the strategy, coordinating the work with B. Frischer and G. Ponti. J. Schryver supervised the excavation and interpretation of the medieval levels. After various stratigraphic units in the garden had been identified, flotation and wet-sieving of soil samples were undertaken in 1999 and 2000. Recovery of plant remains was successful, despite rather poor conditions for preservation and retrieval (see Ramsay, D.14). Animal bones, eggshells and land snails were also preserved. No feasibility studies were carried out for insects, pollen or phytoliths.

Excavation focused first on the identification of the nature of the strata. It is evident from the levels of the 1911-1914 excavations that the quadriporticus lay under two meters of later deposits. The first meter consists of almost continuously cultivated soils. These preserve a rubble layer, dated to medieval times (fig. 7). As has been observed at other sites, a layer of rubble debris is often ideal for preserving garden features, and this proved to be the case in the quadriporticus, where such a layer was present. The best preservation occurred under the thickest portions of this layer, and, during excavation, particular attention was paid to the identification of cultivated surfaces. Once these were established, and the surfaces exposed, excavators turned to the identification and documentation of every small feature and change in soil color. Due to the short work seasons, the areas exposed were plotted carefully, but only at the end of the three seasons was it possible to put the plans together and observe a distinct pattern to the finds. That said, the discovery of three planting pots and several pits in 1999, all parallel to the central N/S

---

18. James Schryver supervised the excavation and interpretation of these areas.
axis, gave us some immediate clues as to the design of the garden.\textsuperscript{19}

The archaeological stratigraphy is sufficiently clear and data-rich to reconstruct the general chronology, with the main periods of use dated by coins and pottery. The following discussion presents the garden excavation in two groups: Sectors V and VI, the central area of the garden with its pool; and Sector VII, a single large trench at the north end of the garden, at the base of the central steps. The excavation of Sectors V and VI is first discussed trench by trench; thereafter the activities they represent are related to each other. The various activities of each period are initially described with stratigraphic unit numbers, artifact descriptions, and soil context; then they are interpreted, within the limits possible for a feasibility study.

\subsection*{C.3.4.1. Sectors V and VI: the central part of the garden (Sector VI) and the piscina (Area 25, Sector V)}

The Pasqui team first excavated the central piscina and its water pipe and small tank on the western side. They also identified two large piers along the south side of the pool. Lugli and Price pursued the pool’s outlines further on the north and east sides and located the northern two piers.\textsuperscript{20} In the published study of excavations, Lugli describes the pool as having a spouting central jet (\textit{fontana zampillante}) that provided an attractive focus within the well-tended gardens for those strolling in the porticoes.\textsuperscript{21} This jet is purely speculative: neither campaign fully excavated the bottom of the pool.

To clarify aspects of the construction of the pool and the contents of its fill, teams conducted remote sensing surveys over the pool and excavations were undertaken inside it (northwest corner, Sector V) and outside it (east side and near the southeast pier, Sectors VI.1 and VI.2, respectively). The pool walls seen today are heavily consolidated with a cement cap. No mortar or clamps survive inside the pool to hint as to the nature of the original coating, nor is there any indication of hydraulic mortar or \textit{cocciopesto} to suggest that the pool was lined with waterproof material. Lugli and Ponti assumed that the walls visible today are foundations, the former on the basis of the materials of construction, the latter on the basis of garden levels to the north of the pool, and both on the assumption that the original garden surface was a short step down from the thresholds between the portico and the garden. The garden levels in cores and trench VI.2, however, place this hypothesis in some question. It may simply be the case that the limestone chip and cement walls seen today are but the core of walls once finished in finer materials. This issue is linked to phasing: the core suggests garden levels well below the top of the walls. The results of the 1999 excavation in Sector VI.2 address this relationship inconclusively (see below). The excavations to date do not establish the original date of the pool’s construction; nor do they clarify the interpretative issues discussed above. If anything, our studies have suggested new possibilities and raised more questions to guide future excavation strategy.

\textbf{Sounding in the piscina (Area 25, Sector V)}\textsuperscript{22}

Area 25 is the rectangular structure located in the center of the garden and interpreted as a pool (\textbf{fig. 8}). The excavation was undertaken to understand the chronology of its destruction, to verify the quota of the floor, and to re-examine its function. The original plan was to undertake several stratigraphic explorations and then to expose the entire pool with the help of a backhoe. Because of structural problems with the perimeter walls of the pool, however, the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{19} The results of the garden excavation were then examined from the point of view of design and human experience. This included analysis of artifacts, some particular to the garden. E. Macaulay developed expertise in ancient flower pots and sundials specifically for this task. A. Kuttner and K. Gleason studied artifacts found in early excavations and will work together on the relationship between the building and gardens for a future interpretative article.
  \item \textsuperscript{20} Lugli 1926, cols. 542-543. Lugli first poses the idea that the piers to the south of the pool are buttresses. Price (1932) evaluates the theory from an engineering standpoint, 140.
  \item \textsuperscript{21} Lugli 1926, col. 541.
  \item \textsuperscript{22} The work was done by Luca Passalacqua, the author of this section (Sector V).
\end{itemize}
project had to be reduced in scope and was limited to opening up a single trench in the northwest corner.

Study of the fill (SU 5001) in this trench revealed a surprisingly large amount of marble rubble, which probably resulted from the stripping of the pool’s revetment panels. Ceramic finds, however, were sparse, and no statuary or decorative elements were encountered. Thus it is difficult to date the destruction of the pool, beyond noting that in late antiquity we often find cisterns or large basins used as dumps for rubbish and debris. That the structure was a pool seems beyond doubt, even if in the area investigated no traces of decorative surface treatment of the walls or floor were preserved.

In this sounding, all that remained was the preparatory bedding for the floor of the pool, at a quota 2 m below the top of the perimeter walls. The bedding consisted of a thick stratum of opus caementicium (SU 5002). No hydraulic mortar or cramps were found on the walls.

**Sounding in Sector VI.1**

In 1998, a small trench was set out that extended from just inside the pool across the pool wall and into a baulk remaining from the earlier excavations. The aim of the trench was to reveal the nature of the soil layers above the Roman levels and to ascertain the preservation of the stratigraphy along the pool wall. Although the earlier excavators had “chased” the pool walls, they did not dig deeply enough in this area to sever the connection between the original garden levels and the pool wall. The stratigraphy of this trench is correlated with that of Sector VI.2 (see the following discussion). Although no garden soils were encountered during the brief excavation, a core taken a few meters southeast of the pool indicated that they were at a lower level than anticipated (figs. 9 and 10).

**Sounding in Sector VI.2**

In 1999, a 4 x 6 m trench was laid out just east of the southeast pier of the pool with the following objectives:

- to locate and examine the garden soils identified by cores taken in 1998;
- to ascertain the relationship of the cultivated levels to the pool walls;
- to examine the stratigraphy associated with the pool and perhaps date the construction of the pool;
- to determine if the piers of the pool were original to the construction or added as support in a later phase.

The phases for Sector VI generally correlate with the phases given for Sector VII below.

**Period I (Activities 1-5)**

This Period cannot yet be correlated with other Periods at the site, as no datable pottery has been found, there are no trenches that link the pool area to stratigraphy from the enclosing porticoes, and we were not able to reach the natural soil in either trench. While we have information on phasing and construction techniques, we cannot yet offer a date for the original construction of the pool. For the present, the assignation of the pool to the “original building” is neither proven nor disproven, pending further excavation.

While this first Period has no confirmed date, later Periods and activities around the pool do correlate with other areas of the garden and villa.

**Activity 1:** The first activity at the site is identified by soil cores, which attest to a redeposition of subsoil (see Foss et al., E.1). The redeposition suggests a probable leveling or raising of the ground. Such grooming of the surface may represent the leveling of the entire terrace for the construction of the villa as a whole, or a more specific preparation for the construction of the pool. There is no ceramic material to date this activity.

**Activity 2:** A cut (SU 6024 in VI.2) just outside the outer pool wall is seen in both VI.1 and VI.2. This cut may be evidence

23. By the “original building” we mean the first traces of a building that at present cannot be evaluated as a single unit (see De Simone, D.1.3.7).

24. Price (1932) also suspected an original leveling of the platform, 141.
of a construction trench, in which the walls are built up against standing soil. If, however, the site was graded as a terrace before construction of the portico and courtyard, an interpretation of a construction set against earth (controterra) suggests that the pool was built once the garden soils had already been deposited. This would imply that the pool was part of the imperial phase of the villa. If the pool was original to the platform, however, it would have typically been constructed first into the subsoils, and then the fills and garden soils would have been brought in and spread around the pool. There simply is not enough stratigraphic information to further inform us on this issue.

**Activity 3:** The wall of the pool (SU 6026) is constructed of concrete and limestone chips. The excavation showed definitively that the piers are integrated into the walls of the pool (fig. 11). It is notable that a mortar coating (SU 6025) was found in a highly decayed state on the outside of the pool wall, as it has been difficult to detect such material elsewhere.

Activity 3 is the construction of the pool wall. It is likely that the walls seen today are but the cores of walls with a finer original finish. It is difficult to conclude from the mortar found in the excavations that the walls were simply plastered, and no clamps or other evidence guide us further in interpreting the treatment of the walls. It is also possible, though speculative, that the walls are foundations for a structure at a higher level, or for a reused feature, such as a cistern, associated with an earlier period at the villa.

**Activity 4:** Immediately outside the pool walls, set within the cut, are fills SU 6006 and 6023. SU 6006, in Sector VI.1, is within the cut of the earlier excavations of Pasqui and Lugli. SU 6009 is the cut of an ancient trench, with SU 6008 at the base of it. SU 6023, in Sector VI.2, is of a lighter color than the surrounding fill of SU 6022. No diagnostic material was recovered to date the fills of these cuts, nor were plant remains or other evidence of fertilizer recovered from the soil samples.

Activity 4 is problematic to interpret from test trenches. The clearest explanation is that the cuts are for the construction of the pool. This may suggest a construction set against earth. If so, the stratigraphy of VI.2 indicates that the earth cut into to create the pool was already layered with cultivated soil levels of earlier periods. This would indicate that the pool was installed later in the history of the villa.

The difference in soil color suggesting a cut might indicate the presence of decayed plaster.

**Activity 5:** SU 6019 and SU 6022, in Sector VI.2, are redeposited fills around the pool. The placement of this activity in the chronology is speculative, as there has not been enough excavation to determine if the pool was cut into these soils or if the soils were laid down after the construction of the pool, as indicated above. SU 6022 should be examined further as a possible cultivated soil.

We cannot rule out the possibility that a garden surface began at the pool edge, as no pavement or substrate for a pavement was seen. The test trenches are too small to confirm the sequence of activity. Organic soil, amended with debris, was seen in a core sample just over one meter beneath this surface (the level at which the Pasqui and Lugli/Price excavations stopped, south east of the corner of the pool). This activity is placed in Period I. Either a garden was laid out at the same time as the pool construction, or there was already a garden in place, and the construction trench was cut into it.

---

25. Price (1932) devotes a considerable part of his discussion to the engineering functions of the piers, 140-141.
Period II (Activities 6-10)

This correlates with a period of remodeling or alteration throughout the villa. The stratigraphy of the soils to the southeast of the pool is intact. It is clear from this trench and related cores that cultivated soils surrounded the pool, though no particular design could be ascertained in the small area of the trench, nor were any soil discolorations or fine features observed. No pots or garden artifacts were discovered, but limited ceramic evidence indicates a date in the second century A.D. SU 6013 overlies another fill level (SU 6017), with pottery dated to the first century A.D.

Activity 6: This is the deposition of SU 6017. This fill is a clayey loam with visible amendments in the form of pottery fragments and occasional carbonized plant material. No identifiable plant remains were recovered from this level, but the soil has all the attributes of a cultivated soil. Depending upon the following interpretation of the structures, the deposition of this soil may have preceded the construction of the piers as a second cultivated soil layer. It is dated by its scant ceramic remains to a time from the end of the first century B.C. to the end of the first century A.D.; the later date is more likely (see Angelelli, D.2.3). If the supports (activity 7) are associated with this level, they would have projected above the garden surface.

Activity 7: This is the construction of two crude brick rubble-core supports (fig. 12). The two features, made of loosely compacted, degraded brick fragments, may be foundation supports for columns or trellis posts. They are spaced ca. 0.9 m apart, and a core taken to the east at the same interval produced more such brick fragments. The line of these features is parallel to a wall extending westward off the east portico into the garden. Further excavation is needed to reveal their extent to the west, as cores were inconclusive. If the supports are associated with SU 6017, they date to the first century A.D., while if they are associated with SU 6013, they may be dated to the end of the first century or in the second century A.D.

It is conceivable that these supports are associated with the surface of garden level SU 6019, as their bases are at the surface. It seems more likely, however, that they are either substructures for SU 6017 or for a feature associated with SU 6013 (activities 6 and 8). Further archaeological exploration, either by geophysical survey or excavation, should investigate the possibility that they are supports for a trellis or other light architectural feature associated with the extension of the aforementioned wall, as hypothetically reconstructed in fig. 13.

This is the level into which it seems most likely that the brick piers were set; however, the composition of this layer would not have presented a useful or pleasing surface to a garden or courtyard.

Activity 8: This is the deposition of SU 6013, a layer ca. 26 cm thick. It is a redeposited yellowish clay fill, lacking organic inclusions but with occasional pottery, bits of brick, tufa, and pockets of sand. We interpret this layer as fill brought onto the site, but not apparently for cultivation, as it does not have the necessary organic content. Ceramic remains date this level to the end of the first century or beginning of the second century A.D.

Activity 9: This is the deposition of SU 6012, a clay-rich layer below the root zone, barely distinguishable from SU 6010 in color. Its presence was marked by the absence of tree roots and other recent organic material. The fill contained roof-tile fragments, a slab of pavement, and large tesserae. Environmental retrieval produced carbonized wheat grains, culm nodes, chenopodium, buttercup,
primrose, and allium. Ceramics in the fill are dated to the end of the first century/ beginning of the second century A.D. This appears to be a fill taken from the immediately surrounding area to level the ground around the pool, and it is strikingly similar to the eroded soils that buried the nymphaeum in the east portico. It seems unlikely that the plant remains represent cultivation in the garden, although it is premature to rule out this possibility. It is more probable that this is soil originating from the nearby slopes.

Activity 10: This is the deposition of SU 6010, dated by a single potsherd to the first or second century A.D. It is the ancient level at which the early excavators stopped, and it has been infiltrated by roots of the modern sod grass and other organic surface materials. A soil sample from the lower levels of SU 6010 produced a carbonized seed of *Galium* (bedstraw), a local weed associated with cultivated areas.

This may be the ancient garden level of the area around the pool; the early excavators evidently thought so. If so, it may be related to SU 6008 from Sector VI.1. It is not possible to offer a definitive interpretation from the evidence—it will be necessary to correlate this test trench with excavation of areas protected by unexcavated overburden.

Period III (Activity 11)

This is a general designation for the period that represents the decline of the garden, and probably of the adjacent quadriporticus. Much of the area of Sector VI was excavated during the Pasqui excavations. This period is clearly preserved in the upper levels of Sector VI.1 (excavation conducted by G. Ponti).

Period IV

This Period has no activities preserved in Sector VI.2, as the levels were removed during the Pasqui excavations. It is represented in Sector VI.1 as the layer of rubble excavated as SU 6005. The rubble is made up of construction materials that seem to represent either neglect or active dumping. It appears that the materials were sifted through to remove pieces suitable for reuse.

This Period correlates with the corresponding Period in Sector VII.1, as well as with the test pits excavated for soil cores along the western edge of the quadriporticus. It is defined for the garden as a whole by the intentional dumping of debris in the northern and western areas of the garden, probably indicating the medieval reoccupation of the adjacent buildings. The excavated trenches of Sector VI show that the early excavations severed any relationship of this layer with the eastern wall of the pool (SU 6002).

Period V (Activity 12)

This Period, too, is represented mainly in Sector VI.1. It correlates well with the northern area of the garden, as a long, continuous period of cultivation on the site, with pottery from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries. SU 6001 in Sector VI.1 is comparable in depth to the cultivated soils described in Sector VII.1. It is notable that these soils have considerably fewer potsherds and other inclusions than Sector VII. This may be due to a more sporadic cultivation history, and/or to the difference in the agricultural practices of the parcel owner, as Sector VI.1 lies on different property from both Sector VI.2 and the northern area of the garden. In Sector VI.2, the archaeological excavations removed most of the cultivated soils of Period V.

Period VI (Activities 13-16).

This includes the twentieth-century excavations and activities associated with the archaeological park. In the garden areas, generally, this is seen in photographs and records as excavation activity, as restoration activity and as cultivation taking place on the

---

26. The northern part of the garden lies on property 1215A/B, owned by the Foschi at the time of the Pasqui excavations. Sector VI.1 lies on property 1214, owned by the Angeletti at that time, and Sector VI.2 lies on property 1213, owned by the Caponetti. Thanks to B. Frischer for providing this information.
unrented portions of the site during the excavations. The pool itself was excavated in this period (see the previous discussion). Extensive restoration is seen around the quadriporticus. Regarding the pool itself, restoration efforts focused on the southwestern portions of the pool, while less restoration is seen on the northern and eastern portions. Photographs from the Lugli/Price excavations show that the earth removed in 1931 and 1932 was used to groom the slopes between the excavated and unexcavated areas to give the effect seen in Price’s model of 1932. The following discussion addresses only those activities encountered in Sectors VI.1 and VI.2

Activity 13: In Sector VI.1 this activity is represented by cut SU 6009 and the redeposition of possible garden soils SU 6006 and 6007 as one layer, which was later cut again (SU 6004) by the Lugli/Price’s excavation, as seen in the photographic record.

The cut SU 6015 and subsequent fills SU 6014 and 6016 in Sector VI.2 are commonly referred to as a “wall chasing” trench with subsequent fill.

Activity 14: Removal of soil down to the upper surface of SU 6010, the surface level of the 1999 excavation of Sector VI.2, after leaf removal. This fill is loam with occasional pottery fragments.

Activity 15: In Sector VI.1, SU 6004 is the cut made through any eroded debris from the Pasqui excavation into presumably unexcavated fills in the narrow area between the pool and the quadriporticus. In Sector VI.2, SU 6011 is a linear compacted surface on top of SU 6010.

Activity 15 is the Lugli/Price excavation. There are no notes on the material removed in 1931, but the excavation of this cut is seen clearly in progress in a photograph.27 Sector VI.1 showed that the Lugli/Price excavation cleared the line of the pool wall (SU 6002) along its east and north sides, but did not excavate deeply into the stratigraphy. Careful study of various photographs taken during restoration of the pool over the years suggests that the Pasqui and then the Lugli/Price baulks were trimmed back on other occasions as well.

SU 6011 in Sector VI.2 appears to represent the compaction and deposition of mud on the wheelbarrow paths seen in the photographs of the Lugli/Price excavation.

Activity 16: Activity 16 is represented in Sector VI.1, where SU 6003 is the erosion of the soil (SU 6001) cut by SU 6004 into the “wall chasing” trench of the Lugli/Price excavation.

C.3.4.2. The northern part of the garden (Area 24, Sector VII)

Sector VII was excavated as a 4 x 5 m trench in 1998, first by K. Gleason, who was able to excavate only the western half and a small area along the steps. Later in the season, the dig was brought down to bedrock on the eastern side under the supervision of L. Cerri. In 1999, the western side was completed and a backhoe was used to open a 5 x 4 m area, expanding the dig to the south and west. This was excavated as a series of steps, for safety reasons, and was not taken down to bedrock. It remains excavated only to the ancient garden level (Period II), with the southern steps remaining unexcavated entirely. In March 2000, a short excavation season of two weeks completed work on the trench prior to backfilling in June 2000.28 The trench was expanded by a meter to the east, by a meter to the west, and into the lowest of the terraced baulks to the south (fig. 14).

During the excavations we identified six distinct periods in this area of the garden. These are presented

27. Price 1932, plate 40.2

28. The excavation took place as part of a course offered simultaneously at Cornell and the University of Pennsylvania by K. Gleason and A. Kuttner. The archaeology students in the course served as supervisors, under the general direction of Gleason. James Schryver supervised the medieval levels.
C.3. The Garden

on the Harris Matrix (fig. 15), and described as follows.

Period I. The Early Garden (second century B.C. - first century A.D.)

This Period (Activities 1-2) can be dated to the late first century B.C. It is characterized by a cultivated soil layer, organically rich, but with few finds or features. Very little of this level has been exposed, but it may be interpreted as the garden associated with Period I of the villa (see Camaiani et al., C.5, and De Simone, D.1.3.7).

Activity 1: SU 7023, 7024, 7028. The earliest activity identified was a north-south cut in the yellow shale, just to the east of the current north-south axis of the central steps to the garden. No diagnostic artifacts or plant remains were recovered.

This activity is the shaping of the shale bedrock for the garden or terrace (see Foss et al., E.1.3.1).

Activity 2: SU 7042. The fill of this cut in the bedrock is a layer of redeposited brown shale-derived soil with characteristics of cultivation, erratic distribution of potsherds, carbonized plant material, and bone fragments. No discolorations or other features were observed in this soil, but the area exposed was limited. No plant remains were found in the soil sample processed (fig. 16). Diagnostic ceramics recovered date to the late Republican period.

The layer was exposed at the base of the trench excavated in 1998 and 1999, but only in the western part of it; to the east is the bedrock, reached in 1998 and in 2000. It continues to the south in the area excavated in 2000. In 1998, we observed that the garden soil appeared to run north under the steps. When we attempted to check the relationship in 1999, however, electrical wiring for new lighting in the archaeological park had been placed under the steps, destroying the stratigraphy and thus preventing confirmation of the continuation of SU 7042.

SU 7043 is a cultivated soil of the late Republican age. It is likely to be a garden of the first phase of the villa, but this cannot be confirmed without the discovery of further features or architectural associations. The cut of the bedrock is man-made, but not enough area is exposed to understand the intention. The line of this cut should be related to the Republican atrium identified beneath the bath complex and to other first century B.C. remains, as the interface between the soil level and the bedrock is along a clean north-south line. No specific relationships of this feature to the adjacent architecture are obvious at present; however, if this garden soil in fact continues for any distance under the steps or under the portico itself, it may suggest the phasing of those architectural features, possibly dating them to the Flavian period. This could be clarified with trenches anywhere along the wall, as the Pasqui excavations did not reach this level.

Period II. The Garden of the Flavian Age

Period II (Activities 3-8) represents a time of remodeling or alteration and is characterized by yellow, clayey, shale-derived fill, with inclusions of small quadrangular pieces of brick pavers, stones, and occasional pottery of the first century A.D. This fill was deposited to raise the level of the courtyard to form the feature that dominates this period, i.e. the Flavian garden. The cultivated soil contains pottery, coins, and other artifacts, as well as carbonized plants, bone and mollusc remains. The most exciting discovery was of a flower pot (VH 148, SAL inv. no. 114428, from SU 7040) and an amphora (VH 160, SAL inv. no. 114550, from SU 7040), reused as a flower pot. These, together with remarkably well-preserved pits, stake holes and post holes, indicate the design of the garden. The finer soil features are preserved only under the medieval rubble layer (see Period IV). It is clear from the remains in this small area that the potted plants date to at least the mid-
late first century A.D., but there are hints of alterations
to the design during and after this time.

Activity 3: SU 7021, 7022, 7027. This activity
represents the burial of the original
garden surface SU 7042 with 30 cm of
redeposited shale-derived clay soils,
perhaps from building activity elsewhere
in the garden or villa, mixed with stones
and fragments of small quadrangular
pieces of brick for paving, found
erratically distributed in the matrix of
the fill. SU 7027 was sampled for plant
remains, and a cereal grain fragment of
indeterminate identity was retrieved.

Ceramics from this level contain
identifiable types, but their chronology
is uncertain (see Angelelli, D.2.3). A
single rim fragment from the late second
century/early first century B.C. is present,
but this may be residual.

The original cultivated surface was
buried to raise the level of the garden,
presumably as part of the Flavian
renovation represented in the next
activity. The contents of the fill may
include elements of an earlier garden
(the pavers, for example), but we cannot
conclude this from the test trench.

Various small postholes and soil
discolorations are evident as inclusions
of grey clay or organic soil in the matrix
of SU 7021, 7022 and 7027 (see below,
and fig. 24). These are postholes and
planting pits from the cultivated level
above. Preservation conditions in the soil
above made it difficult or impossible to
see these features in the surface, so they
are best recorded at this level. As yet, we
cannot assign a chronology to the phasing
of each act of setting a posthole or pit.

Activity 4: No SU was assigned—feature not
removed. A line of chipped limestone
was laid out just west of the north-south
central axis. As the feature was uncovered
in the southern area of the trench, it
began to curve out slightly to the east.

No significant pottery is associated with
this stratum (figs. 17 and 19).

As this feature was first observed only
under the bases of the flower pots, we
initially interpreted it as gravel laid to
aid in draining the plantings in this clay-
rich soil. We were not able to excavate
along the sides of this feature to find its
bottom. The size and density of the stone
chips look similar to the images of the
pool walls prior to restoration; this may
not be a level of loose gravel, but the
disintegrated top of a masonry feature that
separated the beds of the lower garden, or
a phase of the upper garden, that we have
too little evidence to identify. We simply
do not know how substantial a feature it
is.

Activity 5: SU 7019, 7026, 7029, 7040, 7041, 7043,
7047, 7063, 7070, 7081. This activity
involved the deposition of cultivatable
soil. Another layer of brown clay loam,
richer in artifact content than the lower
garden soil, was laid out and cultivated
over the yellow clay fill. The horizon
between the yellow clay fill and the
cultivated soil is typically sharp in the
sections. However, along the baulk in
the southeast area of the trench dug in
2000, the upper cultivated soil formed
a sharp, but furrowed, interface. Not
enough evidence of such furrowing
was seen in other baulks to allow a full
interpretation.

Ceramics from this level include residual
Republican wares (second-first century
B.C.) and fragments dating throughout
the first century A.D., with the major
finds centering on the Flavian era.

Remains of cultivated crop plants
and related weeds were retrieved: an
unidentifiable fragment of nut, Pisum
sativum (common pea), milk vetch,
Lolium sp., crane bill, Allium sp., and
bulrush, a plant found in wet conditions.
A flotation sample produced a range
of cereal, cereal processing debris, and
cultivated herbs and weeds (see Ramsay, D.14).

This is a cultivated soil layer from a Flavian era garden. Residual pottery fragments are typical of amended soils, and the soil of this level has clearly been amended, or fertilized with food processing remains, hearth sweepings, and other burnt debris from kitchens thrown in a compost pile. The features of this cultivated area that lead us to conclude it is a garden soil rather than a field are discussed below.

**Activity 6:** SU 7067. A line of pots is set into the amended soil. These may be separate activities over time (i.e., different seasons, different years), but the dating of the pottery puts all of the vessels into the same time frame, that of the mid- to late first century A.D. (fig. 18). The northernmost feature is the bottom portion of a small, purpose-made *olla perforata* (flower pot, VH 203, SAL inv. no. 114529) found bottomside up at the margin of the garden level and the layer of debris above. It is not *in situ*, but was located along the line of the other features and may be very near its original location. Also found at this margin was a large fragment of a well-preserved glass plate (VH 194, SAL inv. no. 114534, from SU 7061). Approximately one meter to the south, a complete perforated *olla* (VH 148, SAL inv. no. 114428, from SU 7040) was found set into the garden soil, its rim approximately 3 cm below the surface level (fig. 20; see Macaulay, D.3.1).

Soil retrieved from inside the pot (SU 7044) produced remains of horse bean, elderberry, an indeterminate fruit or nut and several plants that grow in wet places: cranebill, sorrell, and sedge. Clearly, the process by which the soil came to be in the pot was a separate and earlier activity that took place away from the garden itself, but it is most appropriate to mention it here.

Emanating from the complete pot is a series of seven small circular holes, 4-7 cm in diameter, appearing as dark soil discolorations on and just below the surface of SU 7040 (fig. 17). These were not excavated and thus have no SU number.

Parallel to the central axis, 0.94 m to the south, a small pit was identified by the looser consistency of the soil. A narrow amphora had been removed from the layer immediately above this location, and it may have caused the pit to form, or it may have been embedded in this location originally.

Finally, 1.1 m further south along the same line, the upper third of a cylindrical-ovoid amphora was found, placed upside down in reuse (VH 160, SAL inv. no. 114550, from SU 7040). It had been shattered, possibly before deposition (fig. 22; see Angelelli, D.2.3). The soil from inside the amphora (SU 7048)—again to be regarded as an earlier, off-site activity—contained a single grain of cultivated barley.

This line of features represents a series of planting pots, embedded in the garden soil of SU 7040 (figs. 17 and 21). The *olla perforata* is a type of purpose-made planting pot (see Macaulay, D.3.1). The cylindrical-ovoid amphora is almost certainly a planting pot in reuse, a practice commonly seen at Pompeii, Hadrian’s Villa, and other Roman garden sites in Italy.\(^{29}\) The breaking of pots prior to planting is suggested in the ancient literature. The plant remains found in the fill of these pots are characteristic of the fertilizer rather than plants that may have grown in the pots themselves. The other feature in the line is a planting pit without a pot.

---

**Activity 7:** This represents a series of activities indicated by small dark pits and dark circular holes surrounded by cemented stone (fig. 23). It is not possible to determine a sequence or chronology of these features in relationship with those described in activity 6. The features were not excavated, so there are no associated SU numbers. No datable material was recovered.

On the north side of the garden, two small holes (ca. 7 cm in diameter) of brown, organic soil surrounded with mortar and small stones (20 cm in diameter) were found, one on either side of the north-south axis, though not paired (“stake holes,” in fig. 17).

Round postholes, 5-7 cm in diameter, filled with brown soil, were noted during the excavation of the yellow fill of activity 6 in a number of locations. These are noted on the plan and tentatively appear to conform to a pattern symmetrical to that of the west side of the garden’s central axis.

On the east side of the central axis, where the overlying cultivated soil becomes very thin (7-9 cm) in the areas where it overlies higher bedrock, excavation of the fill below revealed various pits, up to 30 cm in diameter (fig. 24). Further exploration is required to determine if the shallowness of the soil is due to erosion or to some feature of the garden requiring little depth to the soil.

The small holes surrounded by mortared stone may be stake holes for a light reed or wooden garden feature, as the diameter of the hole is appropriate. The support provided by the stones and mortar is slight (we did not excavate the features), and the purpose may have been to protect the base of the feature from rot.

The 5- to 7-cm postholes without supports are more difficult to analyze at this point. They are almost perfectly round, which suggests the interpretation of a posthole rather than a plant hole. These posts have been pressed or hammered directly into the ground; there is no evidence of pits dug first then backfilled around the posts. As the posts are found in the layer below the cultivated soil, they appear to be sturdy supports, perhaps for a lightweight fence, such as the type of reed fence seen in garden paintings. They would not provide sufficient support for an architectural feature, such as a trellis.

The larger irregular pits seen in the yellow fill below the garden level are most easily interpreted as pits for small shrubs or plants. They are not carefully made, and it is not possible to ascertain from the pits themselves if the plants grew intentionally or wild; however, preliminary studies of their location suggest a place in a coherent design pattern.

**Activity 8:** SU 7005. Traces of a plaster surface were identified along the northernmost edge of the trench. It consisted of a layer of lime mortar only partially revealed and not removed. No datable ceramics or artifacts were recovered. This activity represents the poorly preserved remains of a walk, landing or other feature, probably associated with the lowest unrestored step on the central axis (activity 9).

**Activity 9:** SU 7006. This activity represents a constructed ledge of mortar, corresponding with the dimensions of the reconstructed stairs above, although this step has a higher riser than the restored ones above in the series (fig. 25). Disturbed soil (SU 7002) above this step makes it unclear whether or not the step had been discovered by Pasqui and deliberately left unrestored.

---

30. Without a careful study of the relationship of this surface to the wall, it is not clear if this is an ancient surface or a surface created after the 1911-14 excavations. The Pasqui excavations did not continue below this level anywhere else in the trench, and this seems to have been the surface that signaled the ancient level to them.
or if it was first discovered in 1998. In the center of this feature is an opening framed with brick tile (SU 7007). No significant pottery was identified from the stratigraphic units in this activity.

The most obvious interpretation is that this one step represents the construction of central steps into the garden, more or less as seen restored. It is unclear, however, why the steps were furnished with a channel (SU 7007) set above the lowest step. This feature may be contemporary with or earlier than the activities above, as it is not possible to discern the phasing from the evidence exposed within the sounding. Considering the presence of this drain and the absence of any paving or definitively compacted surface at the base of the stairs, we should keep open the possibility that the reconstructed stairs were incorrectly interpreted. It is worth considering whether the steps were intended to provide access, or were part of a stepped water fountain, popular in the first and second centuries A.D. Further excavation is needed to explore this feature; as noted above, however, after our 1998 season, electricians dug a narrow trench and laid in wiring for lighting at each side of the central stair.

**Period III: Decline of the Garden**

Period III (Activity 10) represents the decline of the garden, and probably of the adjacent quadriporticus.

We have poor stratigraphy for this Period, which is broadly dated by coins and artifacts from the third to the fifth century A.D. Any phasing information that might have come from the association with the surrounding architecture was destroyed when Pasqui’s team severed the relationship with the architecture in pursuit of the line of the walls.

**Activity 10:** SU 7020, 7037, 7038, 7039. The mixed fills of material from this period seal portions of the cultivated layer discussed above. Lenses of wall painting fragments (primarily red, yellow, and white, most without decoration), eroded plaster, patches of debris, irregular surfaces, and finely eroded materials cover the cultivated surfaces between 10-23 cm in the northern part of the trench, closest to the building. In the southern part of the trench, as one moves out into the courtyard, there is hardly any distinction between the Flavian cultivated surface and those above. Plant remains from SU 7038 consisted of wild grasses.

Ceramics from this stratum range in date from residual material of the mid-first century A.D. to more significant material dating from the third century, with types in use until the fifth. Coin evidence also offers a *terminus post quem* of the fifth century A.D., although the types found were in use from the late third through the fifth (see Buttrey, D.11).

The lowest fills over the cultivated surface of the garden can be interpreted as the decay, collapse and erosion of the plasters of the surrounding porticos onto the garden surface immediately nearby (**fig. 18**). This process did not apparently extend far out into the courtyard, and if it did, later agricultural processes obliterated the traces. The layer is best preserved where protected by later fills.

Within the limited area of the trench, we did not identify any deliberate destruction in this phase. We need to see more of this layer to interpret the role of the artifacts. If they are residual, this suggests activity in the third to the fifth centuries prior to the deposition of this layer, or activity occurring at the villa during a period of neglect of the stucco decoration of the building exterior around the courtyard.

The preservation of carbonized seeds of wild grasses may be consistent with some burning off of wild grasses growing over the site, or they could have been blown in from burning in the greater vicinity.
Period IV: Medieval Occupation

Period IV (Activities 11-12) is characterized by the intentional dumping of debris, probably indicating the medieval occupation of the adjacent building. Some three meters from the building wall into the garden, the debris piles taper off and the ground is marked by cultivated soils that merge with cultivated levels above and below (fig. 18).

This Period is distinguished by deliberate human activities taking place after the main occupation phases of the first century B.C. to the second century A.D. Judging from the garden trenches alone, the activities appear to be a clearing of debris from the villa, and probably cultivation of the courtyard beyond the zone of dumping. The Pasqui excavations severed the stratigraphy of these later activities from the stratigraphy of the architecture by trenching along the outer wall of the building, so it is difficult to make specific associations between activities in the building and those seen in the garden. One has the impression from the nature of the materials that the building was cleared out for reoccupation and usable pieces of construction material were removed.

Activity 11: SU 7004, 7010, 7011, 7016, 7025, 7035, 7036, 7052, 7055, 7058, 7059, 7062, 7064, 7074, 7079, 7082. A clear margin distinguished the soils of activity 10, which had little evidence of human effort in the deposition of the fill, from a complex area of apparently intentional deposition above it. This level consists of adjacent deposits of debris, too numerous to define and number individually during the feasibility study (fig. 26). These deposits contained construction material and artifacts from the building: fragments of slate, tegulae, imbrices, bricks, triangular column bricks, marble, painted plaster from the columns and walls; rough volcanic rocks (of the type often employed for grotto effects); blue glass tesserae, black, white, and red tesserae of varying sizes; a range of artifacts, shells, molluscs, and carbonized plant remains. Among the artifacts were pottery, coins, various metal fragments, and extraordinarily well-preserved fragments of window glass and other glass artifacts. Plant remains retrieved from two separate dumps indicate varied uses: sample 13, for example, contained cultivated wheat, barley, and olive, while sample 16 simply contained wild grasses.

Ceramic remains are largely residual fragments from the late Republican period through the imperial age, with types dating from the fourth to the sixth century A.D. Two coins are datable to the fourth century. The terminus post quem is thus the sixth century A.D., although an earlier date may be more likely.

The size of each rubble unit suggests individual dumping episodes. Two impressions stand out when assessing the artifacts recovered from the deposits. First, among the roof-tiles and bricks, nothing was whole. The composition of the piles strongly indicates that the debris was first sorted, then dumped in the courtyard. Similarly, with the artifact assemblage, we have an impression of sweepings that contained things either not noticeable or not worth collecting, as opposed to a habitation dump or artifacts lost accidentally in an inhabited area. Most of the pottery, glass plates and glasses, metal objects, even coins, are of Roman date, but the occasional fourth to sixth century potsherds provide a terminus post quem.

Overall, we interpret activity 11 as an effort to clear out the building for reuse, dumping the material into the garden. We cannot rule out the possibility that the dumps only represent a kind of sorting through or pillaging of the ruins for building materials, although if so, the pillagers were doing some fine sweeping as they went along. The lay of the dumps, sloping down towards the courtyard, suggests that the debris may have been dumped “out” of a relatively intact
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Building into the courtyard. The debris apron appears primarily on the north and west sides of the courtyard where substantial building remained behind the porticoes. It does not appear that anyone made the effort to dump more than 2-3 meters into the courtyard. Beyond the edge of the dump area is cultivated soil, and it is possible that the process of later cultivation disturbed earlier dumps, at least at the edges. Pasqui’s excavators cut a trench along the building wall, which prevents us from determining if the material was simply dumped off the retaining wall at the north. The piles taper off on the south side, and there is some directionality to the lay of the fragments in some piles, but not others (fig. 18).

Activity 12: SU 7033, 7034, 7051, 7053, 7054, 7056, 7073. South of the debris piles, the soil is disturbed by cultivation from the surface to levels lower than we were able to reach. Units merged and were assigned new numbers based on the most subtle of features. Essentially, where there were no rubble piles from late antiquity, no clear traces of activities 6 to 8 could be found. From the surface downwards excavators encountered a series of merging layers, all characteristic of cultivated soils, whose distinctions in content were more evident in the sections than in the horizontal surfaces of the trench. In general, we can observe different ceramic content in different broad stratigraphic zones, and the soil is more calcareous in the more recently cultivated soils than in the clayey shale-derived ancient ones. There are no structures or even particularly evident soil features, such as tree pits, although in the upper levels we searched for some indication of the trees evident in the 1911 and 1930 photographs of the site (fig. 27).

Ceramic evidence and soil structure suggest that cultivation took place regularly, if not continuously, from the early through the late medieval period. The level of the cultivated surfaces has built up nearly two meters since the earliest detected cultivated soil of the late Republican period. This can be attributed to the combination of material brought in for soil amendment and alluvial deposition of soils from cultivated slopes east and west of the site.

It is notable, however, that the ceramic content in the cultivated areas of Sector VII is much greater than that seen in Sector VI. This may be due to the proximity of Sector VII to the building complex. Moreover, Sector VII lies in historically different property (parcel 1215, owned by Foschi) than Sector VI.1 (parcel 1214, owned by Angeletti) or VI.2 (parcel 1213, owned by Caponetti). Depending upon the longevity of these holdings, agricultural practices may have varied between properties. It would make an interesting contribution to the cultural landscape history of the area to examine this possibility in the baulks as excavations continue.

It is not possible to judge from these excavations, therefore, at what point any medieval inhabitation of the site ended. A July entry in the Regesto Farfense from 1011 points to local initiatives towards incastellamento. This may be a plausible terminus post quem, as the cultivated levels directly above this rubble layer contained pottery later than the thirteenth century reoccupation of the site. The presence of potsherds in the soil is not in itself an indication of inhabitation on the property, as it remained a customary practice to fertilize soils with kitchen debris, including broken pottery from various periods.

---

Period V: Surface Levels of the Courtyard

Period V (Activity 13) is a continuation of the agricultural phases of Period IV. We identify this level as the agricultural activities that can be seen in the photographs of the Pasqui excavations—orchards and gardens still under cultivation as excavations progressed. The absence of well-formed surfaces in the upper two meters suggests that continuous cultivation begins earlier than the fifteenth century.

Activity 13: SU 7001. Agriculture appears to have been fairly continuous, with pottery gently gradating from the twentieth century to medieval times as one progresses down through the mixed levels. Horizons are merged, as one might expect in plowed soils. No distinct soil features were seen when these surface levels were manually excavated in 1998 and 2000. In the expansion of the trench, these levels were removed mechanically.

Period VI: The Twentieth Century

Period VI (Activities 14-16) is the pre-excavation surface level. It represents the surface seen in the 1911 and 1931 photographs of the Pasqui and Lugli/Price excavations. Cultivation is active in photographs of the Pasqui excavations. During the Lugli/Price excavation, the orchards remain, but without evidence of activity. Rather, the site begins to be groomed for presentation as an archaeological park. The excavators’ trenches within the garden date to this Period as well. This Period represents the excavation, restoration, and planting that created the site as it was encountered at the beginning of the current project.

Activity 14: SU 7002, 7012, 7013, 7017. A trench, ca. 3 m wide, cut along the building wall on the north side of the garden through the ancient levels.

Photographs from the Lugli/Price excavation of the 1930s show the garden side of the trench to be quite irregular (fig. 28), although without comparative photographs from the earlier excavations, it is difficult to tell if this was the weathering of two decades or if vertical baulks were simply never created by the excavators. During the course of Pasqui’s work, cultivation continued above the trench to the south. The cut of the excavation trench was readily identified, as were the later fills of it.

In 1998, we were initially unable to date the garden level and the rubble piles, as both contained small bits of a grey rock that at first sight looked like the bits of Portland Cement used in the restoration of the steps at the time of the Pasqui excavation, but it was soon identified by Foss (see Foss et al., E.1) as a type of local tufa. For the most part, Pasqui’s team had excavated down to the level of activity 3 and not lower. A half-meter of erosion and fill from the later landscaping has added 25 cm to the bottom of the original excavator’s trench, but it was never completely backfilled (fig. 18).

Activity 15: SU 7009, 7032, 7050, 7069. Sloping fills extending from the unexcavated upper surface at the south to the area of the lowest step of the restored stairs.

During the Lugli/Price excavation, the site was altered, and a small archaeological park was created using the excavated earth to groom the slopes. The baulks left standing in the area of the quadriporticus were graded to produce sloping banks leading from the unexcavated surfaces down to the ancient level. Stratigraphically, this appears to have been primarily a process of cut and fill; some material was taken off the top of the baulk and deposited at the base, creating a slope. This would have happened through erosion to a certain degree, but the photographs and Price’s model indicate that the slopes were intentionally regraded (fig. 29). Price shows the sloping banks in his model, which he created either in the winter or late spring of 1932.
Activity 16: Surface activity—no SU were assigned. The surface level of the site reflects the last phase of cultivation, seen today as grass, spirea, rose, and rosemary, removed for the excavation, and cypress and other trees left in place.

The area surrounded by the quadriporticus was also planted with ornamental trees and shrubs, perhaps as the old orchard trees died. The cypress trees were planted around the perimeter, and other trees appear to have been selected in accordance with Lugli and Price’s interpretation of the area as a combination of ornamental and fruit-producing trees and shrubs.

C.3.5. Evaluation of the Garden Design

Analysis of the features found in the garden area during the feasibility study provide a tantalizing glimpse of a cultivated surface of the first century B.C. We cannot say more about it at this time. The later cultivated surface, however, contains some of the best preserved garden features outside of the area of Vesuvius. The finds from this feasibility study are already sufficient to offer the interpretation of an axially-organized garden of the Flavian period, one that perhaps continued somewhat later into the Hadrianic period.

The axially of the garden design is striking, even from the fragmentary evidence discovered to date (cf. fig. 17). The purpose-made planting pot, the small pit, and the reused amphora lie parallel to the central axis of the garden on the west side. This linearity appears to be supported under the surface in the line of a gravel feature, also running parallel to the central axis, underlying the pots. The possibility of bilateral symmetry guided the excavations in 2000, and the pattern of soil markings offers some evidence for a balanced arrangement between the two sides of the axis, but such bilateral effect—if it is confirmed by further work—appears to be in the layout rather than the materials of the garden. On the east side of the axis, the evidence rests on the arrangement of soil discolorations, some of which are well-defined circular stake holes, while others are more amorphous pits or possibly inclusions in the underlying fill layer. Only further excavation will verify the preliminary outlines of the plan proposed in fig. 17.

During the excavations, it was striking how present the hill at Civitella was to those of us working in Sector VII. Any time one looked up the steps on the central axis, the hill formed a backdrop. This view adds additional weight to the visual strength of the axis in the garden. How this view was handled in the design of doorways and windows of the residence, which stood between that view and the garden, is a critical part of the overall architectural scheme.

Today, the visual relationships within the garden are blocked by the large raised areas of unexcavated overburden. To facilitate an understanding of the relationship of the architecture to the excavated remains along the axis and the features of the central pool, we created both manually drawn single-point perspectives and computer images in Form Z (figs. 30 and 31). The manual drawings were made in single-point perspective to approximate the kind of perspective employed by Roman designers. Form Z was used to enable one to roam through the architecture and garden and “see” what visual relationships might have escaped the notice of the archaeologists, given the site conditions. These computer renderings are only in sketch form; more elaborate images will be generated as further assessment of the evidence proceeds. What both types of drawing indicate, however, is that doorways and openings in the building would have permitted a framed view of the hill at Civitella from the garden through the residence.

The reconstruction drawings also demonstrate how little we know of the garden. The perspective views

looking north along the axis between the pool and the central steps appear inadequate, vacant. Looking south along the axis provides even less information. The focal points are evident, but the layers of framing that are so pronounced and delightful in the gardens around Vesuvius await discovery at “Horace’s Villa.”

C.3.6. NOTES ON ARTIFACTS

Ollae perforatae

The small ornamental pots found in situ, on the surface of the ancient garden level, and in Pasqui’s excavations, are the most obviously diagnostic elements of the garden; they provide both dating material and a certain identification of the site as a garden. The pots are discussed by Macaulay (D.3.1).

Sundial fragment

An intriguing twist on the importance of the central axis was provided by a simple study to determine the possible sites within the gardens for a small fragment of sundial discovered during the Pasqui excavations, now in the SAL storehouse at Santuario di Ercole Vincitore, in Tivoli (on the fragment see Macaulay, D.3.2). The find-spot is unknown and the piece is not mentioned in existing records.

To explore possible locations for the sundial, a three dimensional study model was prepared, using Form Z software (fig. 32). This software has a program for determining sun/shade patterns at any specified time of the day, year, and latitude. Plans were prepared that showed the areas of the courtyard that received light all day on each solstice and equinox of the year. Assuming a one-story porticus around the garden, Gleason anticipated that there would be a limited number of sunny locations within the four quadrants of the garden, but did not express her assumptions until the model was completed. The results were surprising. Continuous sun is not available in any of the quadrants, but only along the central axis of the garden, between June and September, the months when one might be most inclined to reside at the villa.

Clearly the entire villa was not laid out to provide continuous sun for a small ornamental sundial. In antiquity, prior to the development of magnetic north, gnomons were used by Roman surveyors to establish the initial layout of a building or property line in relation to north. We may be picking up on the evidence for the original establishment of the central axis that guided the design and construction of the architecture as well as the garden. This is an hypothesis that can be tested further on the computer.

Components of a grotto feature

Throughout the rubble level, a number of elements came to light that may indicate the presence of a grotto or rustic fountain feature. These include rough, deeply pitted calcareous stone, tufa, blue and green glass tesserae, and scallop shells with mortar (fig. 33), as well as fine bands and fragments of marble.

While no one of these elements, apart from the shell, is particularly indicative of a nymphaeum or a similar feature, taken together, they raise the possibility that the restored central steps into the garden, with the drain at the base, may have been an ornamental water feature, rather than a means of access and regress. Similar features are seen at Hadrian’s Villa and at Pompeii.

C.3.7. CONCLUSIONS OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY AND NOTES FOR FUTURE WORK AT THE SITE

The feasibility study has offered an exciting first look at an imperial garden of the mid- to late-first century A.D., as well as a glimpse of a first century B.C. cultivated surface probably associated with the early phases of the villa encountered elsewhere in the excavations. The site clearly warrants further investigation, as the preservation of the imperial

35. The model was created by Misako Murata, a landscape architecture student at Cornell University. My thanks for her careful work, and to Roger Trancik for his assistance with the necessary computer facilities.


37. Similar shells with mortar were noted by A. Kuttner at the SAL storehouse in the Santuario di Ercole Vincitore, in Tivoli.
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garden is among the best in the Roman world outside of the vicinity of Vesuvius. The preservation of planting features appears to be only in specific areas of the garden; it might be, however, that other more substantial architectural features and divisions of the garden are preserved. The current interpretation is of an open garden with a pool in the middle and plantings in the open area. The evidence here—and comparative examples of Flavian gardens—suggests that we should be looking for masonry and other architectural subdivisions of the space. This conclusion offers specific recommendations for future work in the garden that will reveal these features.

The feasibility study has already offered enough physical evidence of axes and three-dimensional organization to suggest the importance of vision and views in the architecture of the garden and villa, as indicated at the beginning of this report. We are proceeding with an interpretative article that will set out visual and architectural relationships to help shape future work at the site. The images presented in this section raised more visual issues than they could clarify, and thus they should be taken as study images, not as final interpretations of the garden.

Location of well preserved areas

The preservation of fine soil discolorations in the imperial cultivated surface level is only found under the medieval debris (activity 11) and probably only under the earlier deposition of material from the deterioration of the building (activity 10). In our study area, the finest soil discolorations in the garden surface itself were found only under the layer of plaster-rich debris from activity 10. From surface examination and observations made during the coring efforts around the garden as a whole, we believe that the finest preservation will only be on the perimeter, and quite possibly only on the north and west sides.

That said, two other types of garden features were successfully located, and these survived in more difficult preservation conditions. The planting pots were found both within and beyond the area of fine preservation, although all were found within the area covered by the medieval debris piles. To the south of the medieval debris piles, we encountered merging layers of cultivated soils. It is difficult to judge the extent of disturbance of the early garden levels caused by agricultural activity in later periods. We were not able to locate any pots, pits or other features. Only the chipped limestone feature (activity 4) continued south beyond the line of protective overlying medieval rubble piles.

Below the garden soils of the imperial garden lies the distinctive yellow clay fill of activity 3. This layer records stakeholes and pits dug into it from the garden layer above. Although we did not excavate this lower level out beyond the protected area of the medieval rubble piles, we had preservation of features where none had been seen above. It is quite possible that if this levelling surface continues to the south into the courtyard, it will offer a record of features of the overlying garden area.

Given these conditions, future work should proceed as follows. The whole garden and the Castageto should be studied with ground penetrating radar under the direction of an operator experienced in processing the data to detect garden features. It is unlikely, however, that the site will produce a record of garden surfaces through the use of GPR. Rather, investigation should focus on the location of more substantial remains: 1) any structures or irregularities on the slopes above the villa; 2) within the quadriporticus garden, the limestone chip feature found in Sector VII; 3) the location of internal garden walls seen entering the garden area on the east side of the portico; 4) the location of more of the brick footings detected in Sector VI.1, as well as water channels and pipes associated with the pools, fountains, and features of the little explored southern part of the garden.


39. K. Gleason is currently working on the presentation of this material, tentatively titled “The Visual Structure of the Flavian Garden at ‘Horace’s Villa’, Licenza.”
The results of the geophysical survey can assist in prioritizing further excavation. With promising results, a full open area excavation may prove to be the most exciting way to reveal this garden. A more conservation-oriented approach, however, is also possible: use nondestructive methods to detect remains around the portico, then focus on small trenches to confirm the finds and to answer additional questions about the pool and the portico in already excavated areas. The parts of the garden under the medieval rubble piles will yield the most detail on the nature of the plantings and may most fruitfully be fully excavated once the geophysical survey is complete.

Specifically, future strategy for excavation should give high priority to those particular areas protected by the early deterioration of the surrounding architecture, followed by protection of that surface by later piles of medieval rubble. These conditions are clearly observable on the north and west sides of the quadriporticus, and the ancient surfaces appear to lie at or below the base of the trenches of the early excavators. These protected areas should be excavated, rather than studied with geophysical equipment, due to the rubble component, although GPR may be used to excellent effect for detecting subsurface infrastructures, such as pipes and walls above the layer of yellow clay (which may disturb the GPR readings).

The results of excavation also suggest using GPR to locate planting pots along the axes established in Sector VII, and wherever a pattern of small disturbances might be detected elsewhere in the garden. We would only note that the planting pots in Sector VII were located directly above the chipped limestone features, and if this is a construction technique used elsewhere, pots may be difficult to locate geophysically.

In sum, future excavation strategy should begin with full GPR survey of the garden area, laying out a closely spaced series of transects to detect patterns of small features, such as planting pots, as well as walls. For unexcavated surfaces, the length of the waves should be calibrated to detect features more than two meters below, while in excavated surfaces the calibration should be within a meter. Other types of geophysical survey may need to be considered for small features within centimeters of the excavated surfaces. Excavations should then be strategized to reveal elements seen in the nondestructive survey, to explore already excavated features (the pool, steps, edges of the porticoes), and to excavate below the rubble apron to check preservation conditions. Excellent results from this phase of work may well lead to the decision to conduct a full open-area excavation of half or all of the garden. We would suggest the northern half, as there are fewer trees, and the relationships between the architecture and the garden would be much clarified by removing the unexcavated area of the garden. All preliminary indications are that, while the upper garden is Flavian, and clearly not Horace’s, it is a rare example of a Roman garden and a worthy complement to the display of the villa architecture.

Destruction of this garden to reach the cultivated surface of the first-century-B.C. garden needs to be considered carefully and only after thorough documentation of the imperial garden. From our feasibility study, it is clear that the lower level is in a limited area, not under the entire portico courtyard. Study of this lower level, therefore, should begin with test trenches to locate preserved areas. Coring through the revealed imperial levels may be the most effective and least destructive method of locating this early surface. If the lower surface is promising as a garden, it should be revealed according to a strategy interwoven with the excavation of the upper levels. That is, if the upper garden surface contains no features, the subsoil of that garden—the yellow clay fill of Sector VII, for example—should be checked for features. If coring reveals a cultivated level beneath the fill, excavation may be appropriate.

This garden is structurally more complicated than we have been able to reveal in this project to date. Excavators need to be wary of expecting simple lines of plants in neat beds of fertilized soil, but here we have all the hints of garden features popular at the time—nymphaea, masonry features, trellises, pools, statue bases, planting vessels of all sorts, and sundials. In their fragmentary state, these features will present an interpretative challenge to future archaeologists.
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Contextual studies

Environmental retrieval at the site was labor-intensive due to the clay content of the soils, but the results are well worth the effort. The preservation of molluscs is notable, and study of the molluscs, such as that conducted by M. Pinto-Guillaume Ezequiel at the Villa of Livia at Prima Porta, is clearly possible.⁴⁰ We were not able to assess the preservation of insects. Carbonized plant remains and faunal remains speak to the surrounding landscape, rather than to the plants or animals of the garden, but given Horace’s writings about that landscape, it is fascinating to see the relationship between the archaeological finds and Horace’s commentary. We have already found plants and uses he mentions (see Ramsay, D.14).

This brings us to the importance of field survey of the surrounding landscape, as initially planned for the project. The villa’s architecture clearly engages the views of this landscape in intentional and meaningful ways. The economy of the villa has a complex relationship with the landscape, illuminating matters of local production versus luxury for the residents of this villa over time. State-of-the-art garden archaeology places field survey ahead of excavation as the means of addressing these questions, and no other site warrants this attention more than Horace’s Sabine slopes and valleys.
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C.4. QUADRIPORTICUS

BY MONICA DE SIMONE, SILVIA NERUCCI, LUCA PASSALACQUA

C.4.1. INTRODUCTION

Unifying and distinguishing the plan of the complex is the large quadriporticus, whose northern side, the so-called porch (veranda) of the residence, is set at a higher level with respect to the other three arms. From the northern side one approached the two long sides to the east and west by means of two side staircases, while a central staircase led to the open area, which was in antiquity presumably maintained as a garden (see Gleason et al., C.3). The two long sides follow the natural slope from north to south. At the present time, the elevations of the walls have a facing in *opus reticulatum*, but these structures, in their upper sections, are the result of extensive reconstructive restorations carried out in the course of Pasqui’s excavations (see De Simone, D.1). In the southern part of the eastern and western arms and for the entire length of the southern side, the structures are presumably preserved only at the foundation level, sealed by a restoration cap.\(^1\) The reconstruction of the elevation, albeit not completely certain,\(^2\) appears indirectly confirmed by the various interventions of 1911-1914 and of the 1930s, which have affected the internal perimeter wall of the quadriporticus.

In the first phase of restoration, both the photographic documentation and the interpretation proposed by Lugli\(^3\) present a continuous wall (fig. 1), probably reconstructed on the basis of the evidence of the foundation remains.\(^4\) Regarding the articulation of the internal wall of the quadriporticus, the excavation of Price and Lugli in the 1930s led to a new interpretation; consequently, portions of masonry that Pasqui had reconstructed were demolished (fig. 2). This resulted in the current spacing of openings toward the central open area. In the photographic documentation of the first interventions, we can see that the facing of the wall—both in the portions still presently *in situ* and in the tracts later demolished in the 1930s—does not present openings, showing instead a homogeneous and uniform surface. Hence we may suspect that the first reconstruction was practically total, especially since it is impossible to identify a setback of the edge of the wall that would reveal the point of separation between the original structure and the restoration.

Outside of the western and southern arms of the quadriporticus is a series of small buttresses made of rectangular blocks of limestone arranged at regular intervals. On the western wall, the buttresses are preserved for some courses of the elevation (at least in the northern part), abutting the western face of the perimeter wall. In the southern part they are preserved only at the foundation level, as is the southern wall itself. The fact that the parts of the buttresses that are definitely ancient never reach a quota higher than the level of the *opus reticulatum* considered original suggests that much of the elevation in *opus reticulatum* is the result of reconstructive restoration. Moreover, the ancient buttresses seem to stop at the same quota as the top of the structure in *opus incertum*, from which the wall in *opus reticulatum* rises (fig. 3). This poses the problem of whether this quota should be associated with an ancient leveling or with the level of preservation when the structures were first discovered. If the second hypothesis is correct, we must conclude that the upper part of the structure

---

1. **The southern arm (near the southwest corner, exterior)** has a segment of ancient *opus incertum* (see De Simone, D.1.3.3 and MSU 10080, D.1.4 type 1.1).

2. Such uncertainty results from the impossibility of verifying the original mortar. The wall facings show evidence of extensive restoration, but it is impossible to determine unequivocally in favor of a simple restoration rather than a true reconstruction. The only way the matter could be resolved would be to undertake destructive soundings in the masonry in order to investigate the wall in section and to ascertain whether the original core still exists. For these problems, see De Simone, D.1.2.

3. Lugli 1926, col. 541.

4. It is hard to imagine that at the time of discovery, when they found portions of wall alternating with openings, the excavators simply decided to close the openings. Rather, it appears more sensible to hypothesize that they rebuilt the entire structure based on the foundation and on traces of wall in *opus reticulatum*. 
in *opus reticulatum* is the result of reconstructive restoration.

The quota of preservation of the small buttresses diminishes as one goes away from the wall that they join. This is apparently due to the construction of the covering for the sewer, which either reduced their height or partially incorporated them.

The original wall in *opus reticulatum* near the stairs (Sector IV.1) is, exceptionally, preserved because of the nature of the massive structures standing behind and protecting it (i.e., MSU 10048, 10049, and 10051 of rooms 33 and 34).

The eastern arm, which deviates slightly toward the southwest, also presents a series of interpretative problems, which are partly connected to the previous restorations and are complicated by the presence of other structures in the same area.

### C.4.2. Sector II.1, Area 54

The excavation of Area 54 was undertaken in order to understand the published plans of the villa, which show a break in the wall delimiting its southern end. This break has been interpreted as signaling the entrance to the villa.5

The removal of the surface humus (SU 2000) immediately revealed a wall (MSU 2004) preserved to its foundation and running east-west. This wall continued the southern back wall of the quadriporticus and provided closure to the supposed opening recorded on the earlier published plans. Because the wall was covered only by humus, it must have been seen by earlier excavators but for some reason not recorded, at least in the published plans.

In a personal communication, Bernard Frischer notes that in fact the wall is recorded in some unpublished drawings from the Pasqui excavations, now located in the archive of the Archaeological Superintendency of Rome in Palazzo Altemps (see Frischer, G.2.4).

Perpendicular to wall MSU 2004 were found three small walls oriented north-south (MSU 2005, 2006, 2007), which may be interpreted as buttresses (figs. 4 and 5). They are very similar to the buttresses located on the exterior wall of the western arm of the quadriporticus.

Evidence of activity was found immediately to the south of wall MSU 2004, but the interventions concerned were quite limited. Bricks and stones (SU 2003) were found piled up in the central part of the trench. These most likely derive from a small structure whose purpose and design can no longer be determined, given its location immediately below the level of the modern surface, which was probably disturbed during Pasqui’s excavations. Completely absent are the strata pertaining to the walls MSU 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007. This absence probably results from their removal during previous archaeological interventions or during stripping of the site prior to the twentieth century.

Definitive conclusions about Area 54 are difficult to draw at this time. We cannot exclude an entrance here, but we can exclude the possibility that this was the main way into the villa: the buttresses are spaced only 1.2 m apart, leaving too little space in between them for a monumental entrance. A more likely hypothesis is that there was a modest doorway here, intended simply to permit communication between the garden and the area south of the quadriporticus.

The location of the main entrance to the villa remains an issue for future investigations to clarify.

### C.4.3. Sector IV.1, Area 23

The sounding was conducted during late August and the first three weeks of September 1998 (figs. 6 and 7). The area is located in the northern part of the western arm of the quadriporticus, close to the staircase leading to the residence, which is at a higher level. The trench originally measured 4.0 m x 1.85 m and was subsequently widened to 3.15 m (east-west). The principal aim of the investigation was to identify the pavement level or, eventually, the various surface levels associated with the quadriporticus. The area...

---

5. Lugli 1926, col. 541; M. Santangelo, *Fasti Archeologici*, 1975-76 803, no. 11766, - s.v. “Digititia”; C. Centroni, “La villa di Orazio a Licenza,” *In Sabinis*, 5. A main entrance was also hypothesized at this location by T. D. Price in his reconstruction drawing, which places a “cave canem” mosaic here; see Price, Plate 36.
was affected by the presence of a sewer in masonry, which was known before the sounding was begun, thanks to the photographic documentation of the 1911-1914 excavations.

Because of Pasqui’s interventions, the stratigraphy in the area was considerably disturbed and consequently is compromised. In fact, a large modern ditch (SU 4001; fill 4002) occupies about half the space in a north-south direction, probably created to identify the sewer (MSU 4015), whose eastern side it grazes. Visible for the entire length of the sounding, the sewer runs along the perimeter wall of the quadriporticus; it is constructed of mortar, blocks of cardellino, and fragments of roof-tiles. The vaulted structure of the sewer took advantage of the foundation of the wall in *opus incertum* (MSU 4007) on the west side of the quadriporticus. The foundation served as an embrasure for the sewer, whereas the eastern side of the sewer was built against earth (*controterra*). Atop the vault a fracture running east-west is clearly visible. It probably represents the point at which a temporary support structure for building one section of the sewer vault caused damage because it did not join perfectly with its neighbor. Particularly interesting is the stratigraphic relationship between the sewer and the wall in *opus incertum*, which was in turn used as the foundation of a wall in *opus reticulatum* (MSU 4005). This circumstance attests a sequence of phases not otherwise known on the site. MSU 4005 was heavily restored, but this is one of the few places in the quadriporticus where the ancient structure can still be clearly seen. Another important observation can be made in this connection: at this point of MSU 4007 we can see three small fragments of painted wall plaster still *in situ*.6 They revet the eastern surface of the wall.

In widening the excavation trench toward the east, our primary motivation was to verify the structure that comprises the perimeter wall on the interior of the quadriporticus. The elevation of the wall in limestone *opus reticulatum* (MSU 4026) proved to have been completely built during the restoration phase. Its foundation (MSU 4027) was made of a fairly incoherent conglomerate of very thick mortar and fragments of limestone. The impossibility of analyzing the elevation of the structure increases the difficulty of reading the various phases that are firmly attested in this area. Although the first course of the wall that was erected atop foundation MSU 4027 cannot be identified with certainty, it is clear that, in any case, it lay at a higher quota than the level of the first course of the *incertum* structure in front of it. If the foundation MSU 4027 truly belonged to a wall in *opus reticulatum*, we would have to attribute the presently visible quadriporticus to a phase that followed the construction in *opus incertum*.

As the excavation trench was deepened to a quota of -3.00 m, a structure emerged that is difficult to interpret (SU 4032); to build it, more ancient strata had been cut by SU 4038. This structure is oriented north-south and can be seen for a length of 2.16 m. It is 0.50 m wide, and it is made of stones that have not been squared, which are smaller at the top and bigger in the core. One peculiarity associated with it was the fill of two recticulate facing blocks inside SU 4032, which ran toward the north, cutting the foundation MSU 4027. It was possible to clarify the stratigraphic relationship after the partial removal of MSU 4032, which permitted us to confirm that MSU 4027 continued to a depth lower than MSU 4032.

The stone structure has a different orientation from that of the other features on the site. It probably served as a drainage structure for the garden, although other hypotheses are possible.

### C.4.4. Sector IV.2, Area 23

This excavation was conducted in August, 1999 in the western arm of the quadriporticus, about 13 m to the south of the staircase leading to the residence of the villa (figs. 8 and 9). The zone was selected for investigation for two reasons. In the course of the preceding campaign a small sounding had been conducted behind the eastern side of the perimeter wall; this brought to light part of a wall, with facing in *opus incertum* that definitely had finished mortar joints. This wall probably belonged to a more ancient phase than the structure in *opus reticulatum* that rests on top of it. At the same time, in Sector IV.1 we found

---

6. After a careful cleaning, the wall revetment was consolidated with a very dilute solution of acetone and Paraloid B72. The fragments were dressed with gauze and a solution of acetone and Paraloid B72 at a 15% concentration.
not only the wall facing in *opus incertum* but also its revetment with red plaster. This meant that we had to completely exclude the possibility that it could have been a foundation structure built with a facing, but the presence of the sewer in Sector IV.1 impeded the investigation of its foundation. Moreover, the small sounding had also identified a stratum composed of stones and a very degraded mortar attached to the wall. Additionally, to the south of the area identified as Sector IV.2, the perimeter wall of the villa, as Pasqui reconstructed it, is abruptly interrupted exactly at the same point where the structures immediately to the west seem to stop. The course of the wall is maintained by a kind of foundation trace, whose thickness increases toward the internal arm of the quadriporticus; this gives the impression that it is a “double wall” similar to that encountered in the eastern arm. Pasqui’s restoration, as elsewhere in the villa, has completely obscured this situation, so that it is no longer possible to verify at this point what structures existed and what were their stratigraphic relationships. The restoration cap, which emerges for several centimeters above the present surface level, suggests that this was a single, thick foundation structure. But in fact we have to do with two different structures. Where the earlier excavations reached a lower level in revealing the course of the sewer running just outside and parallel to the perimeter wall, we can see the part in *opus incertum* on the western side of the perimeter wall.

To clarify these matters we decided to open a small excavation trench (ca. 3.10 m x 3.00 m)\(^7\) where the course of the facing in *opus incertum* was no longer visible at the present surface level. The wall turned out to be preserved just a few centimeters beneath the surface. First, the surface stratum (SU 4201) was removed and a very recent cut was identified running along its eastern side (SU 4205) carrying an electric cable. The course of the eastern side of the perimeter wall of the quadriporticus was quickly found. Its facing was in *opus incertum* (MSU 4202), which is visible for a few centimeters because a structure (MSU 4203) abuts it. This structure was built with limestone rocks that were not worked and a very thin mortar. Probably after an activity of leveling (SU 4204) to regularize its top, the wall in *opus incertum* was next exploited as the foundation of the wall in *opus reticulatum* (MSU 4211). The original structure of the latter is recognizable only from the western wall, while the eastern wall, which comprises the limit of the trench, was completely obliterated by Pasqui’s restorations.

In the northern portion of the trench, a stratum of rubble (SU 4204) appears that is characterized by the presence of mortar, also very poor and degraded, bricks (fragments of roof-tiles and cover-tiles, i.e. *tegulae* and *imbrices*), stones, and fragments of plaster. This stratum does not cover MSU 4203, but rather seems to abut it. In view of the thinness of the stratum, however, one has the impression that this unit was cut into during Pasqui’s excavations, which seem to have removed its upper part. This stratum was absent in the southern part of the trench, having been affected by a cut (SU 4207) associated with the activity of digging in 1911-1914.\(^8\)

The identification of one relatively coherent stratum of plaster rubble (SU 4208),\(^9\) located on a horizontal plane and with the painted face almost always turned downward, led us to believe that once this stratum had been removed, we could recognize the ancient floor. This hope was unfulfilled, and we are unable

---

7. The excavation trench was partly limited by the conditions on the site. In particular, the earthen ramp of the spoil heap, behind which the trench was opened, made the tasks of cleaning the stratigraphic units more complex. The photographic documentation, too, was made difficult owing to the unfavorable position of the excavation, which happened to be located in a spot where shadows from nearby trees were continually cast over it. The tree roots created other problems, since their roots had grown deep into the area, disturbing the stratigraphy. A final complicating factor was that hardly any pottery was found.

8. From archival photographs we can infer that in some places Pasqui’s excavations reached a point lower than the present surface level; cf. archival photographs SAL E 663 and F 338 (see Frischer, G.2.5).

9. The fragments show a preparation with white mortar of fair quality, but the pictorial surface is quite degraded, probably as a result of the acidity of the soil. After they were documented *in situ*, we recovered them; this operation was overseen by Dr. Laura Cerri. They were consolidated with a solution of acetone and Paraloid B72.
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to explain the absence of a floor surface, even if, as seems likely, we postulate a beaten-earth floor in the quadriporticus. Equally puzzling is the fact that SU 4208 is at a quota somewhat lower than the top of MSU 4203, which presumably must have been a foundation structure and therefore below the pavement level.

A stratum (SU 4209), which was poor in material, was identified below SU 4208; it may be interpreted as an activity of raising the surface level. The construction of the foundation structures MSU 4203 and 4212, which were certainly built against earth, ought to have necessarily affected this stratum. The two foundations seem to be very similar, probably created in the same phase or one shortly after the other, with fragments of local limestone and a very thin mortar that is practically pure sand and has very little binding power. Structure 4203, which abuts the eastern side of the wall in *opus incertum* (4202), rests on the foundation (4215) of the latter, perfectly maintaining its course. Deepening the trench and partially demolishing structure 4203 brought to light the surface of the wall in *opus incertum*, as well as its foundation, for its entire depth (1.70 m).

Excavation continued with the removal of several strata until virgin soil was reached. The foundation 4215, constructed with good mortar and limestone rocks, protrudes from the course of the *incertum* wall by about 0.35 m, thereby offering a solid footing for the structure. The foundation, built against the baulks of the contraction trench, cuts strata 4213, 4217, and 4222, generally datable to the first century B.C. (with the presence of residual materials going back at least to the third century B.C.), and reaches the virgin stratum 4223 as well. The structure was certainly created following the direction of the natural slope, as it shows a north-south inclination. The offset of the foundation is highlighted by a finish that has a subtle stratum of lime, which seals the limestone fragments lodged in the horizontal plane.

SU 4222 is noteworthy, even though it was investigated only in a small part and somewhat mechanically. But it yielded a great deal of ceramic material that attests, through residual finds, early human habitation of this area, at least from the third century B.C.

The excavation data presented thus far lead us to conclude that after an initial period of habitation of the site, wall 4202 was built in *opus incertum*,¹⁰ and later—but perhaps only slightly later—was the quadriporticus in *opus reticulatum* built. At this time, the surface level was raised with a stratum of fill, the internal wall (MSU 4220 and 4221 on foundation 4212) was constructed *ex novo*, and the wall in *opus incertum* was used as the foundation of structure 4211. To this phase we can also ascribe the construction of foundation 4203, the structural function of which remains unclear. In regard to this we may offer two hypotheses. The first reads this intervention as leading to the creation of a no-longer extant structural reinforcement of the wall in *opus reticulatum*. The second interprets it as the widening of the foot of the foundation for the creation of a wall with a greater section than that which is currently seen, whose eastern surface is a complete restoration.

Completely lacking occupation strata, the phase of destruction in this area follows with the collapse of the plaster and of the wall structures (SU 4208 and 4204). The plaster strata pertaining to this activity must be associated with the collapse of the walls, with the plaster still adhering, or of the ceiling.

The identification of the pavement levels remains a major unsolved problem. We did not find any surface level associated with the quadriporticus (phase MSU 4211, 4220, and 4221) and what is even more surprising is the fact that none was found associated with the first phase of wall 4202. Moreover, the scarcity of pottery finds requires us to be cautious about assigning a precise chronology to the various building phases.

C.4.5. Sector VIII.1-6, Area 55

During the 1998 and 1999 seasons, some time was spent cleaning in the central zone in the east wing of the quadriporticus (fig. 10). The structures in this part were first brought to light by Price.¹¹ Today, the walls,  

¹⁰. We have no data about the contemporaneous structures that might have been preserved farther to the east, since the excavation was intended to cover only the area delimited by the walls of the quadriporticus.

¹¹. Price, Plate 34.
much restored, form elongated spaces (caissons or basins?), aligned along the east perimeter wall. This wall, in opus reticulatum, is interrupted at the point where there is a little ovoid structure. The cleaning revealed two features: the remaining part of the perimeter wall, razed in antiquity in order to build these structures that partially intruded into east wing of the quadriporticus, about halfway down its length; and brick walls, presumably part of a structure with oval and rectangular niches, which in part occupied the area immediately to the east of the perimeter wall, “opening” the arm of the quadriporticus toward the outside.

Based on the probable plan, the brick structure ought to be interpreted as a fountain, but we must note that during the cleaning, no traces of any water system were found. The little wall of this fountain (or perhaps a kind of flower bed?), with one side in opus testaceum, might have been used to provide an architectonic feature to conceal a functional element. These long and narrow spaces, in fact, may be identified as retaining structures, to counteract the pressure of the earth of the hillside, rather than as decorative fountain basins. To understand the complex in this phase, one must note that these structures blocked, at least in this part, the ambulatory of this wing. We may also emphasize that the east-west central axis of this feature coincides with that of the piscina.

The overburden, very heavy on this side, prevented the expansion of the excavation to the east, where the ancient stratigraphy ought to be preserved.

C.4.6. Sector VIII.7, Area 55

In the eastern arm of the quadriporticus we cleaned and investigated an area that had already been excavated during the interventions of the first half of the twentieth century and again in 1981 (fig. 11).12 Today this area is not easy to study, and so it had to be cleaned in order to verify the presence of structures and to ascertain their interrelationships. The area is located in the northern zone, immediately to the south of the wall that obstructs the quadriporticus, at the point where the eastern perimeter wall in opus reticulatum is interrupted.

The intervention entailed the removal of the humus and of the pozzolana laid following the earlier excavations. The structures were cleaned and the strata were identified and documented both graphically and photographically. No records of the stratigraphic units were compiled because no archaeological strata were removed and the structures identified did not, in any case, permit a perfect reading. The data that resulted are the following.

The structure with an east-west orientation (first visible only in the tract protected by the restoration cap) continues toward the east, penetrating into the area of the garden. Apparently constructed of recycled materials (tesserae of opus reticulatum, limestone blocks, bricks, roof-tiles), it rests directly on the foundation of the internal perimeter wall of the eastern arm of the quadriporticus. The continuation of this foundation toward the south was found; it was made of a very thin, yellow mortar and of fragments and rocks of limestone. Beneath the western section of the excavation, we identified a rubble layer south of the east-west wall. This stratum, made of bricks and stones, was certainly cut by the previous excavations. On the two sides of the east-west wall we identified a layer that was probably associated with an ancient floor level, found at a quota located between -1.74 m and -1.90 m.

The reading of the eastern part of the area was more complex. Here the recent installation of an electric cable has made it impossible, at this quota, to read the stratigraphic relationships between the structures. Nevertheless, a discovery was made that is relevant for the analysis of the complex in its entirety and which also verified the continuation of the foundation of the external perimeter wall in opus reticulatum toward the south. This is shown by the fact that the wall, where it is preserved, abuts a foundation that is completely analogous to that of the opposite wall in opus reticulatum. Therefore, we do not find here the situation that was seen in the western arm of the quadriporticus (Sectors 4.1 and 4.2), where the entire length of the perimeter wall stands on a structure in opus incertum.

12. Cf. Archive SAL, excavation journal prepared by Dr. Margherita Bedello for the period 5-26 June and 12 October-3 November 1981 (see Frischer, G.1.16.19.1-5).
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C.4.7. CONCLUSIONS

Even if, in the absence of abundant dating materials, the chronology of the quadriporticus remains uncertain, we may emphasize the fact that a number of distinct building phases have been recognized, which suggests different designs and functions of the area at various points in time. This new observation results from the discovery of the wall in opus incertum identified in both our excavations in the western arm of the quadriporticus, whose western face is visible for its entire length. After our recent excavations, this structure cannot be considered as simply a foundation faced with incertum built above ground. The eastern side was carefully finished and at one point still preserves painted plaster in situ (fig. 12). This revetment does not seem to be dated to the occupation phase of the quadriporticus because the quota associated with the plaster is incompatible with that of the opposite wall in opus reticulatum. Even if its function and its relationships with other buildings that may have existed within the complex remain unclear, the structure in opus incertum presents evidence of a phase prior to the construction of the quadriporticus in the form we currently observe on the site. However, the problem of the surface level(s) and the use of the area in this phase remain unsolved.

Even though it was restricted, the investigation in the eastern arm of the quadriporticus, when taken in conjunction with the data that emerged from the excavation of Sector VIII, excludes an analogous pre-reticulate phase in the eastern zone of the complex.

13. Lugli 1926, col. 540, wrote that “la risega serve per appoggiare l’intonaco e ci dà quindi il piano del portico,” thereby indicating that he did not recognize the existence of the opus incertum wall and its plaster, even if he does note at col. 533 the presence of red plaster in the western arm of the quadriporticus (evidently taking it as obvious that it was the revetment covering a reticulate wall).
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C.5. THE BATH COMPLEX

BY STEFANO CAMAIANI, LAURA CERRI, LUCA PASSALACQUA

The bath complex in the western part of the so-called Villa of Horace was subject to archaeological investigation in three separate campaigns in 1997, 1998, and 1999, and is denoted as Sector I.¹

It had been largely explored in a non-stratigraphic excavation from 1911 to 1914 conducted by Angelo Pasqui.² Our excavations focused on the central and northern part of the complex in the Areas denoted on the plan as 35, 38, 39, 40, 50, and 51 (fig. 1 and frontispiece). Evidence came to light that permitted us to understand more fully several building and occupation phases extending from the late Republic to late antiquity and the early Middle Ages.

The decision to focus great attention and resources on the bath complex was dictated by two considerations. First, it was necessary to understand the function of the northern zone (previously interpreted as later additions to the buildings of the imperial period).³ Second, the stratigraphy in this part of the complex was better preserved and more substantial than in other areas, since significant portions of it had not been touched by the earlier excavations. A final motivation was to understand the western boundary of the bath complex and the relationship of the bath complex to the modern terrace adjacent to the west.

For these reasons, in August and September of 1997 rooms 37, 50, and 51 were partially excavated. In 1998, the excavation was enlarged to include rooms 38 and 40; in 1999, Areas 35 and 39 were included as well.

As expected, in practically all the areas that we investigated, the Pasqui excavations were found to have caused great disturbance to the late antique and early medieval contexts in the top meter or so. But the situation was much better below this level, where our stratigraphic excavations brought to light a great deal of new information pertaining to the late Republican and imperial periods.

The excavation has permitted us to identify six distinct building phases (Table 1):

- Period I can be dated to the late Republic and saw the construction of an atrium with an impluvium during the first phase of the villa (fig. 2).
- Period II corresponds to a remodeling of the entire villa sometime in the period of ca. 80-150 A.D., and included the addition of the bath complex and of related service areas (fig. 3).
- Period III probably dates to the fourth or fifth century A.D. and represents the first stage in the abandonment of the bath complex, with the partial collapse of some walls in room 50 and of the frigidarium (the room consisting of Areas 37, 38, 39, and 40). Also dating to this period is the reuse of Area 40 as a burial ground in the fourth century, and the construction of the new walls that created rooms there, sometime during the fifth century (fig. 4).
- Period IV can be dated to the sixth through ninth centuries. During this time, the thermal complex lost its original function entirely, undergoing substantial reorganization including, for example, the creation of new rooms and the raising of the floor levels. We also see numerous examples of theft and plundering for building material, perhaps motivated by the construction of a monastic community whose existence has been hypothesized, but not proven, since the eighteenth century.⁴ To this period also perhaps belong some other burials found in the complex (fig. 5).
- Periods V (fig. 6) and VI cover the very long period between the Middle Ages and the present and, among other activities, include the modern excavations and restorations.

1. The three coauthors of this report, who at the time were completing the laurea in Archaeology at the University of Siena were the trenchmasters. They supervised the work generously contributed by volunteers from twelve countries. In addition to the coauthors, important contributions to the excavation and activities of documentation and analysis were made by S. Nerucci and by A. A. Kaci.

2. Lugli 1926, cols. 536-540, 544-562.

3. In Sabinis, 4, fig. 1.

To facilitate the consultation of the following sections, in which the data and individual activities that emerged from the new stratigraphic investigations are presented in detail, we briefly introduce each part in order to clarify the occupation sequence of the bath complex.

C.5.1. Period I (Second Century B.C. to First Century A.D.)

The earliest construction that we discovered here occurred between the second half of the second century B.C. and the first half of the first century B.C. The area was transformed by the creation of a large quadrangular space (10.40 m x 10.40 m, corresponding to 35 Roman feet), in the center of which was found a square impluvium surrounded by four columns (figs. 7-10).

The only stratigraphic sequence pertaining to this period came to light during the excavation of the interior of room 38. Here the natural clay had been cut by the insertion of a drain or channel (activity 3) that had already been identified during the excavations of Pasqui. The drain was made of two small walls in stone, a bed formed of tegulae and a pitched cover of roof-tiles. The structure was sealed by stones bonded by a yellowish-gray mortar. A very compact stratum of clay rich in carbon covered the drain. Then the walls of the room were built in opus incertum with the first course composed of uniformly shaped cubilia (activity 2). The floor of the room consisted of stones mixed with earth (activity 4), on which was created a square impluvium connected to the sewer below by means of a conduit covered by mortar. Four piers, which probably carried the compluvium roof, were raised directly on the stone surface, at the four corners of the impluvium. The complete absence in the room of a proper floor, as well as the absence of an internal revetment of the impluvium, leads to the conclusion that the room was never completed and that its structures were completely obliterated and reused as foundations in a later building phase. Given the poor state of preservation of the room it can be very cautiously hypothesized that it was an atrium (Corinthian?) perhaps associated with the opus incertum wall that would later become part of the quadriporticus (see De Simone, D.1.3.7).

C.5.1.1. Activities 1-4: The Republican Atrium

Activity 1: Deposit of late Republican strata inside room 38 (SU 874, 875, 877)

In the zone excavated inside room 38—and probably also in the other areas not investigated to this depth in the location of the future frigidarium—the space was filled by three firm strata of clayey earth that raised the original level of the terrain in order to fill in the difference in level existing between the plateau of the villa and the hill above. The composition of the various strata (rocks, bricks, and charcoal), mixed with a few potsherds, is analogous, and their temporal relation is very close: the division into three separate stratigraphic units is only intended to highlight the different levels of the fill.


In the western zone of the villa a large square room was built. The perimeter walls of the space have foundations set against earth (controterra) and composed of chips of limestone mixed with earth; the walls show a first course of cubilia laid horizontally and an elevation in opus incertum. At the center of the room four plinths or piers were built, composed of stones and tile fragments laid in horizontal courses.

The eastern pier of room 40 (MSU 653) was covered by a squared stone of good workmanship (MSU 612), on which perhaps was supported the base of a column. The western pier (MSU 614) was preserved only to a low level, as was also the case for the pier inside room 39.

---

5. For the pottery, which was generally decisive in assigning dates, see Angelelli, D.2.
C.5. THE BATH COMPLEX

(MSU 1001), of which only two courses remain.

In contrast, the pier now inside room 38 (MSU 810) is much better preserved. In it the building technique is clearly visible, characterized by a first horizontal course in bricks on which are laid courses of small blocks of the local limestone, known as *cardellino* (fig. 11). The core of the wall was comprised of brick fragments and small stones. The very impressive foundation of this pier (MSU 876, related trench SU 879) is made of chips of stone arranged without pattern and mortared together.

In the space between the piers was built the *impluvium*, of which remains only a floor paved in stones laid horizontally. Only in the later room 39 does the floor tend to rise in proximity to the pier. A central opening led directly to the drain below (cf. activity 3).

**Activity 3:** Construction of a drain (SU 808, 809, 817, 824, 825, 826, 827, 872, 1017)

At the same time that the square room was built, a drain with an east-west orientation was constructed along the main axis of the room. The drain was covered by roof-tiles (78 x 42 cm), pitched and resting on two simple walls built against earth, with a thin layer of mortar on the lower part. Two meters below the ancient surface was the bottom of the drain, on which the waste water ran. It was made of tiles laid out flat and set close together. Only a small section of the original channel remains, so it is impossible to determine where the drain discharged its water. It cannot be excluded that it had a relationship to the principal sewer of the villa, which runs parallel to the quadriporticus.

**Activity 4:** Installation of the surface level of the *atrium* (SU 632, 651, 869, 873, 1015)

Over the entire surface of the new room a uniform stratum was laid down, consisting of stones of small and medium size mixed with a little earth (SU 651, 873, 1015). Above this was placed a further layer of earth with a sandy and very compact matrix, evidently laid down to even out the irregularities of the surface below, which was characterized by many dips and subsidences. No traces of a proper pavement were found. It seems quite probable that, until the reconstruction of Period II (see the following discussion), this earthen floor served as the surface level for the entire room.

C.5.2. PERIOD II (SECOND HALF OF THE FIRST CENTURY A.D. TO THE SECOND CENTURY A.D.)

As a result of the construction of the bath complex, which significantly modified the aspect of the western part of the villa, the entire area underwent a dramatic transformation in a period that can be dated to ca. 80-150 A.D.

Stratigraphic data concerning the construction of these rooms come from all the areas investigated and have permitted us to clarify the chronology and the building sequence of the new structures.

The floor of the square room (Period I) was raised by dumping earth (activity 5) containing very little pottery but a great quantity of fresco fragments datable to the second half of the first century A.D. (see Mols, D.9). This intervention saw the destruction of the four piers of the *atrium* and the obliteration of the *impluvium*. On these strata a uniform surface of rocks was later laid, which functioned as a loose stone foundation, and then a concrete layer was added. Atop this was placed a very simple black ground mosaic with a double frame along the sides and decorated internally, at least in the part that is preserved, by triangular *crustae* of marble (activity 6; see Werner, D.8).

To the west of this room was built a new space with a semicircular shape (room 37; activity 9). It was designed with a central niche having three steps, and two other niches, smaller in size, which allowed
access to the square room (fig. 12). The floor, set about one meter lower than that of the adjacent room, was covered with a mosaic made of white tesserae in the parts preserved (see Werner, D.8). The walls were revetted with slabs of white marble set on a thick layer of cocciopesto. At the same time, a narrow trench was dug in the western zone of room 37 on line with the central niche. It was cut out of the natural clay and was intended as the bedding for a lead fistula to bring water into the space (activity 11). The presence of the layer of cocciopesto, of the fistula, and of a bench covered with marble along the perimeter of the room allows us to identify the use to which the space was put. It was a plunge pool connected directly to what appears to have been the great frigidarium of villa’s new thermal complex.

To the south of the pool a series of strata (activity 7) that is related to the construction activities in the area was intentionally laid down. Above these were superimposed, at a slightly later time, some strata of dumping (activity 8), which raised the level of the surface by about 50 cm. The terminus post quem for this action is set by several pottery fragments assignable to the Flavian period. A lead fistula was set into a cut made into this fill (activity 12). The pipe, connected to that of the frigidarium, carried water into room 43. The presence of the stamp of the manufacturer, C. Iulius Priscus, does not help to establish a date, since the name is quite common (see Bruun, D.13). Above the pipe was built a new room that was rectangular in shape (room 50; activity 13) abutting the frigidarium, with walls made of small blocks of cardellino with soil used as a binder. The room had a beaten earth floor—very compact and uniform—consisting of irregularly shaped small stones and tile fragments (activity 15). It is difficult to interpret the purpose of this space, but the presence of an earthen floor makes it likely that it was a service area.

In this phase, on the upper plateau of the villa, a series of very compact clayey strata (activity 16) was laid down, on which was created a floor in beaten rubble. On this surface a colonnade in limestone was erected, of which only one column remains. The colonnade probably ran along the western side of the villa in the area of the bath complex (activity 17). To the south of room 50 a new space (room 51) was built, with two shallow apses opposite each other, whose walls were made of cardellino (fig. 13). Partially excavated, the room may be topographically related to the southern zone of the baths and may have functioned in tandem with Areas 43-49.

At the same time, to the north of the frigidarium, seven columns were erected with a north-south alignment. They were probably elements of a colonnade overlooking a garden (Area 35). In the same zone a new room with a rectangular shape was built in the bath complex (room 34); it was completely explored and heavily restored by Pasqui. The recent excavations brought to light the foundations of the western wall of this room, which abutted the northern wall of the late Republican square room (atrium). Below the floor level of the colonnade ran a channel, oriented east-west, which carried water into room 34.

C.5.2.1. Activities 5-21: Construction of the Bath Complex (ca. 80-150 A.D.)

Activity 5: Fill strata of the rectangular room (SU 613, 615, 629, 630, 631, 645, 819, 854, 858, 860, 865, 868, 870, 1006, 1013)

In this period, the surface level of the square room was raised quite substantially (on average 50 cm) through the accumulation of a series of strata of clayey earth that definitely eliminated the loose stone floor, the impluvium, and, probably, the four piers. Some of these strata are characterized by the presence of numerous fragments of plaster, datable to the second half of the first century A.D.

Activity 6: Creation of the mosaic of the frigidarium (SU 602, 603, 604, 621, 624, 626, 813, 823, 830, 840, 857, 1002)

The complete remodelling of the northern area of the baths is attested by the building of a new mosaic pavement in the zone previously occupied by the atrium and impluvium. A uniform layer of stones (SU 604, 830, 1002), ca. 30 cm thick, was laid out directly upon the strata of clay
accumulated above the Republican floor (activity 5). Atop this was set a nicely leveled layer of conglomerate made of lime and tile fragments, ca. 3 cm thick (SU 603, 621, 823, 840, 857). Above this a top bed of mortar was laid to support a pavement mosaic of black tesserae framed by two white bands and decorated with triangular marble inserts (SU 602, 624). The decoration of the room was completed with the revetment of the walls with white marble slabs (SU 626).

The function of the room is not completely certain, although in view of the plan of the baths and the room’s connection to the adjacent pool for cold plunges (cf. activity 9), one may speculate that it served as a frigidarium.

Activity 7: Construction activity inside room 50 (SU 339, 340, 341, 342)

Evidence of construction work in room 50 connected to the building of the frigidarium consists of two rectangular trenches oriented northwest-southeast (SU 339 and 341). The respective fills (SU 340 and 342) are composed of clayey earth of compact consistency with an admixture of charcoal and small tile fragments.

Activity 8: Raising of the surface level of room 50 (SU 288, 316, 319, 326, 327, 328, 334, 336, 337)

This activity relates to a series of strata that indicate a raising of the entire area occupied by room 50. It is of a piece with what is observed elsewhere in the baths at the same time (activity 21). The rise in quota of the surface level of the room was achieved by spreading a layer of stones (SU 334, 336), which served as a loose foundation and lifted the level of the floor by ca. 50 cm above the previous floor. The analysis of the pottery in these strata indicates a date late in the Flavian period or just afterward, a dating confirmed by the analysis of the stratigraphic sequence.


A new room (37) was built behind the western walls of the late Republican atrium. It consisted of a semicircular pool with three niches (a central niche on the axis of the room and two side niches), furnished with a bench (50 cm wide) along the walls. The central niche, 1.80 m wide with three steps at the base, was used for the flow of water carried by a lead fistula (activity 16) that was identified behind the west wall of the pool. The lateral stairs, which also had three steps that were smaller in size, provided a passage from the pool to the frigidarium (fig. 14). The pool abutted the frigidarium on its western wall (MSU 420=802). The elevation of the inner core of the perimeter walls was made of brick, while the exterior face was opus mixtum with regular bands of cubilia alternating with cardellino blocks. On the basis of the existing remains and design, it is possible to hypothesize that this room was covered by a groin vault open toward the east.

Activity 10: Construction of the apse of room 51 (SU 214, 215, 216, 281, 299, 300, 301, 302, 308, 312, 313)

In the course of this activity room 51 was built. During the excavation of room 50, however, it was possible to reveal only the northern apsidal wall of room 51. This structure (MSU 214=299, 215=300, 216=301, 302=MSU 10009) consists of horizontal bands of cardellino alternating with brick courses. Room 51 was excavated only superficially, but on the basis of its plan and owing to the presence of a praefurnium located in the eastern wall of the room, it was
probably one of the heated rooms in the bath complex. The foundation of the apsidal wall (MSU 308=281) is composed of small blocks of *cardellino* and is characterized by a change in level from west to east following the natural surface, which in this part of the villa appears to have a slight slope. With the foundation trench of the wall (SU 312), the fill layer (SU 313) contains ceramic material dating to the Flavian period, which permits us to date the construction of the wall and hence the entire room 51 to a period stretching from ca. 80 A.D. to the middle of the second century. Regarding the function of room 50, we may deduce that it was a service area connected to the use of thermal rooms 51 and 37 located to its sides. Access was most probably from the east, although the complete restoration of wall MSU 298, undertaken in modern times, prevents verification of this hypothesis. It also seems barely possible that there was an entrance on the south side; moreover, one cannot completely reject the hypothesis that there was also access available from the terrace above, situated to the west of room 50.

**Activity 11:** Installation of a fistula inside room 37 (SU 410, 411, 457, 458)

A channel (SU 410) was dug immediately behind the western wall of room 37. It runs in a north-south direction and is the bed for a lead fistula (SU 457). The pipe was almost certainly intended to carry water into the pool of the frigidarium. A preparatory layer (SU 458), related to the housing of the fistula, was laid on the bottom of the ditch. It was composed of mortar, marble chips, and fragments of roof-tiles and bricks.

The poor state of conservation of the fistula, of which only a short section (ca. 30 cm long) remains, does not allow us to understand its relationship with the ridge of the hill immediately behind. It is nevertheless likely that this pipe was connected to the fistula found in room 50 (cf. activity 12; on the hydraulic system in this part of the villa, see De Simone, D.1.3.6).

**Activity 12:** Placement of a lead fistula in room 50 (SU 232, 240, 243, 317, 318, 331, 333, 335)

In the center of room 50 a cut (SU 232 and 317) was made in order to set a lead pipe (SU 331) running northwest to southeast on a diagonal through the room (fig. 15). The pipe was found covered by a stratum of earth (SU 243 and 318), which also filled in the empty areas of the cut made for the fistula after it had been installed. The water pipe—which probably belongs to the same system of plumbing as the pipe fragment found in the western area of the excavation (SU 240)—was protected by two side walls made of brick and stone (SU 333), found beneath wall MSU 266. To facilitate the passage of the pipe through the wall toward the square room 43, situated to the southwest of room 50, a small square opening was created in wall MSU 302. The pipe was inscribed with the name of the manufacturer, C. Iulius Priscus (see Bruun, D.13).

The pottery found in the fill of the channel dates this activity to the second half of the first century A.D. Thus, although the name of C. Iulius Priscus is too common to serve as a dating element, the activity can be dated to the end of the first century A.D. or somewhat later on the basis of the ceramic finds.

**Activity 13:** Construction of the walls of *cardellino* in room 50 (SU 245, 246, 266, 307, 314, 315)

The walls MSU 246=245, 266, and 307 were built during this activity. They delimit a room with an irregular shape abutting the southern wall of room 37. The walls were made of small blocks of
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cardellino disposed in horizontal courses and mortared with earth. At the time of their discovery, the walls were in a very poor state of conservation. The cut (SU 314) made for the foundation of these walls was filled with a layer of soil that did not produce any ceramic material. Nevertheless, the dating of these structures can be hypothesized on the basis of stratigraphic data alone, which appear to indicate a relative chronology in the late Flavian period or afterward; this can be deduced from the close relationship of these walls to the fistula described in the preceding activity. The space delimited by the construction of these walls can be interpreted as a service area connected to the use of the pool (room 37).

Activity 14: Laying of the mosaic and revetment of the walls of the pool of the frigidarium (SU 412, 413, 419, 421, 442, 443, 453, 454, 455, 814, 815, 816, 828, 834, 835)

The whole space used as the pool of the frigidarium was waterproofed by means of a thick layer of cocciopesto (SU 413, 419, 421, 814), which was covered by a marble revetment with slabs of regular dimensions (SU 412, 455, 828). These plaques were attached to the walls by means of “L”-shaped bronze cramps (fig. 16; on the cramps, see Martin, D.12.5). The cramps had square housings from 2 to 4 cm on a side and were secured by means of mortar and small marble shims. In the hollow space between the slabs and the wall, a mortar composed of a pozzolana base mixed with brick chips (SU 442, 443) was spread to bind the entire surface of the plaques to the wall. The pavement of the pool was covered with a mosaic of white tesserae (SU 453, 835) set on a very thick layer of sandy mortar mixed with rubble and brick fragments (SU 454, 823).

Activity 15: Paving the surface of room 50 (SU 261, 274, 276, 321, 322)

Activity 16: Rise in the level of room 50 (SU 211, 229)

The surface level of the area situated in the plateau to the west of room 50 was raised by the dumping of clayey strata mixed with brick and stone fragments. Such characteristics permit us to relate them to the strata described in activity 8, where the chronology has already been discussed.

Activity 17: Pavement levels atop the upper surface of room 50 (SU 218, 221, 230)

Soon after activity 16, a series of strata of very compact soil was laid down in room 50 to serve as floor levels in this area. This intervention, contemporaneous with the remodelling of room 50 (activity 15), also included the installation of a limestone column with a diameter of 34 cm (SU 230), of which a fragment 50 cm long is preserved.

Activity 18: Construction floors in the northern zone of the baths (SU 1219, 1227, 1229, 1230, 1232, 1239, 1242)

In the northern zone of the bath complex, behind the large square space of the late Republican period, a series of strata of various compositions and matrices was laid in order to raise the surface level. The intervention, contemporaneous with the activities of levelling identified
in the other rooms of the bath complex (activities 5, 7, 8, 16) is datable, on the basis of pottery finds, to a period after the last quarter of the first century A.D. Noteworthy is the presence within SU 1229, 1230, 1239, and 1242 of numerous marble chips and mosaic *tesserae*, some of which were not completely worked. It is likely that this material results from the working *in situ* of the numerous marble slabs that decorated the walls and, perhaps, some of the pavements of the thermal rooms.

In addition to this material, the excavation brought to light some fragments of terracotta architectonic plaques that probably belonged to the first decorative phase of the villa (see Strazzulla, D.5).

*Activity 19:* Construction of a channel in the central zone of Area 35 (SU 1236, 1237, 1238, 1250)

A channel for water drainage, oriented east-west and connected to room 34, was built directly atop the strata of soil laid down to level the surface of Area 35 (activity 18; *fig. 17*). The side walls of the drainage channel, built against earth, were made of tufa *cubilia*, probably reused from an earlier structure, and of roughly worked blocks of small and medium size. The bottom of the channel, sloping downward toward the east, consisted of roof-tiles laid horizontally and close together. The use of this channel can be related to the lead pipes found inside rooms 37 and 50. The drainage channel was probably connected at its western end to a *fistula* that was part of the general hydraulic system of the villa (cf. activities 11 and 12).

*Activity 20:* Construction of the perimeter wall of rooms 32 and 34 (SU 1226, 1243, 1246, 1248, 1249)

In order to construct rooms 32, 33, and 34, a wall running north-south along the eastern side of Area 35 was built. The foundation was made of irregularly shaped stones and pebbles of small and medium size, not worked, which were arranged in fairly regular courses and bound with a sandy, rough mortar. The elevation of the structure, preserved in part only in the southeast corner, was built in *opus reticulatum* with *cubilia* of tufa and limestone. Only the relative chronology of the structure can be determined; it is later than the walls of the square room, which gives us a *terminus post quem*.

*Activity 21:* Construction of a colonnade inside Area 35 (SU 1233, 1235, 1244, 1245, 1251, 1252)

Seven columns were erected at regular intervals in the central space of Area 35. These were aligned north-south and perhaps formed part of a porticus outside the bath complex. The colonnade, which connected the residential part of the villa with the baths, was probably delimited by a perimeter wall situated in the part of the western hill still not excavated, while the entrance was perhaps situated on the eastern side. The columns were made of bricks that were cut to have the shape of a quarter circle (see below, *activity 28*).

In contrast to the piers belonging to the *atrium* and *impluvium* (Period I, *activity 2*), these were made entirely of bricks of regular dimensions, bonded by a friable mortar, rather similar to the mortar used in the construction of room 37.

C.5.3. Period III (Fourth-Fifth Centuries A.D. [?])

In the bath complex in this period are attested the first activities of destruction and spoliation or, at any rate, some significant transformations in use. The mosaic floor of the square room was partly dismantled and replaced by a simple floor of beaten earth. Inside room 50 several strata of debris accumulated, partly resulting from the collapse of the perimeter walls (activities 25 and 26). An analogous situation is
encountered within the pool (room 37), where strata consisting mainly of building materials were found near the walls. At the same time, in the central zone of room 40, a trench tomb was dug (figs. 18-19). It was oriented northwest-southeast and had a pitched covering of roof-tiles (*a cappuccina*). On the basis of C14 dating of the bones, this burial can be dated to the fourth century A.D. In the same period, but perhaps somewhat later than the previously described activities, the plan of this sector began to be partially modified through the building of some walls in the large square room. These walls defined a new space within the old *frigidarium* (activity 23).

The northern zone of the baths was affected by a demolition activity, which is attested by a series of rubble strata originating from the destruction and/or spoliation of the porticus (activity 28). To this activity can also be added the excavation of a large trench, oriented east-west, which was filled up with building material (activity 27).

### C.5.3.1. Activities 22-29: Abandonment in Late Antiquity

**Activity 22:** Spoliation of the wall structures and pavement of the *frigidarium* (SU 622, 820, 861)

The partial abandonment of this part of the villa is stratigraphically attested by the destruction and cutting back, practically to the foundations, of some wall structures. The northern end of the western perimeter wall of the square room was completely destroyed (SU 820), probably to recover building material. A similar situation was found inside the pool, where the walls were partially demolished and where all the marbles, the pavement, and also the statues decorating it (if there were any) were completely removed. To be added to these actions of stripping is the systematic removal of the mosaic of the square room, which for this reason is preserved only in small areas along the southern wall of the space.

Unfortunately, there are no dating elements that can provide an absolute chronology for these activities, but it is quite plausible that they occurred shortly before the excavation of a trench tomb identified in the center of room 40 and assignable to the fourth century A.D. (see below, activity 24).

**Activity 23:** Construction of a series of walls inside room 40 (SU 634, 642, 643, 647, 648)

Three walls were built inside this room. Their poor state of preservation does not permit us to understand their function nor to define the spaces that they delimited. The foundations of these structures, which have heavily cut into the earlier pavement levels, were made of medium-size stones bonded with clay and sand.

**Activity 24:** Tomb *a cappuccina* in room 40 (SU 635, 636, 649, 650)

Near the northwest corner of room 40 a rectangular ditch (SU 635) with a northwest-southeast orientation was dug; its purpose was to house a burial *a cappuccina*. This presents the characteristic pitched cover made of roof-tiles with cover-tiles arranged above the upturned rims of the roof-tiles (SU 649). The top of the cover consists of *imbrices*. Two roof-tiles set on their sides and abutting the sloping tiles were arranged along the short sides of the burial (on the east and west); this arrangement constituted the closure of the short sides of the tomb. On the western side, a reused marble slab (25 cm x 55 cm) was placed in contact with the roof-tile of closure and in contact with the cranium of the skeleton. Inside the trench the inhumed corpse (SU 650) was deposited, orientated east-west, with the cranium toward the east. The bones of the upper part of the skeleton, down to the pelvis, were in complete disarray, owing to the collapse of the tomb cover (SU 649). In contrast, the lower half (legs and feet)
was better preserved, especially the feet, thanks to the resistance of the tomb cover at this point. The tomb itself was in good condition, especially on the west, but the eastern section had collapsed inward.

The radiocarbon dating of the bones of the skeleton (performed by the NSF-Arizona AMS Laboratory) permits a dating of this burial to 1,682 years BP (i.e., ca. 318 A.D.) with a standard deviation of +/- 58 years.

**Activity 25:** Strata of rubble inside room 50 (SU 255, 262, 271, 273, 275, 283, 285)

The numerous strata identified inside room 50 relate to a single intervention. As already noted, this event was the dumping of soils, pottery, and building and organic materials in an area long since abandoned. The distinct contexts noted during excavation did not correspond to any chronological sequence in terms of the different deposits, which produced pottery that was largely residual (mostly dating to the mid-imperial period). There was a small amount of pottery found that dated to the fifth century. This provides a *terminus post quem* for dating this activity.

**Activity 26:** Abandonment of the upper surface of Area 50 (SU 209, 229)

The entire upper surface of Area 50, occupied in the imperial period by a porticus that faced the baths, was raised in level by the accumulation of several strata rich in building materials, in large part originating from the collapse of adjacent structures. The deposit of these strata signified the definitive obliteration of the porticus and of the floor belonging to it at a time subsequent to its destruction (see below, activity 29).

**Activity 27:** Excavation and fill of a ditch in the central zone of Area 35 (SU 1228, 1231)

The various dumps of soil presumably laid during the course of the first half of the second century (Period II) to raise the surface level of the northern colonnade of the baths were cut by a ditch (SU 1228), roughly rectangular in shape (1.70 m x 0.70 m), oriented east-west.

The fill (SU 1231) consists primarily of soil mixed with fragments of marble and pottery, as well as building materials. Nothing in the fill allows us to date the intervention with precision or to shed light on the purpose of the cut.

**Activity 28:** Abandonment of Area 35 (SU 1222)

The center part of the southern zone of Area 35 was partially occupied by a stratum rich in building materials that mainly originated from the collapse of adjacent structures. In particular, conspicuous among the elements making up the stratum were regularly shaped bricks still adhering to the core of the wall, as well as bricks in the shape of a quarter circle. The latter were elements of columns and can be assigned with certainty to the demolished colonnade.

**Activity 29:** Construction of late-antique walls in room 50 (SU 237, 250, 251, 289, 290, 303, 305)

In a phase shortly after the first abandonment of the bath complex and after the formation of rubble strata in all its rooms, several small walls with uncertain function were built within room 50. Wall 289 was built in the central part of the space, completely closing the room on its west side. This wall, whose construction necessitated the partial destruction of the northern wall of room 51 (MSU 248) was crudely constructed of small and medium sized stones arranged in an irregular way. The foundation of the wall (SU 237, 290, 303) was also made of irregularly placed rough-hewn stones. At the point at which the wall abuts MSU 246-266, a cornice fragment
(SU 250) was added, reused as a buttress to support the corner of the wall. It was not possible to establish the construction date of the wall with any precision, but on the basis of its building technique and an analysis of the stratigraphic sequence, we can hypothesize a late-antique date.

C.5.4. Period IV (Fifth-Ninth Centuries A.D.)

In the northern zone of the baths, a new flurry of building activity can be detected in the early medieval period. The resumed activity was certainly due to the visible presence of a considerable portion of the ancient structures. The buildings must have been preserved to some height, at least in the western and northern zones, and it was indeed precisely in this area that three new rooms were constructed. To the south, a large room with a rectangular shape (room 40) was created when a wall was built in an east-west direction. The pre-existing opus incertum walls of the frigidarium to the south, east, and west were reused in order to form the other three sides of the room. In the northwest part, a new space was made (room 38) whose west wall was built on the pavement of the pool of the frigidarium; this necessitated the partial destruction of the earlier imperial structure. To the northeast, another room was built, smaller than the others, which reused the Republican walls still in existence to the east and north (room 39).

The southwestern part was not affected by substantial modifications, if one excepts the reuse of a lead pipe, which brought water into the new room 40 (activity 34).

C.5.4.1. Activities 30-40: The Medieval Reoccupation

Activity 30: Excavation and fill of a ditch in room 39 (SU 1004, 1005)

A trench oriented north-south was dug just behind wall SU 843. The fill of the ditch, added soon after, consisted of earth with a clayey matrix, blackish in color and including building material relating to imperial structures. It also contained numerous pottery fragments that permitted a dating of the activity to a time later than the seventh to eighth century A.D.

Activity 31: Spoliation ditch in the center of Area 35 (SU 1220, 1221)

Another deep cut, oriented north-south, was made in the central zone of Area 35. The pit was located behind the second column and the fill consists almost exclusively of building material (stones, bricks, and blocks of cardellino) that probably derived from the imperial colonnade. Noteworthy among the material found are bricks cut in a quarter circle; these are associated with the demolished colonnade (cf. activity 28). Similar bricks were found in the garden (see Gleason, C.3.4.2, activity 11).

The function of the pit could not be determined, although it is probably related to the stripping of the bath complex. Thanks to the presence of numerous pottery fragments found in the fill, the date can clearly be assigned to the eighth and ninth centuries A.D.

Activity 32: Circular cut in Area 35 (SU 1240, 1241)

Beside the perimeter wall of rooms 32, 33, and 34 (activity 20) a small circular pit was dug, the walls of which were covered with stones and brick fragments. The interpretation of this intervention is uncertain; it may be connected to the construction activities of this period.

Activity 33: Construction of rooms 38, 39, and 40 (SU 422, 435, 461, 466, 467, 633, 804, 807, 829, 831, 832, 843, 846, 847, 850, 864, 1003, 1016)

The remodeling of this zone in the early medieval period resulted in the laying out of three new rooms inside the old frigidarium of the imperial age. The walls of late date that had invaded the ancient area (activity 29) and the wall in opus incertum 420=802 were razed to their foundations; three new walls were built
in their place. Stones, brick fragments and earth composed the inner core. The facings were made of rough-hewn stones of various sizes, which were laid in horizontal courses with staggered joints. In the elevation of the walls, limestone, blocks of cardellino, and brick fragments were used indiscriminately. One wall (SU 435-846-847-850), which runs in an east-west direction, is partly seated on one of the previous structures (MSU 634) and partly on the preparatory layer (statumen) of the mosaic, destroying part of the wall in opus incertum that delimited the earlier room on its west side. A second wall (461), oriented north-south and bonded to the preceding wall, was built inside the pool of the frigidarium. Its deep foundation partially destroyed the mosaic and the northern niche, implying thereby that this room was no longer in use as part of a bath complex. A third wall (843), of small dimensions, was erected approximately in the middle of the square room in order to divide it into two separate rooms (38 and 39).

Activity 34: Reuse and modification of the ancient drainage system (SU 293, 294, 295, 297)

The creation of three new rooms was accompanied by equally significant changes to the hydraulic system of the area, which underwent radical modification. A cut (SU 293) was made under the central area of the opus incertum wall 291 in order to allow the passage of a waterpipe (SU 241; the waterpipe had been uncovered during earlier excavations, see activity 48) situated along the northern wall of room 50. A stratum of mortar (SU 294) was laid down inside the opening of the passageway for securing the pipe, while the embankment that supported the channel was created by reusing a fragment of pavement in cocciopesto (SU 295). The recent archaeological interventions and restorations by the Superintendency made it impossible to completely understand the development and course of the new channel. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the ancient plumbing system, with repairs and modifications, was still operational in the early Middle Ages.

Activity 35: Collapse of the walls of the pool of the frigidarium (SU 403, 433, 444)

During the early medieval period several perimeter walls of the frigidarium collapsed, causing the accumulation of a substantial quantity of rubble (bricks, mortar, and marble chips) near the western wall of the basin (SU 403), on the central step (SU 444), and above the southern step (SU 433).

Activity 36: Abandonment layer in Area 35 (SU 1213)

While the central part of the bath complex was reused as a habitation, the entire surface of room 35 was covered with a stratum of uniform soil that definitively obliterated the remains of the imperial colonnade. The layer, composed of a very compact soil mixed with fragments of building material, has yielded a notable quantity of residual material from the early and middle imperial ages, while later periods are barely represented. Noteworthy, among the latter, is a fragment of white majolica datable to the seventeenth or eighteenth century, probably the result of agricultural activity in modern times.

Activity 37: Interventions of spoliation and destruction (SU 258, 259, 265, 268, 277, 278, 279, 286, 287, 309, 414, 434, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 821, 822)

Toward the end of the early medieval period the entire northern area of the imperial baths was affected by a series of interventions of destruction and spoliation. In room 50, a series of
irregularly shaped holes were dug (SU 258, 259, 265, 268, 277, 278, 279, 286, 287, 309), which were later filled with rubble derived from the demolition of the walls and mixed with clayey soil. The material contained in the trenches was of modest quantity and mainly represents residual pottery fragments of the classical and late antique periods.

Inside the pool of the frigidarium a large circular pit (452) was dug. The excavation work probably lasted for a relatively long period of time, as is attested by the superimposition of cuts, perhaps due to later adjustments and levelings. The pit was most likely created to search for reusable building material. During this activity, part of the mosaic on the floor of the pool and all the marble slabs from the walls of the pool were stripped away. The recent excavation revealed that the filling of the ditch occurred in distinct phases, each linkable to a specific stratum (SU 414, 434, 447, 448, 450, 451, 822) but as part of a single general dumping activity. The fill contained a great deal of residual material, mainly of imperial date. Noteworthy in this fill were three fragmentary marble statuettes (see Lattimore, D.10). Also found was material contemporaneous with this activity, including a great deal of unpainted (achromatic) pottery with a wave decoration, pottery with heavy glaze, and African red slip ‘D’ ware (see Angelelli, D.2.1.4). Analysis of this ceramic material suggests a date of ca. 700-800 A.D., or perhaps a little later, for this activity.

Activity 38: Burial west of room 50 (SU 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228)

A rectangular ditch was dug on the plateau west of room 50, ca. 60 cm deep and oriented east-west. Its purpose was to receive an inhumation burial (fig. 20). The ditch (SU 223) was reinforced on its sides by two banked walls (226, 227) made of limestone and brick fragments bonded with soil. Because the burial was discovered during a cleaning operation on a steep slope just below the edge of the plateau, only the eastern end of the tomb was explored. The bones of the legs (femurs, tibias, and fibulas, SU 225) were found in their original position. On the basis of stratigraphic data, this burial can be related to the two burials found in Area 35, which were given radiocarbon dates of ca. 1,194 and 1,118 years BP (see below, activities 39 and 40).

Activity 39: Burial in the western zone of Area 35 (SU 1214, 1215, 1216)

To the east of the pier SU 1207, a ditch (1214), more or less rectangular and oriented east-west, was dug for an inhumation burial. Inside the ditch, the skeleton was buried with the cranium turned to the west and resting on a sort of raised earthen level. This factor determined the position of the shoulders as well as the head, which was found angled forward and resting on the right shoulder. The arms were arranged with the elbows resting on the sides of the ditch, while the hands were placed over the pelvis. The spinal column was perfectly straight, and the legs were extended. The right foot abutted a stone placed at the bottom of the ditch. The burial had no grave gift, so an absolute date was sought by means of C14 analysis of a bone sample. The results indicated a date of 1,118 BP (i.e., ca. 882 A.D.) with a standard deviation of +/- 40 years.

Activity 40: Tomb in the western zone of Area 35 (SU 1201, 1202, 1203)

In the central western zone of Area 35, near the burial just described, a second ditch (1201) was dug for an inhumation burial (fig. 21). It, too, had an east-west orientation. All of the upper part of the ditch had been destroyed by modern interventions in the area; only the lower
part remained. The skeleton was buried with its cranium turned toward the west. Unfortunately, the bones were found in a poor state of preservation. The cranium was caved in, the right arm was folded above the thoracic cavity, and the wrist was placed near the right scapula. No grave goods were found, so once again an absolute date was sought through radiocarbon dating. The results indicated a date that is 1,194 BP (i.e., ca. 806 A.D.) with a standard deviation of +/- 40 years.

C.5.5. Period V (Late Middle Ages)

In this period, the structures of the bath complex of “Horace’s Villa” were demolished and definitively despoiled. In the various areas investigated we found that strata of earth had accumulated, which obliterated whatever still remained of the imperial and early medieval structures. Only in the southern zone of the upper plateau of the villa was a new structure erected. It was composed of a large wall running north-south, plastered along its western face. The purpose of this structure remains uncertain.

In the southern part of room 40 a small circular ditch was dug (activity 41) for the burial of two skeletons found in a secondary deposit and perhaps to be connected to the two burials of the preceding period (see activities 39 and 40).

C.5.5.1. Activities 41-46: The Last Interventions of the Medieval Period

Activity 41: Pit for the deposit of two skeletons in room 40 (SU 611, 639=610, 640, 641)

In the southern part of room 40, beside the wall in opus incertum (SU 620) a pit (639=610) was dug, roughly circular in shape, to a depth of ca. 30 cm. Into this pit numerous fragments of human bones belonging to two individuals were placed; this was clearly a secondary deposit (fig. 22). The burials are probably to be linked to the small late-antique cemetery attested by the tomb a cappuccina identified in room 40. It is probable that the skeletons were removed from their original place of burial as a result of later activities of building or spoliation.

Activity 42: Strata of the rubble of Roman and early medieval structures (SU 428, 440, 818)

The abandonment of the early medieval rooms as well as those dating from the Roman period resulted in the creation of a series of small strata consisting of stones, bricks, and mortar, located within the pool of the frigidarium and in room 38. The presence in these strata of marble fragments—including some of large size—leads us to conclude that part of the rubble relates to Roman imperial structures reused down to the abandonment of the site.

Activity 43: Medieval wall in room 50 (SU 212, 217, 238)

In the southwest zone of room 50 a large wall (SU 212) was built, which encroached on part of room 51. The wall was only partially investigated and only its western face was exposed. It was built of irregularly shaped stones and reused building materials (including various cubilia) and was covered with a layer of plaster (SU 238). The structure SU 217 abutted the wall. It was made with the same building technique and served as a buttress of the wall.

Activity 44: Strata from the collapse of the medieval structure in room 50 (SU 244, 247, 269)

At an undefined time, the medieval structure just described (activity 43) collapsed. This was probably connected to the abandonment of the entire thermal zone. The strata formed by this activity were entirely composed of stones and fragments of brick and mortar. There was a complete absence of post-classical ceramic material.

Activity 45: Ditch on the upper plateau of Area 50 (SU 235, 236)
A deep ditch (SU 235) was dug beside the medieval wall built along the southern limit of Area 50. Oriented east-west, it was about 1 meter deep. The fill in the trench yielded a small amount of finds, all of which relate to the classical period. Thus it is impossible to establish an absolute chronology for this intervention, which clearly must have happened after the definitive collapse of the large medieval wall.

Activity 46: Strata of abandonment and collapse on the plateau of Area 50 (SU 202, 206, 213, 219)

On the plateau west of Area 50, the complete abandonment of the site led to the accumulation of a series of strata attributable in part to the collapse of the medieval structure (activity 43) and in part to the natural erosion of the hillside above. The materials found indicate a chronological time frame extending from the medieval to the modern period.

C.5.6. Period VI (Twentieth Century A.D.)

After the abandonment of the buildings, most of the remains were completely covered by earth; only bits of them were still partially preserved above ground. The modern interventions to the site made from 1911 to 1914 by Angelo Pasqui and later in the twentieth century by the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio represent the last activities that we identified. Our excavation allowed us to bring to light numerous excavation trenches, particularly along the walls of the bath complex, the purpose of which was to permit the earlier excavators to reconstruct the plan of the complex in order to understand the function of its various parts. In addition to these activities, there were numerous interventions of conservation and restoration (in whole or in part) of the walls and pavements beginning in the time of Pasqui and extending throughout the twentieth century.

C.5.6.1. Activities 47-49: Twentieth-century archaeological soundings

Activity 47: Modern restorations (SU 203, 204, 401, 402, 404, 405, 406, 601, 605, 623, 625, 627, 811, 812)

This activity relates to a series of restorations that were begun on the site with Pasqui’s excavations in 1911-1914. This activity affected the tops of the visible walls, which were protected by a layer of cement. The restorations also affected the external faces of the walls, sometimes making it difficult to distinguish the ancient from the modern (see De Simone, D.1). Other conservation interventions concerned one of the two mosaic fragments located in room 40, which appears to have been removed, restored, and reinstalled in its original position.


The excavation interventions executed during the last century affected a great part of the bath complex, causing serious damage to the ancient stratigraphy and significantly compromising our ability to understand the relationships between the various structures and the strata around them.

As can be reconstructed from the course of the trenches dug prior to our campaigns of 1997-1999, the principal objective of the earlier excavations was to identify the plan of the site, including the course of the walls and the location of related floors. The principal method used was wall chasing. Particularly noteworthy
are the deep ditch (SU 256), which was dug along the eastern wall of room 40 in order to restore the wall and the pavement of room 42, and the deep trench (SU 415 and 417) that follows exactly the apsidal structure of room 35, onto the bottom of which was set a crude channel composed of bricks and used to carry the runoff of water from the hillside toward room 34.

**Activity 49:** Formation of strata of humus (SU 200, 254, 400, 600, 800, 1000, 1200)

A rather thick layer of humus with dense vegetation formed atop the structures identified as a result of the extensive excavations and restorations undertaken in the twentieth century.

**C.5.7. Appendix: Recent Work in Sector I.2, Area 507**

In June 2000 a small rescue excavation was undertaken prior to the building of the “green wall” that was to retain the slope along the western side of Area 50 (figs. 23 and 24). The archaeological stratigraphy was inevitably affected by the construction of the wall, but all the evidence was documented (SU 345-366).

The area, already partially excavated, was difficult to handle because of the steepness of the slope, but noteworthy data emerged.

The natural clay bank (SU 346) seems to have been regulated in antiquity by means of one or two vertical cuts (SU 358 and 359), oriented north-south. The cut 358 was filled with a structure of earth and stone, which functioned both as a foundation and protection for the niched apse of room 37. Cut 359 was filled by various stratigraphical units; these were not excavated, however, because they were located to the east of the area affected by the building of the green wall. The ancient regularization seems to have had two principal goals: to expand the buildable area to the west and to provide space for the water supply system. This was accomplished by cutting the clay bank almost vertically, and the excavated material may have been used to raise the level of the Republican atrium (see activities 5 and 8 above) in order to create the floor of the frigidarium.

At the same time, this work was useful for the construction of the water supply system that became necessary for the new buildings there, which clearly needed a lot of water. During the excavation two different conduits were brought to light (SU 347 and 355). The lead pipe 355 (fig. 25) is the western part of the conduit 331 (activity 12), situated at a point where the ground level shifts abruptly because of the deep ancient cut of the clay bank (SU 358). Furthermore, at the western end of SU 355, a junction of pipes for water distribution, although fragmentary, may be recognized. From this junction, at least one other branch went off. As did the fistula 331, this stretch of the pipe (SU 355) also preserved the inscription C IVLIVS PRISCVS F, repeated on both sides (see Bruun, D.13).

An activity related to a later arrangement of this area seems to have been the positioning of the big molded architrave (SU 250), reused as a pier; consequently, both SU 363 (the cut in which the pier is placed) and SU 364 (shims that fill the cut 363) must be connected to activity 29.

This rescue excavation, although limited, reinforced the hypothesis that the slope had been regularized in antiquity. If the villa at some point had been extended to the west, we would expect to find the associated structures at a higher level. If this were the case the problem of the connecting of the different levels would still have remained.
D.1. THE MASONRY STRUCTURES

BY MONICA DE SIMONE

D.1.1. INTRODUCTION

When faced with a complex archaeological site such as the so-called “Villa of Horace” at Licenza, it is tempting to forego new fieldwork, relying instead on data previously acquired and accepted on the basis of ostensibly reliable authority. In doing so, we would blindly follow the opinio communis, which holds that the villa is mainly of Augustan date, the opus reticulatum is of a certain character, and so on. On the other hand, if we do not take this shortcut to understanding the site, we can experience the excitement that comes from accepting the challenge of deciphering the traces still to be found of the various building phases and activities that have occurred on the site. Only by taking this untrodden path can we re-read the site with new eyes.

This chapter presents the results of a fieldwork project undertaken from 1998 to 2001 aimed at providing this new reading of the evidence. A new comprehensive study was deemed necessary by the following realization: first, even a cursory inspection showed that the site was heavily restored, and a glance at the secondary literature quickly revealed that the first excavator—Angelo Pasqui—was indeed criticized for being too liberal in his reconstructions; second, in several striking cases one had to wonder whether the modern walls were as much reconstructions as fanciful re-creations. These and other considerations led to the decision that a full-scale study of the walls was a desideratum. As will be seen, the effort, though time consuming, turned out to be worthwhile.

One must begin by analyzing the masonry structures that, in the case of the Villa of Horace at Licenza, have undergone various restorations. In doing this, we soon find that there are almost total reconstructions, new elevations, refacings and insertions of modern mortar or cement that complicate and often compromise the legibility of useful interpretative traces. Furthermore, the original walls are often preserved only to the level of the first courses or, in some cases, only as foundations. It is clear that the earliest restorations under Angelo Pasqui (1911-1914) were intended to be a substantial reconstruction of these faint remains.

This was partly motivated by the spirit of the times (one might compare, sic parvis componere magna, the reconstructions of Evans at Knossos), and partly by a desire to make the remains more comprehensible.1 Criticism was aimed at Pasqui regarding the massive reconstructions that were undertaken, as recorded by Lugli2 and Blake.3 The latter, following Van Deman, who attributed the opus reticulatum of “Horace’s Villa” to a period later than that of the poet, highlighted this by noting that, “although the tesserae are all ancient, most of the walls now visible were re-laid by the modern excavator in order to make a monument more satisfactory to the casual visitor.”

In fact, the monument is undeniably fascinating. A large, long rectangle (ca. 43 x 113 m) includes a residential area on a higher level to the north and, to the south, a garden area, surrounded by a quadriporticus, which is joined to the residence on its northern side by the so-called veranda. Today, nearly all of the remains within the rectangle consist of limestone opus reticulatum. The complex is situated on the saddle between two hills and only partly conforms to the natural gradient, which falls away to the south; the residence is situated on a partially artificial terrace that levels out the grade. Outside this rectangle, along

---

1. An additional motivation was doubtless to reinforce the identification of the site as the Villa of Horace and to justify the whole project. One could hardly offer a pile of rubble or the remains of the shapeless walls to visitors, who would surely be drawn to the site by the fame of the Latin poet.

2. Lugli 1926, col. 458 n3: “Professor Pasqui has been reproached for overly restoring the walls he found razed to the ground and for having brought them all to a uniform height. But this was the only way to preserve those remains, which are without doubt venerable […] . It is easy, however, to recognize the genuine wall from that which is rebuilt, though almost all are of the same antique materials, for the new are set back by a couple of centimeters and have a coarser surface.” This blithe assurance, however, turns out not to correspond to the full truth.

its western side, is a series of other structures built in different construction techniques and traditionally interpreted as later than the first complex. Today, because of Pasqui’s restorations, the villa appears to terminate on the north with an east-west wall running across the northern part of the residence.

This study is primarily intended to establish what is actually ancient, identifying the restorations and creating a precise documentation of the structures, in order to be able to base the interpretation of the phases and the functions of the rooms on reliable data. What might at first glance appear to be a relatively simple task has proved not always to be so; in visiting the villa today, one cannot easily perceive the difference between what is ancient and what is modern. Our analysis has led to the development of a new site plan, which makes clear the sometimes-fanciful reconstructions that have altered the appearance of the complex and its layout. In fact, sometimes the restorations make it impossible to understand precisely the functions of the various rooms, since the only way that we can do this is to identify structural traces within the skeleton of the building, such as holes, imprints, plugging of holes, cracks, and so forth. Building technique, too, even if not sufficient to give a precise chronology per se, can help in understanding the various phases of enlargement of the building. This is why it is imperative to identify the modern restorations. This project, therefore, has concerned itself with documenting every single masonry structure and identifying the work that has been carried out since 1911, from which a complete re-reading of the phases, functions and circulation routes can be obtained.

Furthermore, a typology of masonry techniques attested at the site has been created in order to verify or disconfirm specific functions and construction phases. This work also included the sampling of mortar because the ancient material is not always easily distinguishable from the modern, and is often made with exactly the same techniques. The study was further complicated by the fact that the early restorers used ancient materials. This practice has been verified both directly, by analysis of the structure itself, and indirectly through documents found by Bernard Frischer in the archive of the Archaeological Superintendency of Lazio (see below and Frischer, G.1.10-12).

D.1.2. The Restorations

The first step was to distinguish the restorations from the original structures, through non-destructive direct observation and by comparison with archival photographs illustrating the various phases of excavation and other interventions (cleaning, restoration, etc.), beginning with those of 1911-1914 and including those in 1930-1931 and in the 1970s.5 Besides Lugli’s fundamental publication, we have also had at our disposal some of Pasqui’s documents, which mainly consist of an inventory of finds, as well as the excavation diaries written by De Rossi, the site foreman. In addition, Bernard Frischer also found the correspondence between De Rossi and Pasqui, along with some letters from the restorer, Verduchi, to Pasqui, which were intended to keep Pasqui apprised of work at the villa. These letters have also been taken into account in what follows, and have furnished a great deal of surprising information.6

D.1.2.1. Analysis of the archival documents

In general, the letters are administrative in nature (numbers of workers in attendance, weather, storage arrangements for the finds, etc.), but information pertinent to our purposes can be found regarding management of the work on the site, purchases made and procedures followed (fig. 1). The passages below have been selected because they refer to the masonry structures. They document the phases of excavation, including some structures that are no longer visible, and the phases of restoration. These passages, which have been translated into English (for the original Italian version see Frischer, G.1.12), are quoted in extenso, except in those places where italics indicate that a summary is given. In several instances, the telegraphic style has been supplemented to facilitate

---

4. These restorations are recorded in letters by Lugli to Hallam (1 July and 14 August 1931); see Frischer, B.4.5 and G.1.14.
6. The documents are held in the Archive of the Soprintendenza Archeologica per il Lazio (see Frischer, G.1.10-12).
the reader’s understanding, with the additions put inside square brackets ([ ]). A brief commentary follows in italics, explaining the importance of a passage, or group of related passages, for the present investigation.

1. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 28 March 1912

In the cryptoporticus, work on the right-hand side has brought to light about two meters of plaster to a height of about 25 cm, red in color like that found before.

2. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 30 March 1912

The excavation proceeds well. The cryptoporticus will be completed by Monday evening up to the boundary with Rocco Foschi’s property = parcel 1215; see Frischer B.3 and cadastral map, fig. 17]. The reticulate walls follow on both sides, where plaster painted red was found to a height of about 25 cm.

It seems correct to interpret the right-hand side as the western wing. The plaster must necessarily have covered a still intact wall surface. Unfortunately, no unequivocal indication is given about the construction technique of the wall in question (opus reticulatum or opus incertum?). A section of red plaster is still preserved, a facing on the wall (in opus incertum) next to the stairs that lead to the residential area (see De Simone et al., C.4). The boundary with Rocco Foschi’s property, in fact, ran through the flight of stairs (see Frischer, B.1.9, fig. 4, where the modern plan is superimposed over the property lines, and E.4, table 2).

3. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 27 April 1912

The excavation on Foschi’s land is almost entirely completed; only foundations were found.

4. Giuseppe Verduchi to Pasqui, 29 May 1912

The reticulate wall adjacent to the stairs has been completed for a length of about 7 m. The work continues well, both the excavation work and the wall building.

From this passage it is not clear if the completion refers to excavation or restoration work; since the person in charge of the restoration/reconstruction of the masonry (“lavoro di muratura”) was in fact Signor Verduchi, it is likely that he means the latter.

5. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 1 June 1912

Transport of bricks and 1860 kg of lime from Roccaiovine to Licenza, because the limekiln owner has no more of lime to sell. On Monday we will get another shipment of lime.

6. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 4 June 1912

Expense note for lime: 20 quintals. The masonry work continues as planned since Signor Verduchi is not worried by the sun. The investigation ordered by Your Most Illustrious Lordship in the center of the pool has been carried out by Signor Verduchi, but without any sign of a source being found, only a lining of stones and pozzolana. […] [The small room] shows the end [top?] of the wall facing, because the wall is terminated and is made of reticulate with edges of roof-tiles. […] transport of gesso [plaster?].

The masonry activity, as is evident from the expense note, required a constant and abundant supply of building materials, which were immediately put to use by the industrious Verduchi. The “pool” he is referring to is, in reality, room 33 (interpreted, evidently together with room 32, first by Pasqui and then by Lugli, as a swimming pool). However, it is
impossible to identify the precise location of the test-pit. For the south wall of room 33, the northern face of which is of terracotta opus reticulatum, see the section on construction typologies (appendix I, D.1.4, type 5.3.3).

7. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 8 June 1912

Expense note for sand and 1000 bricks. The masonry work continues on the reticulate wall adjacent to the stairs; more than half is now done. In the digging, new walls are being continuously discovered. Just today a reticulate wall was found with fine red-colored cocciopesto plaster, 3.2 m in length, with two stairs at the top and two at the foot (of guide also covered by plaster), [which have] a length of 1.00 m and a height of 30 cm.

In this case the (reconstructive) restoration can be identified with certainty, even if the precise location of the work remains to be determined. The new area mentioned is the northern part of room 34. Two points are of interest here: the indications of the waterproof coating of cocciopesto and the note about the stairs “of guide also covered by plaster.” I will return to the meaning of the term “guide” below (cf. the letter from Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 27 December 1912 = no. 20). The reference to the “two stairs at the top and two at the foot” actually indicates the two steps discovered at that time for each of the two staircases; consequently, the height must refer to a single step.

8. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 15 June 1912

Purchase of pozzolana and sand. The basin is completely cleaned and glued, even on the bottom. It has a drainage hole that must lead into the main sewer.

The room in question is number 34. By “glued” (Italian: incollata) De Rossi doubtless means “coated throughout with cocciopesto.”

9. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 21 June 1912

Investigating the perimeter wall on the Onorati’s land, it was found to be truncated by a lime pit.

10. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 29 June 1912

On the land of the Onorati heirs, work proceeds with some laborers to expose the perimeter wall. The wall is cut off by a lime pit, but it comes up close to a large foundation that continues toward the waterfall.

The area in question is north of the gravel road that crosses the remains of the villa (see Frischer, B.3, fig. 17), i.e. the area north and northeast of the excavated residential section. The perimeter wall is the northern wall, interpreted then as the limit of the villa. The foundation structure noted as going toward the waterfall (i.e. toward the west) is probably outside the rectangle of the residence block visible today. This hypothesis is supported by evidence gathered from the testimony of various custodians at the site. The lime pit indirectly attests to a later spoliation and reuse of building materials. Bernard Frischer, in a personal communication, notes that such activity is definitely known in connection with the construction of the local church in the 1840s and 1850s (see Frischer B.1.9).

11. Giuseppe Verduchi to Pasqui, undated

The masonry work in the cryptoporticus is almost finished. On Monday I will begin work on the masonry of the stairs in the garden.

12. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 10 August 1912

Expense note for the stonemason’s working days (De Rossi says “for eight linear meters”) and for the transport of sand.

13. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 24 August 1912

Expense note for pozzolana; the masonry work continues.
14. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 28 August 1912

The stones that were in the vicinity of the cryptoporticus have been transported away from the excavation. The others serve for the construction of the restored walls. A good part of the walls has been aligned; if he wishes, Signor Gatti may come.

The substantial masonry reconstructions are clearly attested by this letter. It is obvious that these are not only repairs, but also actual constructions. The draftsman, Signor Gatti, was invited to carry out the survey for the plan after the walls had been “aligned.”

15. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 31 August 1912

New order for sand. A [mosaic] 2 m x 90 [cm], nearby, fragments of another one without any surrounding wall [have been found]. Suspension of excavation and De Rossi asks if the masonry work will continue.

The restoration work continued non-stop. Sometimes parts of mosaics were found in situ, but the walls of the rooms in which they were located had been reduced to nothing. The note here concerns room 11, as may be deduced from the schematic drawing of the mosaic that De Rossi attached to the letter. It is not possible to identify the second room.

16. Giuseppe Verduchi to Pasqui, 16 September 1912

The masonry work continues very well; about the work on the basin of the bath, the arch and the wall facing, what was left from last year was finished. The cryptoporticus was finished equally on both sides, and now I am working on the heating system on Ricciotti’s land, to restore the small pillars […]; small repairs with cement around the mosaics on the land of the Onorati.

17. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 28 September 1912

There are 12 quintals of lime still to slake […]. Various materials are still to be removed from the cemetery corridor of the bath basin, precisely where the masonry has been done and the hole has been closed, which leads to the sewer. […] The old stock of lime is quite diminished; it would be useful if Your Most Illustrious Lordship could make a larger acquisition of that, because it is lime of good quality and well baked, and not too far to transport, because there are still many walls to restore and they take a lot of material, especially the wall of the cryptoporticus near the gate, which must be urgently done. The mosaics have had all the broken parts repaired (with cement) by Signor Verduchi. The masonry work has proceeded in good order, so that when you arrive on site you will be satisfied.

It is impossible to identify with certainty the room that is referred to as the “bath.” It could refer either to the large apsidal hall (room 33) or to the so-called vivarium (room 53). The fact that De Rossi, in the letter of 17 September 1912, mentions a single arch and refers to the remainder of work from the year before points to the latter hypothesis. The excavation seems to have started from the building that had the most substantial remains left above ground. The reference to a “cemetery corridor of the bath” could create a misunderstanding. We know with certainty that the so-called vivarium was used at some point as a burial place, but one cannot exclude an analogous use for the apsidal hall 33, especially since the 1997-2001 excavations have found burials in nearby Areas 40 and 35. The reference to “the hole which leads to the sewer” is the decisive point. Lugli records at least two holes (one for a water jet and one for an outflow)

8. Another source that cites the room in question in these terms is the site diary for November 1916. In the wall of the ‘unrestored’ bath, De Rossi found a stamp on a dolium rim-fragment that he transcribed as FAVONIAECF / Q FABRICIFE (AB in ligature); broken, it had been inserted in the wall as fill. For the stamp, see Filippi, D.4. Lugli makes no mention of it.
in the floor (in reality, the sub-floor) of the so-called vivarium. These holes are no longer visible.

The use of cement, in place of the usual mortar, is also remarkable in a period in which there was still a cautious attitude toward the use of this material. This detail, however, testifies to a differentiation in the use of the various materials: cement only for the mosaics, mortar and traditional inert materials, necessary in large amounts, for the walls.

18. Giuseppe Verduchi to Pasqui, 10 November 1912

Regarding the work that I oversee, I have taken the greatest care to find the first course of the doors [“spiccati,” i.e., the level from which the wall starts atop the foundations] and, indeed, in the rooms of the mosaics, excavating below the level of the mosaics, I have found the spiccati for three doors, one in the direction of the stairs of the cryptoporticus, and two passageways, one from the first room and another from the second room (that is, the [room with the] mosaic that has always been known). […] Signor Gatti can come at his convenience, for we will attempt, as far as possible, to have it all organized for him.

The rooms discussed seem to be 1, 2 and 4. It is interesting to note that for the first time, after almost two years of excavations, there is sudden talk about finding doorways; no mention of them had been made in the previous series of letters. This is probably in response to an explicit request by Pasqui, who, while not present during most of the excavations, had perhaps just visited the villa and noted this illogical absence from the record (cf. the next letter). Of course, it is hard to find a doorway when the wall is not standing at all. At best, De Rossi could be on the lookout for an area in which a doorway-sized opening of the bare foundation was flanked by at least one course of elevation of the wall (i.e., spiccato [singular], spiccati [plural]), which could be interpreted as the remains of the doorjambs delimiting a threshold.

19. Giuseppe Verduchi to Pasqui, 23 November 1912

The masonry work continues to proceed well with further spiccati for doorways. While working last Monday, De Rossi found spiccati of two other doorways near the mosaic on the land of the Onorati heirs. He is now carrying out the work on the aforementioned spiccati and on the extension of the reticulate walls. It is an important job. At the moment there seem to be six doors. I will do my utmost to see to it that when Your Most Illustrious Lordship visits the excavations, you will be pleased.

See the comment on the preceding letter (also for the meaning of spiccati).

20. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 27 December 1912

I will do as Your Most Illustrious Lordship has ordered, that is, to put the chiodi and guide around the Ricciotti mosaic. Or rather, I propose that since there are not any chiodi and guide in the area of the villa, if Signor Verduchi is late, I can choose from the spoil heap near the bath basin; those [chiodi and guide] are mixed, good and bad, and stones. Then I can move them to the area of the villa and keep them ready for when the restorations are being done. The other extremely important work is that of covering both the restored walls and those still to be restored with earth, especially in that part of the cryptoporticus near the gate that was cleaned for restoration in September, but which was not done. The same should be done for the most recently restored walls, which are still covered with planks, since every clear night brings a lighter or heavier frost, and the walls are being damaged.

The Ricciotti mosaic is probably to be identified with the floor in room 16. Most interesting here is the meaning that can be attributed to the words guide (cf. the letter from Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 8 June 1912 = no. 7) and chiodi (cf. the letter from Giuseppe
Verduchi to Pasqui, 17 November 1913 = no. 24). We may deduce from these passages that the discussion concerns construction materials. Chiodi, in my opinion, are the opus reticulatum building blocks, which may be informally defined that way because of their long and narrow form, reminiscent of a nail (even if the shape more closely resembles a truncated pyramid). Guide, on the other hand, may be the little rectangular parallelepiped blocks that are used for the edging of walls in opus reticulatum. The stairs of room 34 were, in fact, made of guide and chiodi, and the guide to be reused must have been chosen from the heap of stones near the “bath basin.” As we have seen, this must be identified with the so-called vivarium (room 53; on the characteristics and actual function of this building see D.1.3.5). Building materials must have been present in great abundance, although we do not know the percentage of chiodi with respect to “stones that were not good” (evidently the stones might well have come from opus incertum structures). This confirms once again that falsifications could easily have occurred when walls were restored in opus reticulatum when only foundations were preserved.

21. Giuseppe Verduchi to Pasqui, 12 December 1912

The masonry work continues in the vicinity of the mosaics.

22. Giuseppe Verduchi to Pasqui, 27 August 1913

The two olive trees, one on the Onorati land and the other on the Foschi land, have been felled. The latter was the tree that is close to the stairs that are to be restored. The sand is being extracted and tomorrow the transportation of it will begin. […] The stonemason has started the arrangement of the corners that will be used for the small piers of the stairs. […] The masonry work continues very well, mainly concentrating on the doors and the perimeter wall.

23. Giuseppe Verduchi to Pasqui, 25 September 1913

As soon as I arrived at Licenza I went to the excavations at the Villa of Horace, where I found the masonry work proceeding regularly […]. Meanwhile, in my absence, I will leave work for the coming week; this is work on the foundations that can be done easily. In addition there is the work of shaping the bricks.

24. Nicola De Rossi to Pasqui, 17 November 1913

The shaping of the small bricks, 500 in number, was finished by the tenth of this month. Also, a stretch of reticulate wall has been completed that runs from the room of the rough mosaic and joins the boundary wall of the villa […]. This section being finished, work has started on another small stretch of the perimeter wall that joins the remaining corner that is still to be done. Today, work was also carried out on the above-mentioned wall because the lime was ready; tomorrow we will begin to gather the chiodi scattered throughout the excavation and to reduce them to the size of those already put back into use, as Your Most Illustrious Lordship has ordered me. I would like to know, please, if the chiodi now at the end of the Caponnetti cryptoporticus, that is, at the entrance to the garden of the villa, are to be taken back and reduced as well.

The passages in question testify to the intense activity of reconstruction, even at the level of the foundations. The building materials, whether modern (bricks) or ancient (chiodi = building blocks of reticulate facing; cf. comment on no. 20) were shaped (“reduced”) as needed.

---

9. This is where the Pasqui excavations began, so it could be expected that a spoil-heap was located nearby. It may be seen in contemporary photographs (cf., e.g., SAL A 96-1070, D.1.2.2, no. 6 and fig. 8).
D.1.2.1 Analysis of the photographs

A database of photographs was assembled from items in the photographic archive of the Archaeological Superintendency of Lazio, the Fototeca Unione housed in the American Academy in Rome, and the personal archive of Thomas D. Price, now in the possession of his sister. The photos were mainly found by Bernard Frischer, while Kathryn Gleason found the Price archive. The photographs of the Superintendency and of Price lack captions, dates and other details; like the other photos, they are casual and panoramic in nature. But even if they were not taken with the intent to provide scientific documentation, they nonetheless testify to the various phases of work and allow us a glimpse of the conditions prior to restoration interventions. They have been taken into account in compilation of the individual masonry stratigraphic units (MSU, for which see D.1.3.1); the information on these gathered from the photographs has been annotated there. A selection of the most representative photographs is given here, listed in approximate chronological order and accompanied by brief comments.¹⁰

1. SAL E 661 – SAL E 662 (figs. 2 and 3)

Taken in 1911-1914. Room 53. The so-called vivarium is almost unrecognizable (for the function of this room, cf. D.1.3.5). The photograph shows a series of walls, no longer visible today. These walls, which had been made of reused materials, were demolished at the time of the excavation because they were ascribed to the medieval period. The demolition, besides having abolished a phase in the life of the building (thus making it impossible to formulate hypotheses for its later use), has also undoubtedly altered the evidence for its original functions. In this case, the reconstruction work was particularly invasive, as may be inferred from the state of the monument at the time of the excavation, as well as by direct analysis of the remains on the site. Extremely interesting is the relief of a flower with a central button that was inserted into the later masonry. The demolished dividing walls are only indicated by broken lines on the plan published by Lugli. Neither Lugli’s plan nor his text, however, indicates the presence of stairs (visible in the photograph), nor do they clearly describe the structure in its last phase (i.e., the actual state of the hypogeum space, which exploited the vaulted passage).

2. SAL E 729 (fig. 4)

Taken in 1911-1914. Views of many rooms, including 34 (foreground) and 21 (mid-ground), from the south. The condition of the site at the time of discovery, also affirmed by the letters addressed to Pasqui and by Lugli’s publication, is easily recognizable. Room 34 is entirely covered by a layer of cocciopesto, which is now preserved only on the floor, with a cordolo (i.e., a rounded base molding). Traces of the cocciopesto can still be observed on the reticulate stones (but never on the mortar, which is completely modern). The visible section of opus reticulatum (wall MSU 10001) is a modern restoration, except for four or five blocks near the second step on the east. The iron nails mentioned by Lugli are not identifiable in the photograph, but are still present on site, in wall 10048. This wall has, however, undergone substantial restoration. The photograph also shows evidence of an opening in the (reconstructed) southern wall of room 21, which was later restored as a continuous stretch, as indicated by Lugli on the plan and still seen today.

3. SAL E 730 (fig. 5)

Taken in 1911-1914. We see the residential block, from the west, with workers during the construction of the walls. Clearly visible are the planks keeping the strings taut. Many of the rooms have already been restored. In the foreground, the ancient section of wall 10056 in opus reticulatum and aspe 10055 can be seen; the exterior of aspe 10054 appears almost completely without facing. In room 21 the small piers of the suspensurae are evident. Some stretches of walls that are present today do not appear at all. Judging from the darker color of the surface of the edging (the mortar not yet being dry), the passage between rooms 14 and 15 seems to be a “correction”

¹⁰ The acronyms are as follows: AAR=Archive of the American Academy in Rome; SAL=Archive of the Soprintendenza Archeologica per il Lazio; Price=Price Collection.
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in progress, as is the unhappy compromise for the door of room 20. In the background the small sections of opus reticulatum in the eastern perimeter wall are recognizable, as are the huge piles of building material to be reused in the restoration.

4. SAL F 368 (fig. 6)

Taken in 1911-1914. The residential block is seen from the east, showing phases of excavation and restoration. The absence of currently existing walls is rather clear from the picture, as is the regularity of the restorations already completed at the time of the photograph. Furthermore, two mounds—probably divided according to the shape of the stones—may be distinguished at the edge of the excavation area for use in the restorations (cf. the letter of 27 December 1912 = no. 20). For the situation of room 12, cf. De Simone, C.2.1.

5. SAL F 372 (fig. 7)

Taken in 1911-1914. Western rooms, from the south. The presence of masonry remains in opus reticulatum in Area 36 (west of the quadriporticus) is noteworthy. The antiquity of this material cannot be ascertained, and it is difficult to imagine it as the collapse of a section of the wall of the quadriporticus, but perhaps it may be identified as the wall indicated in Lugli’s plan as opus vittatum mixtum. In any case, the presence of this wall, which is no longer visible, further complicates matters. In the quadriporticus the internal wall still appears continuous in the photograph; later, as a result of Price’s excavation, it was re-restored with windows and doors. This detail clearly illustrates the scanty remains from which the walls were reconstructed. We can also see the relationship of the modern level to the ancient, and how the trees planted have disturbed the ancient strata and structures. Moreover, the deep trench that has been dug into the garden to a width of about 2 to 3 meters along the eastern side of the western arm of the quadriporticus has completely destroyed the ancient stratigraphy.

6. SAL A 96 – 1070 (fig. 8)

Taken in 1911-1914. Rooms 36, 52 and 53, from the east. In this photograph we can easily identify the first restoration work on structure 53, which was delineated by the removal of later walls. Most of the brick facing is shown to be an addition; this is verifiable on the monument itself. Successive work further changed the profile of the structure to its appearance today. The view of the two projecting walls (MSU 10035 and 10038) is equally interesting. They are located near the southeast corner of the western rooms, between these and the external wall of the quadriporticus (Area 36). From the photograph, it appears that one was empty, while the other could have housed stairs (the profile suggests two steps). One cannot but note how substantial the reconstructions are for all the visible structures and not just the wall facings.

7. Price Family Archive (fig. 9)

Taken in 1931. The eastern wing of the quadriporticus, Area 55, during the excavation. Three niches, two oval and one rectangular, are perfectly visible. These were made in antiquity by cutting back the eastern perimeter wall of the quadriporticus. Now almost completely obliterated by restoration, these suggest the presence of a fountain structure, as has been demonstrated by recent excavation (cf. De Simone et al., C.4.5).

8. AAR 2721 (fig. 10)

Taken in 1955. Room 33 from the southwest. An arched lintel inside wall MSU 10056 can be seen, which is no longer visible. It cannot be established if wall 10002, which abuts wall 10056, had a similar passage at that point, or if the construction of the wall obliterated it. Depending on the hypothesis, it can be connected either to a hypocaust system that will have existed between rooms 21 and 33 or (and this is more probable) to the passage of the sewer, which will later have been redirected with the construction of room 33). The arched lintel seems to be constructed in brick or roof-tiles. Moreover, we cannot tell from the photograph whether it was made at the same time as wall 10056 or by cutting through the wall during a later phase. Above and on both sides of the arched lintel...
lintel the original stretch of wall in opus reticulatum is easily identifiable. The eastern side of the arch is visible in photograph SAL L2 30659, but the walls seem to have undergone considerable restoration, a fact that prevents further speculations on this subject.

9. SAL L 20650 (fig. 11)

Taken in the 1960s or 1970s. The state of decay of the walls in room 34 is evident from the reticulate facing that has fallen. The surviving section is almost certainly attributable to the restorations of 1911-1914. We are therefore faced with the paradoxical situation that the wall had been restored twice, once in the period 1911-1914 and again in the 1960s or 1970s. The wall facing of the second intervention is offset with respect to the first restoration, as if it were the ancient original.

10. SAL I 1625 (fig. 12)

Taken in the 1960s or 1970s. Restoration work in Area 36, from the north. The previously reconstructed sections of masonry are easily distinguishable. First and foremost, it is important to note the remnants of structure MSU 10046. These include a tract of wall made of complete bricks for the first two courses and fragments of bricks (or roof-tiles?) for the remainder of the section. Despite the poor state of conservation, no limestone blocks can be distinguished, but these are seen today and were evidently inserted during subsequent restorations. However, the most noteworthy fact is that this tract of wall rests on another, which is now no longer visible on the site; it has been covered by the stone floor being laid at the time the photograph was taken. The demolished structure may be associated with the northern side of the drainage conduit leading into the main drainage channel. While it is impossible to determine whether the facing of this wall was opus incertum or reticulatum, the fact that it had a facing, according to this photograph, is noteworthy considering its level. Wall 10017, which delimits the west rooms, has a facing, albeit ruined, of opus incertum.

The small buttresses that abut the outside of the western wall of the quadriporticus (MSU 10056/10068), which are still visible at the site, have never been preserved above the level of the opus incertum section (10068). Furthermore, their original profile suggests that they are to be associated with the cover of the main drainage conduit, subsequently ruined and collapsed. Such indications may support the hypothesis that the buttresses were intended to be buried.

D.1.2.1. Conclusions

The extent of the reconstruction work carried out on the site from 1911 to 1914 and later in the twentieth century is now well documented. To some extent these early efforts were forgotten or were accepted at face value as a reconstruction that was faithful to the original.

These restorations aimed not only at reconstructing some walls, but also at the demolition or obliteration of others, particularly those thought to be of the medieval period. Because the work was carried out without first having come to an adequate understanding of the structures and without having made a thorough documentation of the original remains, it has caused irreversible damage. The sudden interruption of work in 1914 (see Frischer, B.4.1) created a further unevenness in the complex. In Area 17, for example, the structures partially preserved at the level of the foundations were not rebuilt, as they were in other areas, and, as a result, we obtain an image of the monument that has been falsified yet again—this time precisely by a reconstruction that is inconsistent and hence (in the total absence of a sign on the site or at least a scientific publication explaining what was done, not done, and why) confusing and misleading. The most recent restorations, sometimes employing modern materials, have in turn created further ambiguity, because the vertical line of the facing was set back in relation to the 1911-1914 restoration, carried out primarily using ancient materials. The unfortunate result is that, at first glance, the 1911-1914 restorations appear to be original walls.

The various superimpositions and demolitions of stratigraphic relationships make the interpretation of very partially preserved structures even more complicated and have consequently given rise

12. In this connection, see also De Simone, C.2.1 on the finds from the excavation of room 12.
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to a series of new questions that have not all been resolved.

D.1.3. Direct Analysis

Parallel to the collection and analysis of archival documents and photographs, the arduous task of analyzing the wall structures on site was undertaken. This work included measured drawings, creation of a database of wall features, and a sampling of mortars (cf. Appendix II, D.1.5). The collection and collation of data was not enough on its own, but it was a convenient way to approach the study, and it provided the starting-point for the reflections that follow.

D.1.3.1. The cataloguing

To document the individual structures, a Masonry Stratigraphic Unit (MSU; see also Frischer et al. C.1.7.1) catalogue form was used. It was modeled on the MSU form recommended by the University of Siena.13

 Granted that it is impossible to create a form that could contain all the terms and fields useful for the study of the monument and that a database alone is not sufficient for understanding it, the creation of a catalogue is still a useful procedure, since it helps to keep our critical faculties constantly alert as we confront the monument.14 The study must therefore be based upon direct knowledge of the structure, whose data can be only partially captured on a catalogue form, which for this reason is only a means, not an end. These kinds of documentation are not exhaustive by themselves and a greater effort needs to be focused on precisely the personal choice of the data that ought to be entered. But the documentation phase has its undeniable importance, especially with respect to the lack of understanding that can arise from excessively fanciful restorations. Of course, every intervention on an ancient monument ought to be rigorously documented, within the limits imposed by subjectivity, in order to avoid misunderstanding or loss of information. This is a policy to which assent is very readily given and that can also be considered completely obvious, yet it has often not been applied and—what is worse—is even today not always observed.

As noted, some of the data we have gathered were drawn from materials not originally intended to furnish exact documentation, such as letters, notes about expenses, and casual photographs. In the present case, we have attempted to proceed in the opposite direction, reconstructing the modern interventions that have affected the walls, isolating the parts that are clearly original and seeking, insofar as is still possible, to identify remains that are helpful to the interpretation of the phases and function of the various rooms and spaces of the villa.

In the residence (rooms 1-21), the walls that have been restored or entirely reconstructed have been examined, but only a sample of them has been catalogued, whereas in the rest of the monument we have documented not only the walls identified in the new excavations but also the walls that were excavated earlier and subsequently restored.

Another limitation of this study should be mentioned. We have restricted our investigations, in the areas previously excavated, to the features presently visible on the surface. We have not been able to undertake new excavations or cleaning beneath the currently visible remains. It is thus probable that portions of a wall indicated in the catalogue as “completely restored” still preserve an original course below the surface. On the other hand, we also know that some structures have certainly been completely reconstructed atop the foundations or even from the foundations up.

Because it was merely the means of the study (not the end), the catalogue form has been used with a certain flexibility, which admittedly runs the risk of subjectivity.15 Where it has been impossible to decide


15. The “maximum height” indicated in the MSU refers to the original structure, but in some cases it actually refers to the wall as completed by restoration. The “minimum height” refers to the level of the
if we are confronted with one or more masonry stratigraphic units, a single form has been filled out treating the wall as it currently appears (e.g., MSU 10004) and putting the various issues into a note. Where there are various ancient wall segments that can be clearly identified as belonging to a single structure, only one catalogue form has been used (e.g., MSU 10061, fountain). For the building with an internal oval plan furnished with niches (building 53) no catalogue entry was made since it would have been impossible to do justice to its complexity in a short entry. The structure has been treated in a separate paragraph (D.1.3.5). This activity of “wall census” has been identified by its own operational sector (Sector X) and the pertinent MSU belong to group 10000 (see fig. 13 for MSU numbers). Given the fact that so many stratigraphic relationships are no longer legible, the construction of a stratigraphic matrix for the wall structures unfortunately has not been possible.

The direct analysis of the monument, corroborated by archival documentation, enables us to establish some fixed points from which a new reading of the complex could proceed. On the basis of various observations, we have therefore created a plan showing those features, currently visible on the site, that have at least one genuinely ancient course of elevation. A two-dimensional plan could not, of course, handle the situation in which walls are preserved one atop the other, when the upper wall is entirely or partially restored.

It appears clear that, at the Licenza villa, the portions of ancient masonry that can be analyzed are quite small, sometimes limited to just one course. As noted, however, there may be additional ancient masonry preserved under the surface (including, as the 1997-2001 excavations showed, entirely new building phases hidden beneath the levels where the previous excavations stopped and where restorations were consequently made). It should not be forgotten, furthermore, that the medieval period is under-represented because the excavations of 1911-1914 intentionally removed much of what remained from this period in order to reach the classical levels. Sometimes what seemed to the previous excavators to be medieval could also have belonged to other phases, thereby further complicating any precise reading of the site.

The information derived from the plan should be combined with the MSU catalogue entries. The numeration of the rooms or areas is, of course, purely arbitrary and was made for the sake of convenience. It was often not possible to take account of distinct units nor, obviously, of distinct phases in the life of the villa.

D.1.3.2. The Residence

It is evident that the walls in opus reticulatum in the residential part of the villa (rooms 1-21) were heavily restored and sometimes even completely rebuilt. A country road passed through this area (cf. Frischer, B.3, fig. 17) and the structures were preserved for only a few courses or simply at the foundation level. Moreover, some walls were re-erected that probably had already been razed to the ground in antiquity. The reconstruction of many of the structures down to the foundation level reduces everything to a single phase, while it is quite possible that in several places earlier structures affected, or were in part exploited for, the terracing of the residence. These pre-existing structures have been verified in at least one case (see De Simone, C.2.1).
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Some of the problems encountered concern the whole area in general, while others refer to individual loci. Among the general problems the following may be noted: the masonry work; the true dimensions of the complex; the doorways and the complete absence of evidence that the doorways were walled up; the floor levels; the circulation routes; and the main entrance. Among the specific problems one can list: the organization of Areas 8, 12, and 17; the opening in the foundation between rooms 24 and 33; and the access to room 33. Many of the definitely original tracts of walls in opus reticulatum present tufa facing-blocks, while the reconstruction exclusively used limestone. This situation does not necessarily offer a dating criterion or an indication of phase, but can simply reflect the use of a mixture of materials readily available in the area.

The pars urbana must undoubtedly have been more extensive. Evidence of this, at least with reference to later phases, is the strange situation of Area 8 and the relationship between the structure identifiable as a fountain and the northern wall, which has always been interpreted as the limit of the building. In particular, the northern wall, of which only the foundation level was found for nearly its entire length, now appears as continuous, but it probably had openings that connected it to the zone farther north. In Area 8, it is likely that part of that wall was cut and razed to the ground when the fountain was built in order to permit the fountain to be used.\(^\text{17}\)

The square structure of the brick fountain was inserted into an area that was presumably not covered at the time, but which must have had a completely different arrangement. The fact that the intervention was later has not been proved by a difference in wall type, but is based on other considerations. Traces of a wall in opus reticulatum, certainly razed in antiquity, are still visible in the southwest corner of Area 8. The wall, which cannot be considered a foundation, is disposed at a 90-degree angle with respect to the south wall, and is interrupted at the point where there is a manhole giving access to the drain below. In a first phase the wall might have delimited a small room—perhaps a cubiculum—and there might have been an analogous wall on the north side (now occupied by the fountain), of which no visible trace remains. Later, the open area—perhaps originally furnished with a small peristyle—had been enlarged, by way of leveling off the structures of the west side. It was paved with limestone slabs. Traces of this arrangement survive in the southwest corner, where we also find, cut into a big slab, a small drain that leads to the sewer below.\(^\text{18}\) These changes were probably undertaken to make space for the insertion of the monumental fountain. Its present arrangement seems somewhat anomalous because it does not occupy the geometric center of the area, and it is difficult to recognize any axial relationship that may have existed within the space as restored. Moreover, to the north it pierces through the perimeter wall, thereby being surrounded on its other three sides by an irregular U-shaped space.

There are hardly any legible remains of the structure of the fountain, which has also been greatly affected by modern restorations, and no hypothesis can be made about the revetment that protected the walls. Almost square in shape, the fountain is equipped with an outer channel as well as a smaller inner one, which is essentially a hollow space (intercapedo). The latter communicates with four semicircular niches, each set in the center of one side. In creating the two channels, the builders of the fountain dug down to a level lower than that of the pavement, except for the center of the fountain, which was left at the original height. The exterior side of the outer wall of the fountain was built directly against the baulk of the construction trench. One side of the interior wall with its niches lined the center of the fountain, which means that it was built

\(^{17}\) It was certainly a centered fountain (da centro) and could therefore also be enjoyed from the north. There can no longer be any doubt about the existence, already hypothesized (cf. Frischer et al., 255), of structures related to the villa to the north of the wall that was considered, or presented as, its limit by the excavators of 1911-1914; see also Cerri, C.2.2.

\(^{18}\) Without saying whether in connection and in situ, Lugli (1926, col. 577) mentions that slabs of white marble and palombino were found, combined in a cross pattern, such as those found in room 7. The slabs, which Lugli reports in Area 8, should probably be assigned to room 7. On the other hand, a limestone pavement, only partially covering the area and including some parts left as open planters, is better related to Area 8, which, for other reasons, we may posit was uncovered as well.
against the opposite side of the construction trench. The center of the fountain does not present evidence of basins, and, in the absence of a small pond, we have to imagine that it was kept as a garden, perhaps with one or two ornamental statues. Water gushed from the niches, probably emerging from protomes. The water flowed within the narrow *intercapedo*, thereby forming waterworks of the “cascading” type, flowing finally into the external channel.

It has already been noted that the addition of the fountain changed the original layout of the first phase of this zone. The most striking aspect of this modification was precisely the demolition of the north wall, a feature that presupposes the opening on that side. The form of the structure, furnished with niches on all four sides, identifies it precisely as a fountain to be centered (*da centro*), and this brings up yet again the problem of how it could have been enjoyed from the north. In this connection one should recall what Lavagne said about analogous structures: “The crucial phase in which the fountain begins to be treated as an autonomous subject, to be placed in the middle of a room or a courtyard, and no longer as a decorative motif within a niche, seems to be in the first years of the second century A.D.” It should be emphasized that in reality there are already precursors of this trend attested in the late first century A.D. (cf., for example, the “pelta-shield” fountain on the Palatine from the late Flavian period).

The wall that functions as a partition and comprises the north side of corridor 5 ought, most likely, to have had an opening that permitted Area 8, where the fountain was inserted, to communicate with it and thus with room 12 as well. Because of these walls, as reinterpreted by restoration, we lose the ability to see the circulation routes and the various phases. In discussing the documents, we have already noted how the doorways have been sometimes ignored, rethought, or arbitrarily reconstructed, not to mention the fact that there is no recorded evidence that doorways were ever walled up, generally a fairly frequent occurrence in any building complex. In several cases the openings, in their present condition, do not show any original features. One will have to take into account these observations before hazarding a formal appraisal of the residence that emphasizes its symmetry, functionality, and the axiality of circulation routes visible today.

It has been practically impossible to identify the ancient pavement levels. For the most part, the foundations were rebuilt to a uniform level, as were the first courses of a large part of the reconstructed walls. After the removal of the mosaics, carried out in the 1970s, the pavements were reset at a different level. Moreover, no data are known about the subfloors of the mosaics, which could also belong to a different phase with respect to the surrounding walls. Some walls appear arbitrarily aligned at the edge of one of the two sides of the foundation, while others are set (as is usually the case in Roman architecture) on the middle of the foundations; consequently, the reconstructions falsify the original wall thickness.

The arrangement of Areas 12 and 17, for different reasons, betrays the subjectivity of the first excavators. Area 12, generally identified as an *atrium*, today consists of a rectangular space ca. 9.75 m x 8.20 m, with a small square brick basin, which, however, is not located in the geometric center of the room. The excavation has shown that not all the foundation remains were taken into account equally at the time of the restorations, and other structures were identified that attest to different phases and different arrangements of the space (see De Simone, C.2.1). Accepting for the sake of argument that the space was used as an *atrium*, at least at a specific moment in

---

19. One could compare, for example, the Silenus mask with a hole drilled for use as a fountain, recorded by Lugli 1926, col. 577. Bernard Frischer, in a personal communication, notes that this mask was found (as De Rossi’s excavation journal notes) on Angeletti property (parcel 1214), which did not correspond to the residence, so, unless the mask was found in a secondary deposit, it was itself not from the fountain in Area 8.

20. For the hydraulic system, see D.1.3.6.


22. Lugli 1926, cols. 529-530, suggests that the structure functioned as a fountain, assuming a central jet. There is, however, no evidence in support of this hypothesis, particularly since no water-supply conduit has been found.
the life of the building, then such a space, the purpose of which is so intimately connected to the circulation of people, light, and air, ought to have been equipped with further openings, but the current state of the evidence shows no trace of them.

In Area 17, tracts of walls also have been identified that were not taken into account at the time of the modern restorations. Together with the neighboring rooms 18, 26, and 27, for which no ancient segments of wall have been recognized, it constitutes an area that is difficult to understand. Some walls now appear to be made of small blocks of limestone and *cardellino* (cf. D.1.4 for the definition of *cardellino*) and respect the surviving mosaic flooring. The latter disrupts the continuity of the wall in *opus reticulatum* traditionally considered as the west limit of the villa in its original design.

Although in the case of rooms 19-21 the portions of ancient masonry are also very scarce, it is clear that this zone underwent an ancient intervention intended to change its function. The insertion of the small piers of a *suspensurae* system left the foundation of the pre-existing wall uncovered. The new use necessitated a different arrangement of the spaces, with the creation of two walls to bound room 20, which was also furnished with an apse. The latter feature seems to be in phase with room 33 behind, while the two partition walls do not provide dating elements, except inasmuch as they are later than the so-called perimeter wall (west side). The partial closing of the apse—this also restored—may be associated with the division into rooms at a later date. What is most interesting in this area, however, is the existence of an arch in that part of the foundation of the so-called perimeter wall which corresponds to room 21, an arch that is now no longer visible (cf. the commentary on photograph AAR 2721, D.1.2.2, no. 8, and see also the discussion of the sewer system, D.1.3.6).

It seems plausible that at the time room 33 was built there could have been access to it on the east side, even though there is no trace of any opening, in that the so-called perimeter wall in *opus reticulatum* has been completely restored and follows the course of the foundation without a break.

**D.1.3.3. The quadriporticus and the garden**

At present, most of the archaeological site is occupied by the area of the garden and the quadriporticus that surrounds it (ca. 42 m x 85 m). Since it is at the same level as the residence, the northern side of the quadriporticus serves as a joining structure with it and produces a sort of veranda. This, in turn, gives onto the garden and must have had windows to provide the rooms with light and air. The connection between the different levels was provided by three ramps, two lateral ones for the long porticoed wings and a central one for the uncovered area. Except for the veranda, which rises on a small terrace, the other sides of the quadriporticus were constructed following the natural slope.

As we have seen, in this zone the massive restorations have also resulted in situations that are difficult to understand. The masonry remains must have been minimal. In fact, at first, an almost complete reconstruction of the raised part of the walls in *opus reticulatum* (at least in the northern half of the quadriporticus) was proposed by the restorers, thus creating a continuous internal wall.

The subsequent excavation of Price, however, showed that at least at one point in the internal wall there were openings that communicated with the garden. Therefore, a new restoration was undertaken, which fixed the arrangement visible today.

If such a question has found a reasonable solution, the same cannot be said of the problems posed by the

---

23. They appear as broken lines in the plan published by Lugli.

24. One can hypothesize that the difficulty in understanding this zone is due to at least two factors: we are at the northwest limit of the area affected by the first excavations, where one of the spoil-heaps of the excavation was located. This heap was cleared toward the end of the work. Moreover, this seems to be an area where the reconstructions of late antiquity were massive.

25. For a detailed description, see De Simone et al., C.4, on the quadriporticus.

26. Cf. the plan published by Lugli and the archival photographs; Lugli himself hypothesized open windows in the internal wall only (col. 541).

external walls, particularly on the west wing, nor of the structures that impinge on the east wing.

On the west wing, the structure in opus incertum faced with plaster, brought to light in the recent excavations, attests to a distinct phase; at present, this structure is visible for the whole of the western face of the perimeter wall and in part on the outside of the south wing (fig. 14). It was previously interpreted as being a simple foundation offset for the support of the plastering on the opus reticulatum wall. In the documents, there is never any mention of a structure in opus incertum, although stretches of plastering are noted (cf. D.1.2.1, nos. 1 and 2). The wall in opus reticulatum therefore belongs to a later phase, when the quadriporticus was constructed, after the ground level was raised. The erection of structure 4203, which lines the portion of the wall in opus incertum on its eastern face, must be connected to this work. The correct interpretation of this activity cannot be separated from the question of the modern reconstructive restorations. The external perimeter wall of the quadriporticus (MSU 10056=4211=4005) has on its west side a long stretch of a structure in opus reticulatum that is undoubtedly original. There remains reasonable doubt concerning the antiquity of the uppermost part, however, because it seems that the first excavations reached the very level indicated by that portion of opus reticulatum that is certainly original. Did they dig until they uncovered the top of the remaining structure, stop excavating at that level, and then reconstruct the wall to its present height? Or had they already found the wall at the current height and therefore it is only the upper part that is sealed with modern mortar set onto the surface of the facing? In the 1970s the excavators went deeper, bringing to light the portion of opus reticulatum that was certainly original. They did not reconstruct it at all for the rest of its length and instead uncovered the wall in opus incertum beneath it.

We have three elements, of varying importance, which lead us to hypothesize the almost complete reconstruction of the upper part. First, in Sector IV.1, the original wall in opus reticulatum juts out in relation to the line of the southward continuation, which is set back and evidently restored. Second, the external buttresses survive to a height that never reaches the level of the structure in opus reticulatum that we believe was completely reconstructed in the process of restoration. Third, the internal wall of the quadriporticus is also poorly preserved, and after the first reconstruction there was a subsequent restoration, which altered the arrangement of the full and empty spaces. This modification would not have been possible if it had been necessary to demolish the original wall. The practice followed by the excavators of 1911-1914 seems to have been consistent: identification of the top of the wall and the reconstruction of it, set back in relation to the line of the facing. It is also possible that the excavators identified the structure simply as a more or less coherent nucleus, which was preserved up to a greater height than that hypothesized here as being original. They therefore unified it by means of refacing, as seems to have happened in other parts of the villa. It is thus shown that the east side of the external wall is wholly the result of reconstruction in the early 1900s, except for the undoubtedly original portion of Sector IV.1. But what was the purpose of structure 4203? I maintain that, together with the structure in opus incertum, it constituted the foundation of the wall in opus reticulatum, which was almost twice as thick as that proposed in the restoration (ca. 45 cm). If we accept, on the other hand, the restored wall of 45 cm, it is necessary to hypothesize a structure, now completely lost, which was founded on 4203, evidently with the purpose of reinforcing the perimeter wall. An analogous situation presents itself on the east wing, which has either two parallel walls built up next to each other (according to the restorations), or conversely a single thick wall; it is impossible to identify, however, those parts that are certainly original.

The perimeter wall of the quadriporticus, on the south and west sides, is furnished with a series of

---

29. The excavators of 1911-1914 must certainly have seen this portion of masonry, since they worked on the covering of the drain that is supported by it. For all questions relating to the identification of this structure, refer to De Simone et al., C.4.
30. The diminished thickness at Sector IV.1 might be explained by the presence of the drain.
D.1. The Masonry Structures

limestone *opus vittatum* buttresses set at right angles (*a pettine*) and backing onto the wall.\(^{31}\) The structural reasons for this intervention are multiple. First, the buttresses countered the pressure of the soil caused by the difference in ground level. Second, they served to evenly distribute the forces pushing against the continuous wall, which, because it is so long, is exposed both to a high risk of rotating, due to its own weight and that of the roof, and to cracks caused by thermal fluctuations. In addition, the conduit of the principal drain runs parallel to the outside face of the wall of the quadriporticus; this further indicates that the lowest point of the original ground level must have been precisely in this area, that is, the meeting-point (*compluvium*) of two slopes on the east-west axis, which created a natural channel. This originally gathered and drained away the surface water naturally, and then later was reorganized, regulated and used as the sewer system. We must still consider the original height of the buttresses, which could not have been very high, even at the moment of construction, given their limited length.\(^{32}\) The height of the wall of the quadriporticus can be partially worked out, albeit indirectly, from the spacing of the buttresses on the west side; in fact, this type of buttressing performs its static function only if the distance between each element is less than the height of the wall. Since the distance between the buttresses is ca. 2.96 m (= 10 Roman feet), we can deduce that the wall supported by them was certainly higher than that. On the outside of the south wing, the buttresses found at the level of the foundations are spaced more closely together, evidently on account of the natural slope of the site, which slants from north to south.

The east wing, which bends slightly to the southwest, includes a series of structures that modify its original appearance and function (cf. De Simone et al., C.4.5 and C.4.6). These works partly eliminated the wall in *opus reticulatum* and modified both the circulation routes and the visual axes. It is possible that these were necessitated by a partial structural failure of the perimeter wall; caissons would then have been built, filled with earth and stones, to counter the pressure from uphill.\(^{33}\) Perhaps in order to mask these structures and to render the rest of the portico usable, a construction with oval and rectangular niches was added, presumably a fountain;\(^{34}\) since the portico at this point was no longer usable, it is possible that a sort of detour was created through the garden in order to bypass the obstacle (cf. Gleason, C.3, fig. 13). In this part of the quadriporticus, then, they had to destroy the original roof, which was almost certainly one with an inward slope. Neither a flat roof nor one sloping outward is possible here. A flat roof, which is not particularly common in this type of structure, would have been avoided in this geographical area due to the amount of snow and heavy rainfall. An outward-sloping roof was not normally used for covering a quadriporticus, because it makes the joining of the slopes of the roof for the *compluvium* difficult. Furthermore, the roof of the veranda certainly sloped outward toward the garden. In order to cover a span of only 3.00 to 3.20 m, there was no need for a pitched roof, which in this case would have created problems for the watershed.

A problem unresolved on account of the scarcity of remains concerns the openings that must have linked the quadriporticus with the area to the west. Nor can we be certain, although it is plausible, that there was access from the outside to the south wing, as Lugli hypothesized (col. 541), but it certainly cannot have been the only entrance to the villa, nor even the main one.

The area of the garden has only partially been examined and the sole structure found is a large pool in limestone *opus signinum*. This should be considered as an open-air water reservoir, which

\(^{31}\) In fact, raised portions of these structures only survive on the west side. On the south side only their foundations have been found.

\(^{32}\) They might have been a series of small vaulted rooms.

\(^{33}\) It cannot be excluded that at a certain phase the villa was further enlarged to the east, opened onto that side by way of earthworks. If so, it would bring about a re-interpretation of these structures, but would require a deep excavation under the present parking area.

\(^{34}\) The partially identified plan of this structure and its construction technique lead us to suppose that it was a fountain, even though no data have emerged relating to the water system. It may well have been just a “scenographic set,” but in that case we do not understand the necessity for using brick.
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occupies a large space (24.50 m x 12.90 m), almost at the center of the garden. The fact that the villa received water from a small aqueduct coming from the west and that no traces of any piping leading from the reservoir have been discovered, lead us to believe that this is not a real cistern. The only link with the water system of the villa seems to have been the outflow conduit, which starts from about the middle of the west side and flows into the main drain; it follows an oblique course, in order to take advantage of the natural slope. The outflow is regulated by a small sump with footholds consisting of two cover-tiles (imbrices). The sump abuts the west wall of the pool, and serves as a manhole for regulating the level of the water. The excavations carried out in the first half of the twentieth century followed the line of the walls and removed the earth only from the inside of the tank, creating a situation similar to that of antiquity, but compromising the static equilibrium of the structure; in fact, with no water on the inside, there is no counterthrust for the earth, which puts greater pressure on the long sides. The same problem existed in antiquity, when the structure no longer held water and began to be buried. In fact, the north side has a tranche, which is broken and has slipped southward, while the south side is missing in the middle, and on the west has been forced out of plane, with damage at the corner. The structure has two external bodies on each of the long sides. A calculation of a depth of about 2 m gives a volume of more than 600 cubic meters (more than 600 tons of water). To understand the forces working on the masonry, it is necessary on one hand to calculate the weight of the water and the incidental load (due, for example, to wind) and on the other hand, the weight of the earth; in addition, the difference in level between north and south as visible from the longitudinal section of the whole villa should also be considered.

Price had already questioned whether the four avant-corps served a static function as buttresses, or as foundation-bases for other superstructures, perhaps of an ornamental nature (such as statuary groups). In considering this issue, we must remember that the two pairs of buttresses are of different sizes. Those to the south are built to counter the lack of static equilibrium of the pool when it is full; they are bigger, because the slope necessitates more support on this side. Furthermore, it is probable that this area was partially levelled with less compacted soil brought from elsewhere and thus requiring more powerful and deeply sunk structures in order to achieve the maximum anchorage possible. In order to understand correctly the function of the structure, we must remember that the southwest buttress, the only one today not completely buried, has a cavity opening towards the inside of the piscina. This is not enough to support a hypothesis that the whole buttress was hollow; if it had been, it could not have performed its static purpose. It is possible that such a recess may have been a refuge for fish; although the documentation provides no information for the other three buttresses, we cannot exclude the same function for them as well. We can, therefore, visualize the piscina as a fish-pond. Unfortunately, this structure, which is entirely attributed to the same building phase as the quadriporticus, does not have the elements for a certain and absolute dating.

**D.1.3.4. The thermal zone**

The constructions on the west side of the site consist of a series of rooms that can be generally attributed as the baths of the villa. The excavations of 1911-1914 did not completely uncover these buildings, but they did compromise any interpretation, in that, in addition to the restorations previously discussed, some walls were demolished (cf. figs. 2-8), while others were reconstructed on minimal evidence. The last intervention, in the 1980s, affected the upper strata of rooms 37-40 and 50-51. Based on the documentation and what is still visible on the site, it is possible to deduce the primary characteristics of the complex.

In this area, too, which was previously occupied by other structures, work was carried out to counter the incline of the natural slope (at this point slanting from west to east). Thus, the floor levels are more or less at the same level as those of the dwelling area, thereby creating a kind of terrace in relation to the quadriporticus.

35. Lugli hypothesizes that it is a fountain (col. 541).
36. Price, 140-141.
37. Relating to this part, see in detail the contribution of Camaiani et al., C.5.
The space occupied by the thermal rooms gives the impression of being excessively large in relation to the size of the residential block.\footnote{38} This disproportion diminishes if we remember that the living quarters must undoubtedly have been more extensive, stretching to the north and probably to the northwest. The thermal buildings are the result of two distinct construction phases, the second of which affects the southern part, with the addition of a series of heated rooms and the construction of a building of considerable architectural importance, the laconicum (room 53). The two different construction phases can be deduced not only from the different building techniques, but also from an apparent irrationality in the layout of the service rooms, which denotes two completely distinct heated areas.\footnote{39} Having ascertained the difference in the building phases, we cannot exclude the possibility that all the rooms functioned at the same time. Another equally plausible hypothesis, however, is that the earlier buildings were modified wholly or partially and adapted to different uses.

The first thermal rooms to be built were undoubtedly rooms 32-34, which abut both the west perimeter wall of the villa and the north wall of the Republican atrium (a space subsequently subdivided into rooms 38, 39, 40) and which were modified through the incorporation of later structures.\footnote{40} Lugli saw in these constructions a variety of phases, which cannot be detected in the masonry; his reading is not convincing from the point of view of their presumed functions.\footnote{41}

We have in fact a homogeneous group of rooms, composed of a large hall with an apse (33), flanked by a service corridor (32) and linked to a single room that contained a stairway (34) (\textit{figs. 15} and \textit{16}). In order to construct this complex it must have been necessary to go far below the floor level of the residential block in order to have a height sufficient for the functioning of the hypocaust system. Room 32 consists of a long, narrow corridor (ca. 13 m x 1.30 m) in \textit{opus reticulatum} and coigning in limestone blocks, at present accessible from room 31 by way of a series of steps which are most likely products of the restoration. The presumed floor level is at ca. 2.80 m below ground level. The west wall (MSU 10053) and the south wall (MSU 10062) are wholly constructed against the regularized slope, with only the exposed side provided with facing; about halfway along, the west wall turns into a very shallow apse, with a span of ca. 4.40 m. In the east wall (MSU 10057) there are two small arches for the praefurnia, with similar characteristics (height at the keystone 1.70 m, width 0.80 m, radius of the arch 0.35 m), at the level of the apse. The praefurnia connect the corridor with room 33, which is a large rectangular hall, with an apse on the north side (ca. 12 m x 5 m, excluding the apse; the span of the apse is 4.36 m, the radius 2.10 m). The hall, which survives only at the subfloor level, has internal wall facings in \textit{cotto} (cf. MSU 10001, 10002, 10051, 10052, 10053, 10054). Rather than bricks, broken and trimmed roof-tiles are used, which sometimes are put in courses with the unbroken rim showing (creating a string-course, e.g., for the installation of the suspended floor, cf. D.1.4, types 4.1, 5.3.1, and 5.3.2). The partially preserved subfloor level consists of roof-tiles and is raised in relation to the service corridor. No trace remains of the suspended floor, but its level is indirectly discernable from the line of the string-course roof-tiles and the height of the arches of the \textit{praefurnia}.\footnote{42} An offset along the east wall most probably served to support a \textit{fistula} (cf. D.1.3.6). The south end, unique for its construction technique (MSU 10001; cf. D.1.4, type...
5.3.3), is articulated by two quadrangular brick avant-corps (MSU 10051 and 10052), which form a small recessed area. The passages to room 34 should be identified as corresponding with the two avant-corps. This room (ca. 3.80 m x 6 m) is not an ordinary space. Against the north wall is built a narrow platform-like structure, approached by two small lateral ramps next to the avant-corps of room 33; the floor level of the room, which is accessed by way of another ramp situated against the east wall, is essentially at the same level as that of corridor 32, while the top of the platform is about 1.50 m higher. A small rectangular avant-corps is located between the stairway and the south wall. At the time of Pasqui’s excavations, the walls in opus reticulatum and the steps in limestone blocks were found to be completely coated with a layer of cocciopesto, of which only some small patches, belonging to the watertight edging of the floor, are now visible.\footnote{43} A hole with a lead outflow fistula is visible. The west wall is constructed against the regularized slope (controterra) only up to ground level, and has a small specus linked to a small channel; part of the south wall partially abuts the north wall (MSU 10045) of the Republican atrium.\footnote{44} The room has an outflow hole, with the related fistula and lead protection sheet. Lugli also mentions another outflow (or overflow?) at the level of the platform (col. 537), of which no trace has been found.

These rooms formed the first thermal nucleus of the villa. Room 33 is certainly to be identified as a calidarium, but it is difficult to locate where its tanks may have been, in that there are no traces of furnaces or water pipes. Due to lack of space, it would have been nearly impossible to place the tanks close to the praefurnia, as usual practice would dictate. We could hypothesize the existence of a basin in the rectangular niche of Room 33, although this would have resulted in considerable heat loss. Lugli mentions a fountain, of which there is no trace, in the apse of the same room. It is probable, however, that within the apse there was a labrum attached to a water supply. The calidarium, which was certainly of notable proportions for a private complex, was accessed from the east, probably from room 21, which served as a changing room. It is impossible, however, to specify the chronological sequence of rooms 19-21, which occupy the southwest corner of the rectangle of the living quarters; this part was evidently remodeled in order to be used as thermae. It is fairly clear that the apse of room 20 (MSU 10055), which was created by cutting an opening in the perimeter wall of the villa, is perfectly in phase with the apse of the calidarium lying behind. Little can be said, however, about the internal arrangement and the purpose of rooms 19-21 at that time. Inasmuch as it is visible today, room 20 was subsequently turned into a heated room; in the course of this work the foundation of the perimeter wall was uncovered to give enough space for the hypocaust. This was probably heated independently of calidarium 33, by way of a furnace in room 19. It is probable, however, that this last room was in direct communication with service corridor 32, if we hypothesize a continuation of the oblique wall.

Room 33 also allowed passage to the south, into room 34, and to the west directly to the porticoed area (35). Corridor 32 in fact was completely hypogean,\footnote{45} and the portico was constructed with a series of masonry columns, aligned parallel to wall 10003/10057 (the west side of rooms 33 and 34), upon which rested the ridge of the roof slope. The covering of the corridor may have consisted of simple planking or of a proper concrete ceiling laid on a wooden framework. No trace remains of these structures. The shallow apse that characterizes the corridor certainly did not have an aesthetic purpose. Rather, it served a structural need, countering the thrust of the earth behind, and at the same time it fulfilled a functional requirement.

\footnote{43}{Note that the walls of this room were largely refaced in the restoration; some of the tesserae of the opus reticulatum reused in this work carry traces of cocciopesto.}

\footnote{44}{See Camaiani et al., C.5.2.1, activity 20. One should not be deceived by the restoration, which has opus reticulatum facing for the south wall too; this is incomprehensible if the wall was built right behind the previous one.}

\footnote{45}{In this case, too, we must not be taken in by the interpretations of the restoration. MSU 10062, like MSU 10053, was completely built against one side of the construction trench (set against earth = controterra) and did not have an elevation above the floor level of the portico. The present facing in opus reticulatum, which is visible for several rows on the south face of MSU 10062, is due entirely to reconstruction work, and has no reason for existing.}
by providing as much space as possible for working at the mouths of the *praefurnia*. It is not possible to verify the existence of supports for hot-water tanks on the inside of the corridor, which appears too narrow, but we may hypothesize that the blind end of the corridor, south of the furnaces, was used to store wood.

The interpretation of room 34 is more difficult. Evidently, this room was intended to hold water, but it is not possible that its level reached the top of the platform, which must have been used as a narrow passage, while the central stairs led down to the immersion pool. The south *avant-corps*, which skirts the stairs, must have served as a passage to the area even further south, previously occupied by the quadrangular room of the so-called Republican *atrium* (rooms 38-40). Both for functional reasons and because of the difference in level, I maintain that there was no communication between the quadriporticus and room 34. This room may be identified as a small *frigidarium/*natatio, rather unusual for its layout as well as for its size.  

This small thermal complex (*calidarium* 33, *frigidarium/natatio* 34, service corridor 32, group of rooms 19-21) was protected on the west side by a portico (Area 35). The remains of this portico consist of the foundations and, sometimes, the first course of six brick columns and one brick pilaster. As we have noted, the portico was partly placed over the hypogean corridor (32) and made use of the west wall of rooms 33 and 34; it was therefore ca. 3.80 m wide (ca. 13 Roman feet, calculating from the center of the column). The interaxis between the columns, approximated by reconstruction, is about 10 Roman feet, except for the last one on the south, between the column and the pilaster (ca. 11 Roman feet). It is difficult to establish when this work was carried out. The fact is that the portico is perfectly aligned with the two west piers of the Republican *atrium*; this can hardly be by chance. It is possible, therefore, that the colonnade was constructed with the intention of harmonizing the new structures with the earlier ones, by providing an element of continuity. Nothing is known about the arrangement of the area to the west of the portico, which may have been used as a *palaestra*.

The incorporation of these structures may have partly altered the disposition of the roofs of the residential block. The sloped roof of the residence must have been at a higher level than the roof of the small thermal complex. The conjectured covering for room 33 is a barrel vault, rectangular in plan, protected by a single-sloped roof, inclined to the west, and overhanging the slope of the roof of the portico.

Immediately to the south of these first thermal buildings an extension was built. An apsidal basin (room 37) was constructed, with a platform and lateral steps, and arranged with rectangular niches (two lateral ones, for access to the basin, and a wider, central one). The structure was built next to the west wall (MSU 10016) of rooms 38-40, and, in order to reach the depth necessary for the basin, the foundations of the earlier wall 10016 were partially exposed. In this way the Republican *atrium* was adapted into a *frigidarium*. The floor level of 38-40 was raised and a mosaic floor with triangular marble inlay was laid. In order that the apsidal basin (MSU 10010) might be used, the west wall of the old *atrium* (MSU 10016) was demolished; it is possible, however, that the upper part was retained, or rather remodeled, in such a way as to create an arch over the entrance opening toward the basin. In this case, if the four central piers continued to be in use, it would not have been necessary to alter the layout of the roof, and the *compluvium* structure could have been retained. Obviously, the basin must have had its own cover, with an apsidal semi-dome, itself protected by a semicircular roof.

---

46. *As result of the study of the circulation routes and because of the characteristics described above, not the least of which the dimension of the central steps, I exclude the possibility that this could have been a service room.*

47. *A series of five bases, but drawn further north in respect to their actual location, appears on the plan published by Lugli (1926). The author describes them in a way that is consistent with what we see today. Probably this is the result of an error at the moment when the various parts of the drawing were joined together.*

48. *This frigidarium is also mainly below the level of the floor, of which little remains, except for the basin, in which there are still visible some fragments of mosaic on the bottom. The restored doors do not help us to understand where the passages were in this phase.*
Unfortunately, the excavation data are not sufficient to resolve this question, both on account of the earlier work, and because of the poor state of preservation of the remains, which were subsequently transformed over the centuries. In fact, we do not know with certainty whether the piers were in use at the same time as the mosaic floor. Indirect support of such a hypothesis, however, can be detected by the intentional alignment of portico 35, which as noted harmonized the pre-existing structures in view of their renewed use. Further indication for the process of homogenization is provided by the very dimensions of the basin, whose apsidal platform has nearly the same radius as the apse of calidarium 33.

Access to the frigidarium could have been from the east, perhaps directly from the quadriporticus, by way of several steps that linked the different levels. Traces of a small ramp may perhaps be seen in the two masonry fragments that are equidistant from the median axis of the frigidarium and which might indicate a possible access to the room. South of the stairs, at a level slightly lower than the terracing on which the frigidarium lies, the latrine would have been built in an unused space. Its walls have in part disappeared but are recorded in Lugli’s plan and in an archival photograph (SAL F 372, fig. 7). At the moment, the typically shaped slabs have been repositioned, perhaps at an arbitrary level, but the drain conduits underneath guarantee their planimetric layout.

If we analyze the rooms to the south of the frigidarium 37-40, it is immediately evident how a new thermal complex, which was completely distinct from the original nucleus 32-34, was created. It is not possible to establish whether this work was carried out simultaneously with the new frigidarium or later. The building technique provides no clues, as it is linked in this case to purely functional requirements. The south buildings (43-49, 51, 53) are all heated and separated from the frigidarium 37-40 by a screen of rooms (41-42). Room 41, from its narrow and elongated shape, seems to have been part of the circulation plan of the thermae, and/or a changing room separating the heated areas from the others. Its connection with the small rectangular basin 42 is not entirely clear, as there are some anomalous steps set at its corner. Moreover, for this phase, we do not know the arrangement of the area immediately east of room 41. The floor levels of the heated rooms are similar to those of the frigidarium 37-40. Indirect evidence for reconstructing floor levels is provided by the identification of the door that gives access between room 49 and building 53.

The corridor that served these rooms is to be found to the east of room 47, which, on account of its proximity to the furnace, should be interpreted as a calidarium. To the west is a series of spaces, heated indirectly, whose arrangement into distinct rooms is difficult to determine, with the sole exception of room 51. This room, even though it is not completely visible today, presents a rectangular plan, with very shallow apses on the short sides; it is equipped with an arch for the passage of hot air. The disposition of the rooms and the actual levels that can be seen imply that the domestic staff would not have had direct access to this praefurnium. It is unlikely, too, that a system of praefurnia existed to the west, since on that side the slope rises steeply. It is possible to hypothesize an extension of the complex to the west, but only at a higher level.

Room 52 may possibly have been a staircase, but there is no data enabling us to relate its construction directly to the use of the thermal buildings. The scant remains available do not allow us to hazard hypotheses about the roofing in this area.

49. In consideration of this, I would propose that there was also access to frigidarium 37-40 from the side of portico 35.

50. We suppose that some of the buttresses of the outside western wall of the quadriporticus, at least in this zone, were no longer in use at this time.

51. Moreover, the remains have been reduced to almost nothing at subfloor levels, and the walls are largely restored, in part obliterating or reusing pre-existing structures.

52. As evidence of this, we still have part of the subfloor level in tiles, some small piers in bessales (repositioned by the restoration), and the arch for the praefurnium that served room 51.

53. The establishing of the levels and the profile of the virgin soil on this side was possible thanks to the excavations in Area 50.
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Directly linked to this group of heated rooms, but with an extremely unusual appearance, is the most famous building of the site, which Lugli had identified as an ornamental fishpond.

D.1.3.5. The laiconicum of the Villa of Horace: is it an unicum?

Building 53 is without doubt the most attractive and monumental structure of the entire archaeological site; this is partly due to its relatively well-preserved state, at least when compared to the other surviving masonry structures, and partly to Lugli’s fascinating interpretation of it, in which he visualized a nymphaeum that was subsequently converted into a vivarium (col. 559).

The building is elliptical in plan, incorporated into a trapezoidal form (fig. 17). The ellipse is further arranged into four semicircular niches that correspond to the four corners of the trapezoid. Apart from the alterations, which reflect the addition of masonry now partly demolished, and the construction of a longitudinal trench at the bottom, three different internal levels are visible today. These can be described as follows, from top to bottom: a) corresponding to the elliptical ring that is joined to the niches—residues of brick flooring; b) level of the floor bed that marks out the smaller ellipse—residues of brick flooring; and c) floor level of the hypogeum corridor—brick flooring. The structure itself is entirely built of brick, with the exception of some peripheral parts, which are faced in cardellino blocks. In the wall that marks the change in level between the present upper and lower ellipses, there are some small rectangular niches (51 cm x 49 cm, ca. 79 cm in height), with a slope at the bottom and covered a cappuccina (fig. 18). Each of these communicates with the floor of the ellipse above by way of a chimney-like feature. There are four niches on the east side, into which the arch of the hypogeum corridor opens, and five on the west side. The distance between them is not consistent. In addition, next to the elliptical internal wall to the north and south, there are two solid avant-corps that jut out toward the center of the building. In the northern one, it is still possible to see a hint of a curved wall. In the southern one there is a small conduit, triangular in cross-section and connected to the outflow system. The building still has two openings, which are at different levels; the higher one is in the northwest niche, and the lower one is in the curved section between the two northern niches. In addition to these openings, there is, as previously noted, a hypogeum corridor that goes off at an angle, penetrating the building from the east through an arch faced with bricks sesquipedales. Just by the arch, at the level of the lower ellipse (level b), there are two small walls in brick, which extend the lines of this corridor into the building.

Upon analyzing the various data, we see that there is no shortage of evidence that contradicts Lugli’s hypothesis, and which can be summarized as follows: location, orientation and functional characteristics.

The first is the simplest and may also be the least binding of the three arguments; nonetheless its implications must be carefully considered. The building, which belongs to the same construction phase as those immediately to the north, is an essential component of them. Building 53 was accessed by means of a door communicating with room 49, which was probably a room for passage. This door has been interpreted by some observers as a window because of its current location, or orientation and functional characteristics.

55. Lugli 1926 mentions other fittings relating to the hydraulic system (col. 553), as well as two fragments of a lead fistula bearing the inscription C IULIUS PRISCUS F, found “in the east wall of the vivarium,” positioned on the curve, with the outlet towards the drain” (cols. 581-582, nos. 3 and 4: cf. D.1.3.6).

56. My first encounter with this structure dates back to 1991, when, with my colleague Claudia De Persis, I began working on my BA dissertation on Horace’s Villa at Licenza. The identification of room 53 as a highly heated room (laiconicum or sudatorium) was arrived at after much consultation with Prof. Cairoli Fulvio Giuliani, Professor of Survey and Technical Analysis of Ancient Monuments at the University of Rome “La Sapienza,” who guided us to the correct understanding of the functioning of the building. For many years the notorious misnomer of “aquarium” (fishpond) has prevailed.

54. It should not be forgotten, however, that considerable restoration work was performed on this structure as well.
longer survive, as mentioned earlier. Therefore, the present floor level corresponds to the subfloor upon which stood the small piers that supported the use-level floor. The users of the thermae would walk on this level, which coincides with the floor of the north opening of building 53 and is therefore undoubtedly a door. In this way, the first of Lugli’s arguments is refuted, as he did not recognize any access other than through the hypogean corridor.

Furthermore, we should consider why the builder would have created such an intentional difficulty in the construction of this building by rotating it slightly and thereby putting it out of alignment with the rest of the complex. If he did not do it by mistake (which is the only logical conclusion), the orientation must have been of critical importance. This is comprehensible only in connection with the purpose of the building. We can immediately deduce from the plan that the axis of the building is aligned to the north and that it was constructed in relation to the cardinal points. It is protected to the north (the coldest side) by the presence of other buildings, but completely open on the other three sides, in order to exploit the maximum exposure to the sun. To the fish the orientation of the building certainly would have been inconsequential, but to an architect intent on obtaining the optimal results from a special construction, this aspect would have been paramount.

The functional element is the most evident, however, and it is truly surprising that it was not recognized earlier.57 First of all, the hypogean corridor, which goes directly into the center of the room, is nothing other than the service area for heating the building itself, in accordance with the usual hypocaust system. The extant levels indicated by a and b (fig. 19) correspond respectively to the subfloors, paved in brick, on which stood the small piers for the suspended floors. These are at two separate levels because inside the building there was a high step of the type commonly found in both laconica and frigidaria of circular plan.58 The internal elliptical wall supported the upper floor, positioned at the same level as the north door. The rectangular niches, with their sloping floors and their flues, served to circulate the hot air at the upper level, and to transmit it into the walls, which were probably originally equipped with a hollow space (intercapedo). The niches were the unifying part of the system, which otherwise could not have functioned. The two projecting avant-corps, placed to the north and south, supported the steps that gave easy access to the lower level; at the same time, the southern avant-corps contained conduits, as it is likely for the northern one, although no decisive evidence is visible at present (see D.1.3.6). The two small walls flanking the portion of the corridor that entered the building had the double function of supporting the floor more solidly than the small piers could have done at that point, and of preventing the loss of heat. The only remaining question is why an oblique corridor was created. It is possible that this, too, was a device designed to maximize heat retention as much as possible, since the temperature within the building had to be maintained at a constant level, avoiding unexpected drafts and sharp changes in temperature.

It is now clear why such a building required a completely autonomous service system, although this does not mean that we must postulate different phases in relation to the rooms immediately to the north. The semicircular niches, of which the northwest one certainly had a window, were covered by an apsidal semi-dome. This semi-dome did not form an extrados, but was buried inside the masonry of the corner.59 The geometrical unity of the original ellipse, on which an elliptical vault rested, was thus reconstituted at the

---


58. Enumerating all the examples would be long and tiresome; it is enough to remember the various buildings of this type at Pompeii. The only difference in the Licenza case is that the ground-plan is absolutely unique, in that it is elliptical.

59. Other windows, in addition to the one in the northwest niche, may have existed on the south and west sides.
upper level. The vault, in turn, could have supported a false dome, which allowed the hot air to rise to the top. The vault itself may have been sunk inside a compact block, protected by a pitched roof, but a lighter and cleaner solution would have been a vault with *extrados*, reinforced up to a certain point with a stepped feature and possibly equipped with a central *oculus*. This second hypothesis would affect the dating, however, putting it back to at least the time of Hadrian.\(^{60}\)

The room was undoubtedly very well heated and possibly supplied with water, although not furnished with a true *alveus*.\(^{61}\) The lower level may have constituted a pool, presumably lined with marble panels, as was the upper step. In fact, an outflow hole has been identified in the south *avant-corps*, but since no fragment of this floor has survived, it is absolutely impossible to make a definitive statement. It is probable that the building’s primary purpose was for *sudationes*, but it is also possible that the lower floor was flooded occasionally to create a heated swimming pool. In this case, however, we have no traces of the possible methods used for direct heating of the water. Usually, in fact, these intensely heated buildings were supplied with cold water in very small quantities, as it was only used to produce steam.

Although such buildings are fairly common in the Roman architecture of the imperial period, the originality of the planning in the Licenza example is extraordinary. The only comparanda, based on geometrical shapes similar to the ellipse or the oval, are the *laconicum* in the Forum Baths at Ostia, also sited for the best possible exposure to the sun’s rays, but without the corner niches, and the irregular room, almost octagonal and also supplied with a high-temperature heating system, in the so-called Heliocaminus Baths at Hadrian’s Villa. On quite a different scale, but vaguely similar in their basic schemes, are the twin rooms that have also been identified as *laconica* in the Baths of Caracalla and the Baths of Diocletian in Rome. One might object that among these three are public buildings and one of them is part of the villa of the emperor Hadrian, who is known for his experimental architecture. Furthermore, the earliest of the four examples cited dates to the period of Hadrian. Although it may seem anomalous, the building at Licenza has every right to be included in this innovative series, and its inclusion could have an impact on the question of the identity of the owner of this villa at the time when building 53 was constructed.

In the complete absence of accurate dating, it must be remembered that circular buildings of this type were quite common from the first century A.D. on, and that they continued to be widely used, with ever-changing variations, through the third and fourth centuries, although they were different in size and purpose. We would not be far from the truth in proposing a date between the end of the first century and the middle of the second century A.D., with a preference, however, for the later limit, that is to say, the age of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, for the reasons previously stated.

The building was subsequently reused, with the creation of walls at various levels; a hypogeon room that was accessible from the former service corridor was also built, in which were found many human bones.

### D.1. The Masonry Structures

**D.1.3.6. Systems for the supply and drainage of water**

The whole complex must have received water from a small aqueduct coming from the west, of which no trace has been found.\(^{62}\)

During the recent excavation, it was discovered that several lead conduits reached the building near Area 50. Together with those still *in situ* and with others that were found and removed during the 1911-1914 excavations, it is possible to reconstruct the principal outline of the water system. The drainage system is better preserved, for reasons linked chiefly to questions of level. In figure 20, the two systems are shown in different colors. When there is uncertainty

---

60. I thank Prof. Giuliani for his suggestions, which are always lucid and generous.


62. So wrote Lugli 1926, col. 549. The east side is in fact rich in water, as is shown by the sixteenth-century Orsini nymphaeum and the springs higher up.
about to which system a conduit belongs, it is marked in a third color, while a dotted line indicates a conjecture.

The natural topography of the site conditioned the positioning of the original drain. Its principal axis (i) runs north-south on the outside of the west side of the quadriporticus, precisely at the point where the two slopes naturally meet. Clearly, the existing topography was exploited and regularized, imitating the path of the surface drainage. The conduit, at present open to the air for a considerable length, averages 60-70 cm in width and must have had a covering that was ogival in cross-section, as is visible further south in the unexcavated portion. There, two channels join from the east. The first (d-f-h), which links the zone of the impluvium and that of the fountain, flows at an angle into the principal system near the southeast external corner of room 34, clearly respecting this construction in the course of its alteration. The second channel (o), following an oblique line in order to exploit better the natural slope of the terrain, starts at the sump of the pool (25) in the center of the garden and, going in a southwest direction, joins the large drain about halfway along its length.\(^63\) Channel d-f-h, which crosses the western part of the residential block obliquely, and then aligns itself on the inside of the perimeter wall, is in fact the product of several distinct building phases. Before the incorporation of the group of rooms 32-34, the conduit left the outside of the buildings at exactly the point (g) where it shows a change of direction, which was necessitated by the construction of subsequent buildings (cf. fig. 10 and comment on photograph AAR 2721, D.1.2.2 no. 8). The drain was thus forced to follow the inside of the perimeter wall closely for the stretch (h) to the east of room 34. Since the covering of the conduit at this point obliterates the portion in opus incertum of the west perimeter wall, it is clear that at this time, or perhaps earlier, the level of the quadriporticus and of the garden was raised. On the other hand, the segments h-f seem to have been restored, since they are rather different in shape from the length i. A water drainage system for the residence must have been planned from the beginning of the construction, but the channel visible today is different from conduit i, which we know with certainty was the principal one and the most ancient. Drain f-h, in fact, has a wider cavity and a vaulted ceiling, ribbed with a series of brick arches, and part of its lining is preserved. Also, on account of the direction of this conduit, which was linked to the construction of the fountain, we can suggest that it was built in the same period, or rather adapted from the pre-existing system and restructured. The sewer f-h received water from at least three drains: conduit d, of which a length of lead fistula was found in the 1911-1914 excavations (Lugli 1926, col. 582); the drain of the fountain in Area 8, through outflow hole k; and probably rainwater also, through the outflow j carved in a limestone paving block. The channels from the west (l and m with covering a cappuccina), which were linked to the thermal buildings and inexplicably considered to be water pipes by Lugli (col. 549), and the outflow for the latrine (n), also joined the principal outflow conduit (i). In l was found a large lead fragment of a tank (a). By l, near the southwest corner of room 41, there is an outflow hole in a marble paver (w) and, connected to the conduit, is also a rectangular manhole. Unfortunately, it is impossible to understand how much of this structure is due to restoration.\(^64\)

We can also hypothesize that conduit q, which in its turn took the sewage of p1 and p2, joined the main system further south. We do not know the route taken by r.

Exactly at the point where the last stretch (h) of the conduit of the residence flows into the main system (i), the drainage channels relating to the hydraulic equipment of rooms 33 and 34 (x and a) must have also joined. On the southeast corner of 34, there is still in situ a length of lead fistula (a), at the point where there is also preserved a lead facing panel, inserted between the wall and the cocciopesto coating.\(^65\)

\(^{63}\) There is no known system for supplying water to the big pool 25.

\(^{64}\) Lugli 1926, col. 549, states that this structure had foot-holes.

\(^{65}\) Lugli mentions another fistula for this room too, although it is not clear whether this was by way of supposition or documented reality: “the water could drain out through a lead pipe at the level of the platform, in such a way as to maintain the same level always”; cf. Lugli 1926, col. 537.
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The arrangements for supplying water are less well preserved; there are some lead fistulae, of which at least four series are known, with inscriptions. In one case, it appears that the water pipe simply consisted of a small channel, with a brick bottom (s), which flowed from the west into room 34. We do not have sufficient traces, however, to reconstruct the path of the water required for calidarium 33. An offset along the east wall (MSU 10002) of this room joins two lodging holes created respectively in the lateral shoulder of the apse (MSU 10054) on the north and in the avant-corps (MSU 10051) to the south. It can be hypothesized that the offset partly supported a fistula, most likely belonging to the drainage system.

Water must have arrived at the fountain of Area 8 by way of the lead conduit (y) still in situ under the mosaic of room 16. Fragments of fistulae are recorded by Lugli; one of these (e), probably not in situ, was found at the west end of the so-called veranda 13.

There is more documentation on the thermal areas further to the south. The recent excavation, in fact, brought to light three distinct conduits (i, u, v); the first (i) served the frigidarium, while the other two led to the heated rooms, crossing the structures by way of specific recesses (as in MSU 10058). It is very likely that conduit u was linked to fragment z, which was set into a limestone threshold slab.66

For the laconicum, there is no evidence for the water supply, if we exclude the fistula (c) that Lugli mentions was incorporated into the curved wall (attributed by him to the drainage system), and hole (p3), no longer visible, in front of the north avant-corps.

A fistula was found on the site by the Baron de Saint’Odile and another one by some peasants, in the period when de Chaupy took interest in this area. Unfortunately there are not sufficient data to locate exactly their find-spots. The first carried the inscription M BURRUS and the other TI CLAUDI BURRI.67 It is probable that the first of the two, however, if not both, came from the area of the laconicum, which at that time was the only building partially visible. Baron de Saint’Odile had also discovered underground chambers, which may well be identified as the service corridor of the laconicum.68

No hydraulic system is known for Area 55, where there may have been a fountain.

To help with consultation and to aid in understanding the plan, a list of the individual elements marked on the plan follows:

a) Wall of furnace or other type of reservoir, found (not in situ) during the excavations of 1911-1914 near the drain i; inscription CAESERNIUS–LUCERNIO FEC (Lugli, col. 581).

b) Length of lead fistula (1.70 m long) consisting of two tubes joined together, which Lugli reports was the drain for room 34, emptying into i; one tube carries the inscription P OSTILI FIRMINI (Lugli, col. 581); at the Museum of Licenza two fragments are preserved (inv. SAL 00403242 and 00403243), both of which also carry the same inscription (cf. Bruun, D.13). Frischer, in a personal communication, notes that Lugli is in error (see Pasqui’s Catalogue G, no. 2 and no. 4, in Frischer G.1.12) and that this pipe was found somewhere in rooms 44, 47, 48, 49, or 51. For the drain of room 34 see a.

c) Three fragments of the same fistula, one of which has the inscription C IULIUS PRISCUS FEC, found inside the east wall of building 53, a)

66. When the baths were built, this threshold slab was no longer in use; it had been obliterated by the suspended floor above it. Later, with the dismantling (or collapse?) of the suspended pavements, other masonry structures were built. The slab is actually covered by one of these (MSU 10019). Worth noting, from the point of view of analyzing the pre-existing elements, is a pavement fragment in opus spicatum, at a level perfectly compatible with that of the slab.

67. For all epigraphic considerations, see Bruun, D.13; on the Burrus inscriptions in particular, see Frischer in Frischer and Brown, 154 n39.

connected to the drain p2 (Lugli, cols. 581-582; inv. SAL 00403241).

d) Fragment of small fistula, which formed the last part of the drainage conduit of the so-called impluvium (Lugli, col. 582).

e) Fragment of fistula (diameter 7.5 cm), at the end of which is fastened another fistula (diameter 3 cm), found probably not in situ (Lugli, col. 582).

f) Drain conduit, in masonry of unworked rough limestone; the covering is ribbed with a series of brick arches; most likely it was rebuilt during the life of the villa.

g) Arch on the inside of the wall; corresponds to the exit point of conduit f in phase I (cf. fig. 10 and D.1.2.2, no. 8).

h) Drain conduit in masonry; constitutes the connecting stretch between f and i, constructed when f could no longer issue forth via g.

i) Drain conduit in masonry; constitutes the main axis on the line of the natural compluvium, on the outside of the so-called perimeter wall. In the first phase, it probably extended northward and joined tract f at the point g.

j) Limestone paver with outflow hole for draining water into drain f; perhaps gathered the discharge from a downpipe.

k) Outflow hole of the brick fountain of Area 8, for discharging into the sewer f.

l) Drain conduit in masonry, covered a cappuccina; constitutes the outlet for basin 42; probably received also the discharge from room 41 (of a labrum?, cf. w) and also perhaps of those rooms directly to the south, to then discharge itself into the main conduit i.

m) Drain conduit in masonry, covered a cappuccina; used as outflow pipe for tank 37; it originally served the so-called Republican atrium (see Camaiani et al., C.5.1.1, activity 3).

n) L-shaped drain conduit in masonry, relating to the outflow system of the latrine. Heavily restored.

o) Drain conduit in masonry; constitutes the outflow for the pool 25, with which it is connected by way of a drainage sump. It follows the natural slope of the terrain, thereby reaching the main conduit i obliquely, into which it flows.

p) 1. Small conduit, triangular in cross-section, incorporated into the south avant-corps of building 53. It is possible that it held a small fistula. It presumably emptied into drain q.

2. Lugli refers to a rectangular hole for the outflow, positioned lower down than p1, to the east in the corner between the south avant-corps and the elliptical wall. Fistula c must have flowed into p2 (Lugli, cols. 553 and 582). No trace of it remains.

3. Lugli also mentions a hole (for clean water?) in front of the north avant-corps (Lugli, col. 553). No trace of it remains.

q) Drain conduit in masonry; took the outflow from building 53 and presumably continued until it joined up with the main conduit i. Lugli remarks that this conduit was covered a cappuccina (Lugli, col. 549, n1, letter p of his attached plan. There are, however, errors in the attribution of the letters).

r) Recess for a conduit, presumably a fistula, which runs on the outside of the north side of building 53. It is difficult to establish whether it is a water-supply pipe or a drainpipe.

s) Small channel bringing water for room 34 (see Camaiani et al., C.5.2.1, activity 19).

i) Fragment of fistula relating to the system for bringing water to basin 37 (see Camaiani et al., C.5.2.1, activity 11, SU 457). Perhaps connected to the fragment further west (SU 347; but cf. also u).

u) Stretch of lead fistula (VH 085, 086, 087; inv. SAL 114587, 114588, 114589) composed of three separate elements soldered together for a total length of ca. 5.20 m. One of the tubes has a joint for another emission channel (see Camaiani et al., C.5.4.1, activity 34, SU 241). We cannot exclude the possibility that the fragment of SU 347 should be attributed to this conduit, and not to t.

v) Stretch of lead fistula (VH 121, 122, 207, 208, 209, 210; inv. SAL 114585, 114590, 114591, 114546, 114547, 114548) composed of five parts soldered together, plus fragments, for a total length of more than 6 m (see Camaiani et al., C.5.2.1, activity 12, SU 331 and 240, and C.5.7, SU 355). There are on all five identical inscriptions (C - IULIUS - PRISCUS - F), after one of which is the indication III.

w) Marble paver, with central outflow hole in the form of stylized petals.
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x) Hypothetical conduit, which crosses the east avant-corps of room 33 and joins the main drain i. Perhaps connected with the passage of a fistula along the east side of room 33, attested by the offset along the east wall, and by a protected passage in the east embrasure of the apse.

y) Stretch of lead fistula, in situ, under the mosaic floor of room 16.

z) Fragment of lead fistula, in situ, preserved under the wall MSU 10019 and set into a stone block, probably a threshold slab. Perhaps to be attributed to conduit u coming from the north.

aa) Fragment of lead, in situ, partially covered by cocciopesto, beside a drain conduit; southeast corner of room 34, flowing into i.

D.1.3.7. The identification of the phases

Like any architectural complex, the so-called Horace’s Villa underwent a series of transformations through the ages, with additions and rebuilding of what already existed. The scant masonry remains and the modern reconstructive restorations severely limit our ability to reach an interpretation that explains in detail the sequence of these changes. In spite of that, we have attempted to develop a plan that shows the principal phases of activity on the site, even if it is not always possible to relate all the diverse elements to one another. The following observations are based on the stratigraphical data, where available, as well as on structural and functional considerations. We also refer to all earlier analyzes, both of the documentary material and of the physical remains, in an effort to offer a synthesis of the conclusions reached.

The occupation of the site in antiquity is attested from the fourth and third centuries B.C., as some residual material from the lower strata of the excavation in Sector IV.2 demonstrates. It is possible that these finds were washed into this particular zone. The site rises on the saddle of a hill and is characterized by various differences in level: a predominant and constant slope that descends from north to south; a slope that slants gradually from east to west; and a more accentuated slope from west to east. The point at which these last two join, on an east-west axis, constitutes the natural meeting point for the draining of surface water and coincides almost exactly with the west side of the quadriporticus. This difference in level diminishes to the south.

Period I

At the site, the first constructions that we have any knowledge of can be classified in three distinct groups, which, in their present state, appear to have no relationship to each other. It is difficult to give an overall picture of the first phase of the life of the building, which cannot even be described as such, and therefore the structures in question are here indicated generally as “pre-existent” (fig. 21). We lack further deep excavation data, especially under the residential block as it is visible today, which could supply valuable clues as to the design of the first building. We can recognize, however, that the elements identified point to a commitment to build a structure of substance. Referring to the plan we can see these features marked and can address some of them in detail.

- The long wall in opus incertum (MSU 10068 and 10080), of which only a few centimeters survive, later was reused and in part overbuilt with an analogous wall in opus reticulatum. In the first phase of settlement, it could only have served as an enclosing wall, as there is no data to enable us to relate it to porticoed structures.
- The remains found underneath room 12 and belonging to a basin that was adapted to the natural slope, as the terracing at that point had not yet been created.
- The group of structures to the west that were subsequently incorporated into the thermal buildings; in addition to the Republican atrium, we must note other structures in opus incertum (MSU 10004 and MSU 10006, cf. figs. 56-58 and 42-43), which can hardly be attributed to the later interventions. Also to be considered as “pre-existent” are the fragment of flooring in opus spicatum to the east of MSU 10004 and the threshold slab subsequently obliterated by the later MSU 10019.

For all of these structures, which were not necessarily built at the same time, an indicative chronological span, which runs from the end of the second century B.C. through the entire first century B.C., can be proposed.
**Period II**

The phase that received most attention during the excavations of 1911-1914 was undoubtedly the one regarded as being Horatian, a simplification due to the presence of masonry in opus reticulatum. Because of the modern demolitions and reconstructions, however, the first feature identifiable in its entirety is the large elongated rectangle created by the construction of the residential block and of the quadriporticus that surrounds the garden (fig. 22). It should be recalled that its image, too, is partly altered in view of the now certain extension of the masonry walls northward. There was considerable building activity at this time, correcting the slope on the side to the north and thereby creating the terrace of the living quarters. In the garden and in the quadriporticus, levels were raised as well. In the garden the large pool 25 was created, which, while not datable, can plausibly be included in this phase.

At this time, it is probable that Area 8 of the residential zone had a peristyle, with an arrangement of the spaces different from what we see today (fig. 23). The living quarters must have already had a drain, which was linked to the main system, emerging on the outside of the perimeter near room 21. It is probable that the residence had an upper floor. The location of the entrance is not known, but it could have been either on the north side, of which we know nothing, or more likely, near the present northeast corner, by rooms 26 and 27. In this case, there would be two visual axes and circulation routes set at right angles, a feature that is well-attested to in other complexes (fig. 24). The fact that these rooms (26-27), which presumably served as an entrance, jut out in relation to the compact and regular rectangle, is not an obstacle to such an interpretation, especially if we take into account the fact that there may have been a modification during the construction. More problematic is the fact that we know very little about these original masonry structures; even if we accept the indications of the restoration and of the mosaic floors in situ, we still must use great caution in formulating such a hypothesis about the entrance in this phase. The dating of this work can only be tentative, as there is absolutely no stratigraphic data, and can therefore only be guardedly attributed to a chronological span that extends from the Augustan age through the end first century A.D.

**Period III**

The intervention that immediately followed consists of the addition of the first thermal complex with rooms 32-34 (fig. 25) and the consequent adaptations to the inside of the residential rectangle (definition of the rooms 19-21?; deviation of the drainage conduit; creation of portico 35). The later date of the structures 32-34 in relation to the living quarters is not proven by the building techniques used, but by the stratigraphic relationships, the planimetric arrangement, and the hypothetical presence of other features from the same phase as the residential block. The use of brick by itself is not a sufficient indicator of a distinct phase, whereas the determining factor is the stratigraphic relationship between walls. In fact, the east wall of the calidarium 33 (MSU 10002, in trimmed rooftop brickwork) was built right up against the west perimeter wall of the villa. This additional wall covers not only the facing, but also the foundation of the perimeter wall, because in order to build room 33, the level had to be lowered to accommodate the hypocaust system. Exposed foundations, in fact, very often indicate a different phase or a change in the planned project post operam.

Furthermore, we cannot ignore the very position of the group of buildings that undoubtedly project forward from the compact block created by the quadriporticus and residence. Prime consideration must also be given to the arch that opened in the foundation of the west perimeter wall (cf. fig. 10 and D.1.2.2, no. 8). This was the point where the drain conduit first exited the quadriporticus-residence rectangle, running alongside the wall for its whole length. The incorporation of rooms 32-34, with the required lowering of the level,
made it necessary to re-route the drain to the inside for some distance. It then exited immediately to the south of room 34. The constant and almost exclusive use of roof-tiles in the brick facings of this period is indicative of a dating no later than the middle of the first century A.D.\footnote{With a consequent narrowing of the chronological span proposed for the residence-quadriporticus complex, which is certainly earlier than the addition of rooms 32-34. We cannot exclude, however, the possibility that the use of trimmed and/or broken roof-tiles was simply because that material was the most economical available, even in a later period, when the use of brick was already well established (Cf. also De Simone, D.1.4. Appendix, type 4.1, MSU 10002).}

Perhaps the great frigidarium (37-40) was built only shortly afterwards, as an addition to the first thermal complex, exploiting the pre-existing structure of the Republican atrium, with a considerable raising of the level. It is impossible to say whether the other important works were carried out at the villa at the same time; in the absence of reciprocal relationships, they can only be considered as belonging to one period, without division into sub-phases, that extends from the middle of the first century A.D. to the middle of the second century A.D.

There was then (phase IIIB?, \textit{fig. 26}) a further extension of the thermal complex to the south, with an arrangement of heated chambers, architecturally notable (cf. the laconicum).\footnote{The two autonomous systems of service corridors, plus the service corridor reserved exclusively for the laconicum (room 53), which was essential for practical reasons, should be kept in mind. The existence of two distinct and independent thermal systems may imply that the southwest heated rooms were built in the time of Hadrian, as a consequence of the law promulgated by the emperor that forbade the mixing of the sexes. This hypothesis may provide another clue regarding the ownership of the villa. The owners might have been linked to the imperial family, people who would have had to respect the provisions of the emperor, which elsewhere were completely ignored. Or, the property may have been part of the imperial fiscus.}

At this time, the residence was altered by the addition, in Area 8, of a monumental fountain \textit{da centro}, which completely changed the appearance of this zone. The features built in the east wing of the quadriporticus are also to be attributed to this period, probably for structural reasons and not just aesthetic ones, with the addition of a fountain (or some scenographic setting), whose center is perfectly aligned with the axis of the piscina of the garden.

**Period IV**

The last phases of the life of the villa cannot be analyzed in detail, except where the stratigraphy is preserved (see Camaiani et al., C.5.3-5, their Periods III-V). New construction becomes less frequent (\textit{fig. 27}), and there is almost always an attempt to readapt an existing building according to the needs of the moment. Materials from the earlier structures are reused, the thermal complexes fall into disuse, and the suspended floors are wholly or partly dismantled, resulting in the creation of new rooms on new foundations. The modern partial demolitions, undertaken in order to uncover the presumed Horatian phase, render the layout and the stratigraphic sequence of these new phases of the life of the villa almost unidentifiable. As it is now, the residential area does not offer any elements attributable to these later stages, when some parts were even used for burials (from the fourth century onward). The \textit{laconicum}, which after a period of abandonment was perhaps the most serviceable building remaining, was probably reused as a small church, in which was created a crypt, designed for burials and reached by way of the old service corridor of the hypocaust.\footnote{Cf. Lugli 1926, cols. 529 and 562. On the question of the existence of a church on the site in medieval times, see \textit{In Sabinis}, 21 and 23.}
Conclusions

In spite of the minuscule quantity of the remains it is still possible to attempt to sketch some outlines of the plan, at least for the first phase of an architectural complex that can be evaluated as a single unit.75 If we include in our calculations its north side, that of the so-called veranda, the quadriporticus forms a rectangle of ca. 290 x 145 Roman feet; the proportion of 2 to 1, between the length and the width of the porticoed rectangle around the garden, is evident and the garden is therefore formed of two squares.76 In reality, the proportions of the quadriporticus were slightly modified during the carrying out of the project; the south wing is 3 meters shorter than its northern counterpart. This situation was evidently created by the deviation of the east wing, which was almost certainly caused by the terrain that required the modification of the plan in the course of building.

The module of the “two squares” also constitutes a guideline for the incorporation of the large pool 25. The south wall of the piscina is set along the median latitudinal axis of the quadriporticus. A visual axis is also identifiable on the east-west median of the piscina, which coincides perfectly with that of the fountain incorporated into the east wing of the quadriporticus. It is more difficult to establish the internal relationships for the living quarters, because, as we have seen, we do not know for certain the extent of the space it occupied. We could perhaps hypothesize that it occupied the module of one square (namely, ca. 145 x 145 Roman feet).77

D.1.4. Appendix 1. Typology of Masonry Attested to on the Site

The variety of building techniques adopted at the Licenza villa, as elsewhere, cannot be taken as evidence of the structure’s different building phases, nor can it in itself be a necessary and sufficient basis upon which to establish an absolute chronology. A prominent factor in the choice of a building technique is determined by the function of the structure to be built, especially where some building materials, such as brick, cost more than the stone that is locally available. Hence, outside of the city of Rome brick is not used as nonchalantly and indiscriminately as it might be, without economic consequence, in the Urbs itself. On the contrary, in situations where there are no particular requirements, it is often the quality of the material more easily available that determines the choice of masonry type. Another important factor is the technical skill of the craftsmen and how up-to-date they are with their craft.

In our case, the materials used most frequently are the local limestone and the stone called cardellino.78 Bricks appear in smaller quantities, evidently employed for particular structures. This is indirectly confirmed by the walls that have different facings on their two sides, which were built in this way to respond both to functional requirements and to the need to contain costs. The tufa used at the villa merits separate treatment. It was particularly friable and therefore is poorly preserved, but it is attested to in various parts of the opus reticulatum structures.79 Moreover, as is seen elsewhere, in the case of sites

75. The pre-existing elements cannot be taken into consideration on account of their fragmentary nature.

76. We know that in antiquity the use of internal proportional relations was very often the norm, as is attested by Vitruvius. These were frequently not followed slavishly during the actual construction, when matters would be adapted according to the contingencies of the site. They remained, however, a constant reference point for the planner.

77. With the north wing of the quadriporticus included or excluded? It is certainly dangerous to play around with the figures, but it is worth noting that six circuits of the quadriporticus adds up to a Roman mile and that therefore it may have been a porticus miliaria.

78. The term is traditionally used to indicate the yellowish concretionary travertine of the Anio; see Mari 1994, 24.

79. The tufa facing blocks are present, albeit in small quantities, in the entire north zone of the villa and not only in the group of east rooms, as Lugli claimed. Lugli also mentions that the tufa quarries closest to the site known to him were on the two banks of the Anio, near Castel Madama and near Vicovaro (col. 532 n1). Mari mentions also the tufa quarries between S. Balbina and Mandela in “La Valle dell’Aniene nell’antichità,” in Atti e Memorie della Società tiburtina di Storia e d’Arte 68 (1995) 25-52, at 29, citing C. F. Giuliani, Tibur. Pars Altera. Forma Italiane 1.3 (1966) 40, no. 27 and 51, no. 43.
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that have a long and continuous occupation and are subject to dramatic remodeling, material becomes available from demolitions, and this material, even if it is not always of high quality, is nevertheless reused when necessary.80

The foundations, where they can be analyzed, prove to have been built directly against the baulk of the construction trench,81 generally with stones of small and medium size set in mortar, earth, clay, or lime. Usually they conformed to the natural slope (e.g., MSU 4215); sometimes they are stepped (e.g., the foundation of MSU 10008). In the residential block, in at least one case, the foundations were built above ground, from a certain level upward, with a facing of stones of medium and large size. The slight declivity was regularized by using a fill to level it.82

In the Licenza villa, opus reticulatum has been read by previous scholars as a clear indication of a Horatian date, but it is necessary to stress that this is a simplification. This technique is often assigned exclusively to the Augustan age, but it must be remembered that it was in use at least from the end of the second century B.C. to the second century A.D., varying in chronology and intensity of use from one geographical area to another. In the case at hand, we find ourselves in a region where the technique was widely used.83

There is no doubt that the various types of building techniques can be broad dating elements,84 but since each was used over a relatively long period of time, they cannot offer the kind of precise dating needed to establish an absolute chronology. This can only be obtained in the cases in which archaeological stratigraphy has furnished reliable evidence.85 In addition, the presence of different techniques does not indicate unequivocally distinct phases, because the choice of technique might have been dictated by structural and functional considerations. It is important, therefore, to seek to identify precisely which conditions have led to the adoption of a particular building technique and how they have affected the life of the building. Unfortunately, in the case of Horace’s Villa, as we have already seen, the masonry remains, destroyed and then heavily supplemented by restorations, rarely permit such readings.

---

80. On the quality of material deriving from demolitions, see Giuliani 1990, 149.

81. Only in one case has it been possible to identify the impression of the planks of a timber-panelled trench: the foundation of MSU 10016=420 and 802.

82. Cf. De Simone, C.2.1.

83. For considerations regarding the innovations following in the wake of the new technique, which in the time of Vitruvius “everyone is using” (Vitr. II.8.1), and for its areas of diffusion, see M. Torelli, “Innovazioni nelle tecniche edilizie romane tra il I sec. a.C. e il I sec. d.C.” in Tecnologia, Economia e Società nel Mondo Romano (Como 1980) 139-159. There was a standardization of the facing blocks that brought a new form of organization of tasks and changed the working conditions. Moreover, it also promoted rationalization of accounting procedures, especially in the execution of large-scale projects. See also J. P. Adam, L’arte di costruire presso i Romani: Materiali e tecniche (Milan 1989) 139ff. and 170 n.15.

84. Giuliani 1990, 19ff. and C. F. Giuliani, “Rilievo e analisi tecnica dei monumenti e definizione cronologica delle strutture murarie,” in Metodologie della ricerca topografica. Atti del Primo Congresso di Topografia Antica (Roma 13-15 maggio 1993), Rivista di Topografia Antica 4 (1994) 85-90. Works such as those of G. Lugli (La tecnica edilizia romana con particolare riguardo a Roma e al Lazio [Rome 1957]) or M. E. Blake (as n. 3; Ancient Roman Construction in Italy. From Tiberius through the Flavians, II [Washington, D.C. 1959]; and Ancient Roman Construction in Italy. From Nerva through the Antonines, III [Philadelphia 1973]), although still used as standard reference books, can no longer be considered up to date, from the point of view of methodology. For this reason we will not discuss here the opus quasi reticulatum, interpreted for a long time (and sometimes still today) as a brief transitional phase, but, following the lead of Giuliani, we will simply use the terms opus incertum and opus reticulatum.

85. The sizes of the stones and bricks, as well as the quality and thickness of the mortars, can certainly provide evidence about craft techniques and the building construction site. Here, however, we deny a chronological interpretation of the “module” (e.g., five brick courses and five mortar beds), since we do not consider it an appropriate criterion for establishing an absolute date.
A relative chronology and an approximate absolute chronology can only be based on a method that combines stratigraphy, building techniques, architectural planning solutions, functional necessities, architectonic features, fittings, and installations. It would be methodologically unsound to derive a date from data provided by only one of these approaches.

Thus, the typology that follows is not intended as a chronological sequence its purpose is simply to demonstrate the variety of solutions used and the close association of some of them with various structural and functional requirements. In some cases, of course, a difference in building technique does coincide with a difference in building phase.

Finally, it should be emphasized that only in a very few instances has it been possible to examine the tops and sections of structures, because they were generally covered during restoration with a protective coping.

1. **Opus Incertum**

The use of this technique is encountered in several parts of the site: on two of the perimeter walls of the villa; in rooms 38-39-40; in fragments of walls in the area of the bath complex; in a foundation structure built above ground with a facing; and on the small walls of a basin. The last two examples, strictly speaking, should not in fact be included in this category, because they are generally built with stone and mortar, which could better be simply described as *opus caementicium*. For rooms 38-39-40 it is possible to hypothesize, at least tentatively, that the structures were built in *opus incertum* only up to a certain quota and that the upper part of the elevation was made in a perishable material (e.g., wood and clay).

1.1. **Opus Incertum** with Limestone Facing

MSU 10068=4007; 4202 (figs. 28 and 29)

Areas 23, 36. Sectors IV.1 and IV.2

Maximum visible height: ca. 0.65 m; thickness: 0.55 m

This is the lower portion of the long external wall of the western arm of the quadriporticus, running north-south. The east face is almost completely hidden below the present surface level and obliterated by another foundational structure (MSU 4203, at least from what can be inferred from the excavation of Sector IV.2); only in the northern section is a part preserved that is still visible, on which remain some tracts of red plaster. In contrast, the west face is uncovered. The stones are small (6-11 x 8-16 cm) and are made of local limestone. They were carefully chosen or hewn in the form of a wedge, and laid with a certain regularity, inclined and on edge. One can observe that close attention was devoted to the joins, which were given a special finish after installation, being smoothed over with a whitish mortar and concave (at least in the area that preserves them, i.e., Sector IV.2). This was apparently done to improve the quality of the wall, filling in voids and presumably facilitating the adhesion of the plaster.

The wall follows the sloping course of foundation 4215 and it is overbuilt by MSU 10056. Its western face is abutted by the buttress piers (10061, *vel sim.*).

Mortar of good quality (CM 99/29, 35, 60).

The construction is datable on the basis of stratigraphic data to not before the first century B.C.

Other MSU: 10080 (cf. *fig. 14*); 10006 (cf. *figs. 42-43*); and cf. 10004 (type 5.1, *figs. 56-58*).

1.2. **Opus Incertum** in Limestone with Some Facing Blocks of *Opus Reticulatum*

MSU 10014 (=620), 10016 (=420, 802), 10017 (=623, 652), 10045 (=845) (*figs. 30 and 31*)


Maximum visible height: 0.35-0.90 m; thickness: 0.60 m

For MSU 10014 and 10017, only the face toward the interior of the room can be analyzed. These are structures in *opus incertum* made of limestone chunks that are of small and medium dimensions (7-12 cm x 15-20 cm), installed more or less in horizontal courses and perhaps consisting in part of reused material. Small rectangular parallelepiped blocks (8-11 cm x 20-24 cm) are also found. Characteristic of the walls is the fact that they have a band of reticulate
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facing blocks (7-10 cm x 7-10 cm) laid horizontally, to signal the point at which the wall elevation begins. MSU 10017 is an exception. It limits the room on the east and does not exhibit this feature, although it was built at the same time as the other walls. But in this case, too, the stones of the first course have been set horizontally, and one shows signs of having been cut on site rather than in the quarry (fig. 32). The foundation of MSU 10016, the only one that could be analyzed (MSU 878), consists of small chips of limestone. It reveals the imprint of the planks, at least in one place, which demonstrate the presence of a form within the construction trench (fig. 33). The binding agent used was of poor quality and has an earthy (clayey?) matrix, so that it is perhaps incorrect to call it mortar.

The walls delimit a room with a central impluvium with piers (cf. MSU 10041), the construction of which is datable on the basis of stratigraphy to the late Republican period.

The structures present an elevation in small blocks of limestone and cardellino that can be associated with various building phases and are only partly attributable to restoration interventions.

1.3. Opus Incertum with Medium to Large Stones of Limestone and Cardellino

MSU 10078 (=3125) (fig. 34)
Room 12. Sector III.12
Maximum visible height: 0.70 m; maximum visible length: 1.86 m; thickness: not determinable. Only the northern face has been analyzed.

This is a foundation structure, partially faced, resting on a foundation built directly against the baulk of the construction trench (MSU 3127). MSU 10078 (=3125) is composed of selected stones, not worked, of medium to large size (10-15 cm x 15-20 cm; 40-45 cm x 15-22 cm), positioned quite irregularly. The binding is a yellowish eroded mortar of poor quality. Many small shims are present, and in the interface with the foundation footing a roof-tile fragment is visible. This structure, at present heavily restored (CM 01/09), was presumably meant to be buried, serving to level the slope as part of the terracing of the residence block. In the absence of stratigraphic data it is impossible to confirm with certainty that it did not have an independent phase as a free-standing, raised wall, which was later reused as a foundation structure. From the point of view of relative chronology, it falls after the structures MSU 10074 and 10075.

1.4. Opus Incertum (?) in Stone and Mortar

MSU 10074 (=3107), 10075 (=3123) (fig. 35)
Room 12. Sector III.12
Maximum visible height: 0.79 m; maximum visible length: 2.08 m; thickness: 0.39 m

One side having been built against the baulk of the construction trench (controterra), it is not possible to analyze the only facing of these walls, because it is coated with cocciopesto. Thus, it is possible that they are simply opus caementicium walls, without any kind of proper facing.

These two small walls, only partially visible, belong to a basin. From the top and from the gaps in the cocciopesto one can identify a non-regular facing. The stones (small to medium dimensions) are irregular and do not present evidence of having been worked. They prove to have been flattened more or less into horizontal layers in a mortar that is thick, grayish and fairly strong (CM 01/05).

These walls constitute one of the first known structures on the site, dating to the late Republican period and later obliterated by opus reticulatum structures. Structure 10075 seems to have been already subjected to restoration in antiquity (CM 01/12).

2. Opus Reticulatum

This technique appears to have been broadly used in the villa, at least to judge from the large quantity of facing blocks found during the first excavations. We have seen how these were freely used in Pasqui’s restorations, which were at times based only on foundation remains. Nevertheless, it is obvious that opus reticulatum must have played an important role in one phase of the life of the villa, in connection with a remodeling or large-scale monumentalization. Opus reticulatum was employed in the residence and in the
quadriforticus. The coigning, when present, was in small blocks of limestone. It is likely that some of the limestone *tesserae* (truncated pyramids) and the blocks of the coigning were reused, sometimes in conjunction with other techniques (cf. type 5.3 below).

2.1. Limestone Facing Blocks

MSU 10072 (= 3117) *(figs. 36 and 37)*

Room 12. Sector III.12

Maximum visible height: 0.28 m; maximum visible length: 3.25 m; thickness: 0.48 m

This wall segment in the residence is made with truncated pyramids of limestone with the quadrangular base exposed, 8-9 cm per side, arranged at a 45-degree angle with ca. 1-2 cm mortar beds. The yellowish mortar has only a modest binding capacity (CM 99/51).

The structure must be associated with the phase in which the site underwent a thorough reworking, with the regularization of the natural slope and the creation of a terrace for the residence block.

Cf. MSU 10056 (=4005, 4211); MSU 10073 (=4220) with coigning in small limestone blocks.

2.2. Facing Blocks in Limestone and Tufa

MSU 10003 *(figs. 38 and 39)*

Room 34

Maximum visible height: 0.30 m; maximum visible length: 1.82 (west), 2.51 (east); thickness: ca. 0.74 m

The west face emerges from the ground at ca. 2.10 m higher than does the east face, because the wall up to that level was built directly against the baulk of the construction trench. The east face, originally coated by a layer of *cocciopesto*, has undergone extensive refacing in the recent past. The few remaining original segments have facing blocks of limestone and two blocks in terracotta (cf. MSU 10001). The west face preserves a course of tufa facing blocks and has a weakly cohesive yellowish mortar (CM 99/57). The use of tufa *tesserae* was also encountered in other wall tracts (rooms 1, 5, 13, 17). The structure, perhaps added as a second thought during the construction phase, is later than the terracing system of the residence in terms of design and construction.

2.3. Facing Blocks in Limestone and *Cotto* (Terracotta)

MSU 10001

Rooms 33-34

For this very particular type, refer to 5.3.3 below.

3. Opus Vittatum

This technique was employed at the villa both by itself and with others (opus *mixtum*). We discovered that the structures made only in small blocks of limestone (3.1) are associated exclusively with the phase in which there is extensive use of *opus reticulatum*. However, the use of small blocks, even with heterogeneous materials, is attested to over a very long stretch of time. This is because of the ease of laying the blocks and the ready supply of stone (coming in part from demolitions). With the exception of the type with a brick socle (3.4.3), these are generally isolated interventions, the purpose of which was to add new features or to modify existing rooms.

3.1. Small Blocks of Limestone

MSU 10061 *(figs. 40 and 41)*

Area 36

Maximum visible height: 0.82 m; maximum visible length: 1.20 m; thickness: ca. 0.60 m

This is one of the buttresses set at right angles (*a pettine*) abutting the exterior of the west and south wings of the quadriforticus, built at regular intervals of 2.95 m (though different for the southern wing) and in a homogeneous manner (only those to the north can be analyzed in elevation). The blocks are regularly squared (18-25 cm x 7-11 cm) and laid in regular courses, with joins of 1.5-2.0 cm. The mortar (CM 99/39) is poor (*macra*), yellow/light-beige in color, compact, with small river-borne inclusions (sand and river gravel).

The buttresses, in the original portions, are preserved to a height that reaches the level from which the *opus reticulatum* wall (10056) begins, and therefore they...
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abut only the structure in opus incertum (10068). They presumably rest on a bed of limestone fragments, which delimits the sewer to the east. The building of the series of buttresses must be associated with the time when the opus reticulatum wall (10056) was built and thus to the arrangement of the quadriporticus as visible today.

The coigning in opus reticulatum and the stairs of room 34 were also built in small limestone blocks.

Owing to the extensive restorations, it is difficult to give an opinion regarding the structures of the northwest zone of the villa (rooms 27-30).

3.2. Small Blocks of Cardellino

MSU 10037
Room 52
Maximum visible height: 0.30 m; maximum visible length: 7.90 m; thickness: ca. 0.60 m

A structure that runs in an east-west direction, built in small blocks of cardellino laid in horizontal courses, regularly bedded, is preserved to a maximum height of three courses (but the archival photographs show clearly that it was preserved to a greater height when discovered). The wall is joined to the analogous structure 10036 (thickness: 0.90 m). The mortar was not detectable.

The construction can be interpreted as a stairwell; it dates to after the construction of the southwest thermal rooms, but no more precise chronology is possible.

Other structures in small cardellino blocks include: MSU 10018 (rooms 44 and 45; only the south face of the latter can be analyzed, but it seems to rest on another structure in opus incertum); MSU 10050 (room 33, at the closure of the small southern room); MSU 10060 (room 33, at the partial closure of the apse); and MSU 10066 (Area 36).

3.3. Small Blocks of Cardellino, Limestone, and Bricks

MSU 10007 (figs. 42, 43 and 44)
Room 44

Maximum visible height: 1.02 m; maximum visible length: 1.60 m; thickness: ca. 0.60 m

This masonry structure is built of small blocks of limestone and cardellino, with occasional use of brick shims. It stands against MSU 1007, to which it is bonded by a series of masonry mortise joints. The stones are arranged fairly regularly, but their lack of formal homogeneity shows that they are reused (cf. type 7 below).

The structure covers two pre-existing wall segments (10005, opus testaceum, presumably belonging to a small wall of a praefurnium used for room 51; and 10006, opus incertum, visible only on the east surface).

This activity is associated with a later use of the thermal rooms, which at that point were no longer functioning as a bath. Other analogous structures (10015; 10019; 10063) also attest to a construction phase later than the thermal rooms, which are either modified or obliterated by them.

3.4. With Brick Courses

3.4.1. With the first course in brick

MSU 10042 = 810 (figs. 45 and 46)
Room 38
Maximum visible height: 0.42 m; dimensions: 0.61 m x 0.57 m

A pier nearly square at its base is constructed in small blocks of cardellino (preserved for a maximum of four courses), regularly arranged with joints between 1 and 3 cm and beds of 2 cm. The first course of the wall consists of brick (halved bessales), cut in triangles for the central part of the pier and in rectangles at the corners; the core is made of irregular pieces of bricks and stones. It is impossible to ascertain whether the elevation was completely in small blocks, or if it had other courses of brick, or was even completely different. The analogous pier 10044 was covered by a column base (SU 612, see Camaiani et al., C.5.1.1). The excavation data place the intervention between the second and the first century B.C. The presence of bricks compels us to be cautious, and to lower the date to the first century B.C. (but cf. type 4 for this question).
This pier, with other analogous piers 10041 (=1001), 10043 (=614), 10044 (=653), must have carried the compluviate roof of the atrium (see Camaiani, et al., C.5.1.1).

3.4.2. With double courses of brick (trimmed roof-tiles)

MSU 10057 (fig. 47)
Room 32

This type only appears for the coigning of MSU 10057 (junction with 10054 and coigning by the two praefurnia), for which see type 5.3.1 below.

3.4.3. With socle made of bricks

MSU 10009=299=300=301=302 (figs. 48 and 49)
Room 51
Maximum visible height: 0.85 m; maximum visible length: 2.93 m; thickness: not detectable.
Only the north facing could be analyzed.

The wall structure, running east-west, consists of a very shallow apse built with mixed facing: a brick socle (six courses) and opus vittatum with small blocks of cardellino.

An analogous situation is encountered for MSU 10023, which, with its apse, forms the south side of room 51. Bricks and blocks are laid regularly, in horizontal courses. Shims are used. The dimensions of the materials are not homogeneous (bricks vary from 17 to 27 cm in length, from 3 to 5 cm in height; the blocks range from 16 to 30 cm in length, and from 6 to 10 cm in height). Compact mortar (CM 99/50) is pale yellow in color, with lime, sand, and volcanic elements (black grains).

We exclude in this case more than one phase for room 51, but it seems obvious that here the material was used in a manner that was functional and economical. MSU 10009, whose south face can unfortunately not be analyzed, joins MSU 10020. The latter, in its original section, is faced in brick to a higher level than the socle of MSU 10009; this must be because it was more exposed to heat (a praefurnium, heavily restored, opens in the wall).

We suppose, conversely, that the interior of room 51 was completely constructed in brick, and that we therefore ought to assign this structure to the type described at 5.2 below.

MSU 10058 is also to be attributed to the same phase and to the same technique.

See also MSU 10004, north face; MSU 10029, east face; and MSU 10030, south face.

4. Opus Testaceum

We can affirm without hesitation that opus testaceum was used on this site with a parsimony typical of localities not very close to the city of Rome. In the economics of construction, brick is found only where a functional need requires it. At the villa the only structure known to have been completely built in brick is the laconicum (room 53), an original construction of notable architectural quality with its own special requirements (cf. D.1.3.5). Otherwise, recourse was made to brick coverings or socles (cf. type 3.4 above), and more often to masonry constructions with walls having various facings (cf. type 5 below). This no doubt optimized the use of building materials, but it also meant a compromise in construction quality, since the different materials responded differently to stress.

Despite the fact that brick was used infrequently on the site, we have examples of the most common types. Roof-tiles (tegulae), found in large quantities in the course of the excavations, were used not only for covering the roofs, but also as wall facing; for the subfloors of the rooms with hypocaust systems (as in room 33); in the coverings a cappuccina (drain conduits, niches for the heating conduits of building 53, the tomb in room 40); and on the bottom of the drain conduits. Cover-tiles (imbrices) were evidently used for roof covering, but also employed in pairs so as to form foot-holes in the sump of the piscina; they were also recycled in the covering of the tomb in room 40. Bricks bipedales and sesquipedales were used whole or as semilateres in the arched lintels (foundation of MSU 10008 and building 53); in the subfloors of the rooms with hypocaust systems (rooms 47, 48, 53); and on the bottom of the drain conduits. Bricks bessales (laterculi, bessales) were
used whole in the piers that supported the floor in the rooms with hypocausts, or were cut as triangles for the masonry facing. Some half-bricks (semilateres) from bessales were also found, cut in rectangles (VH 224, with incisions). Note in particular that VH 225, a piece of a brick bessalis, is of a clay mixture very similar to that of the fragments of roof-tile that carry the stamp of M’ NAEVIUS (VH 035, VH 125, VH 135, VH 185, VH 189, VH 201), and may well have come from the same workshop. This data could be important as a chronological reference for the use of brick at this site (for the brick stamps, see Filippi, D.4). In the archaeological literature, the first examples of facings made of baked brick in Roman architecture were traditionally dated to the Augustan age or at the earliest to that of Caesar. At that time, however, it is likely that only broken roof-tiles were used. The normalization in the use and of the dimensions of real bricks ( tegulae=lateres cocti), not made out of roof-tiles, began with Tiberius and became widespread during the first century A.D. However, for specific purposes (small piers and floors for hypocausts), baked bricks were already in use by about the middle of the first century B.C., in sizes that later became canonical (cf. Vitr. X, 5); it is therefore possible that, in exceptional cases, they were also used in masonry at that time (cf. type 3.4.1 above). The question of the use of baked brick in the Republican period has recently been re-opened by Coarelli; he documents the use of this material at Fregellae (roof-tiles) for masonry structures that are datable on a stratigraphic basis to around 300 B.C. The author provides a reinterpretation of literary sources and of some monuments, which demonstrate an earlier use of baked brick ( tegulae and lateres cocti in opus testaceum) than that traditionally accepted. In this perspective, the data from the “Villa of Horace”, in particular those from the structure discussed in type 3.4.1 above, can contribute to the question.

Among the particular fictile items found during our excavations, note the fragments of small tubes ( tubuli) of rectangular section, for the heating system; the bricks shaped like the arc of a circle, for the masonry columns; the small bricks for the herringbone flooring ( opus spicatum, a fragment of which is visible in situ in Area 44); some small squares for rustic flooring (from the garden, cf. Gleason, C.3.4.2, activity 3); and the architectonic terracotta elements (see Strazzulla, D.5).

Lugli also mentions four fragments of “fusiform tubes for the ribbing of small vaults” (col. 568) and documents the use of roof-tiles, with nails for spacing and fastening, as wall facing revetments that created a hollow space in-between. In fact, he refers to the finding of a “fragment of roof-tile, with a hole toward one end, in which was found inserted a long iron nail, with T-shaped head,” emphasizing that “it was used for the lining of the calidarium.” He notes the presence of other T-shaped nails as well (col. 567).

4.1. In Roof-tiles

MSU 10002 (figs. 50 and 51)

Room 33

Maximum visible height: 1.40 m; maximum visible length: 10.65 m; thickness: 0.39 m

The structure runs north-south and is made of trimmed roof-tiles. It is built against a stretch of the wall in opus reticulatum (10056) that constitutes the west side of the residence and the quadriporticus. Two successive stages of restoration can be distinguished on the wall. The more recent of these, in modern brick, closes the opening in the foundation of 10056 (cf. the commentary on AAR 2721, D.1.2.2, no. 8). The wall has an offset, also made of roof-tiles, which protrudes for 7 cm and is 32 cm higher than the level of the subfloor (also paved with roof-tiles) of the hypocaust system. The offset, which probably provided partial support for a pipe, consists of, and is highlighted by, a course of roof-tile fragments with their rims forming the facing. Eight courses above the offset there is another course of untrimmed roof-tiles. This can be interpreted as the string-course of the pavement suspended on the small pillars ( suspensurae). I do not maintain that this course must be taken as being in the “fashion” of the age of Domitian, as does Lugli (col. 545, n1); the levels and the elements of an analogous course found on the wall in front

---

86. Giuliani 1990, 152.
(MSU 10057, cf. type 5.3.1 below) point rather to a building-site indication for the correct installation of the suspended floor. Lugli reports that during the excavations, fragments of pavement were discovered lined with bipedales bricks above and below.

As far as could be determined, the fragments of roof-tiles have a roughly rectangular shape and are employed regularly, but they vary considerably in length, being generally divisible into three sizes: shims between 8 and 12 cm; medium ones between 17 and 22 cm; and exceptionally large ones, between 25 and 30 cm. The thickness is constant, between 3.0 and 3.5 cm. The thickness of the rims ranges from 5 to 7 cm. The binder is made of a friable mortar (CM 99/53), beige/light-gray in color, composed of lime and sand with volcanic elements, and especially fine gravel. The only M’NAEVIVS brickstamp found in situ was discovered in this wall during restoration work in 2005 (Frischer’s personal communication). Filippi (see D.4, table 2) dates M’NAEVIUS’ production to the first century B.C. It is not sufficient evidence, however, to offer a reliable chronology for the wall since roof-tiles may easily have been reused.

This wall (MSU 10002) provides a solid brick reinforcement for the wall behind it. This was evidently necessary for the functioning of room 33, which is interpreted as a calidarium. Analogous are the two avant-corps 10051 and 10052, which make up the rectangular niche to the south of room 33, and which were also made of trimmed roof-tiles.

To the same building phase we also ascribe MSU 10057, 10054, and 10055, which attest a construction decision once again dictated by considerations of economics (cf. type 5.3.1 below).

MSU 10076=3111
Room 12, Sector III.12
Maximum visible height: 0.70 m; diameter: 0.48 m

Another totally different example of opus testaceum made of roof-tile fragments is a column found beneath room 12. This element is not completely circular in shape, and is made of pieces of roof-tiles laid irregularly in horizontal courses, in an abundant whitish, adhesive mortar, and coated with a thin layer of cocciopesto (see De Simone, C.2.1).

This can be attributed to the earliest phase of construction on the site (from the second to the first century B.C.).

4.2. In Brick

Room 53 (figs. 52-55)

This is the only building known from this site that is entirely constructed in opus testaceum, as is the wall that joins it to the buildings immediately to the north (MSU 10025, room 49). It is likely that the surrounding rooms, which belong to the thermal complex, were built with the same technique. This is what MSU 10027 (rooms 44-48) would suggest, but the situation may be analogous to that of room 51 (socle and facing in brick only where made necessary by dampness or heat; cf. type 3.4.3 above and type 5.2 below). It is impossible to make a single conjecture for all those structures, of which not more than four or five courses survive (for instance, MSU 10008, rooms 47, 48, and 52).

The building that we identify as a laconicum (or sudatorium) has a fairly homogeneous facing in bricks in its original parts. These bricks, positioned as usual, are cut into triangular shapes (16-26 cm long, with the majority 23-25 cm; 3-3.5 cm thick; mortar beds and joints 1-1.5 cm). The floor fragments (of the upper floor and of the hypocaust construction) are made of bricks sesquipedales, as are the arched lintels of the praefurnium, whose bricks taper slightly at the bottom. The only original parts not in opus testaceum, but in cardellino blocks, are on the outside of the building, that is, on the north wall (below the entrance door) and in the outer part of the praefurnium corridor; this finding indicates, also in this case, a desire to limit the use of the expensive brick material. Inside, however, the only elements in heterogeneous material (i.e., limestone and cardellino) are the alterations made later, when the hypocaust was remodeled as a hypogean chamber.

Room 53 has undergone restoration, refacing and repointing, all of which preclude the analysis of its ancient binding, short of destroying what remains of the building.
D.1. The Masonry Structures

Lugli suggests a span of time between the Flavian period and that of Hadrian for the building of this structure (col. 557). Another indication of the date, to be used with all due caution, may be provided by the lead fistula found “within the east wall” and bearing the inscription C IULIUS PRISCUS F.88 In all probability, this pipe belonged to the same conduit of which lengths were found in Area 50 during the excavations of 1999 and 2000 (cf. fig. 20, v). The fistula with the inscription TI CLAUDIUS BURRUS presumably comes from this building as well.89

In the absence of stratigraphic data, it is absolutely impossible to give an exact dating, but the building must be placed somewhere in the period between the end of the first century and the first half of the second century A.D., as the architectural structure would also suggest (cf. D.1.3.5).

Other MSU in opus testaceum: 10005 (cf. figs. 42 and 43); 10067=1233; MSU 1235 (faced foundations for piers).

5. Structures with Facing in Opus Testaceum on One Side Only

Brick was used with care in this site, and only where necessary, which resulted in structures with different facings. This choice may in part be attributed to the reuse of material that was available as result of demolitions. In those cases, however, in which it was possible to reuse a whole wall easily, the wall, or that part of it exposed to humidity or heat, was protected by means of a further structure (cf. type 4.1 above, MSU 10002). The wall MSU 10004 (cf. type 5.1 below) represents just such an example. Obviously, construction of this kind is to be found in those rooms that were, at least at some stage, part of the bath complex. No such speculation can be advanced for the rooms of the residence, because the scanty remains, having been completely reconstructed in opus reticulatum, leave no room for such an interpretation. Rooms 19, 20, and 21 are an exception to this; while preserving traces of successive restructurings,90 they offer no certain indications as to building technique, in that the dividing walls (in bricks and small cardellino blocks) have been substantially recreated by modern restoration.

It must be stressed that in the structures with different facings on the two sides one is always in brick; no exception to this has been found. This shows that brick was only used when necessary; therefore, it was not a case of the builder’s caprice, nor simply the employment of recycled materials.91

Because we wish to concentrate on the material used rather than the exterior appearance of the facing, we are also including in this section MSU 10001 (type 5.3.3 = 2.3), which is undoubtedly very rare and must have been the result of the whim of its builder.

5.1. Other Side in Opus Incertum

MSU 10004 (figs. 56, 57 and 58)

Rooms 42-44

Maximum visible height: 0.65 m (south wall), 0.49 m (north wall); maximum visible length 3.15 m; thickness 0.64 m

The south wall of the masonry structure, which is aligned east-west, is in opus incertum of local limestone, mainly made with selected stones, but also with some roughly shaped stones (10-12 x 11-13 cm, up to a maximum of 17 x 11 cm). The facing still preserves traces of a cocciopesto layer. It has not been possible to determine the level from which the wall began (spiccato) because of the modern flooring.

The north wall is faced with triangular bricks, probably made from bessales (26 cm long, 3.5 cm thick). The revetment on this side must have been of marble panels. There is no way to analyze the binding (in the facing there is virtually nothing other than

88. Lugli 1926, col. 583, but for the question of the dating of this fistula, see Bruun, D.13.
90. These rooms were in fact transformed and have traces of the subsequent installation of the hypocaust.
91. If these last two hypotheses were true, we would expect other examples, such as a structure with one side in small blocks, for instance, or with a side in limestone opus reticulatum.
earth and modern mortar). The wall is the south side of room 42, which is identifiable as a small basin.

It is not possible to affirm with certainty that this is a single wall, and not a wall in opus incertum, which was protected on one side with a brick structure, since the top of it cannot be analyzed and its thickness is not decisive on its own. Moreover, there is an addition to the height in small cardellino blocks, the result of restoration. It is perfectly possible that the cardellino blocks were found at the moment of excavation, in which case it cannot now be established whether they derive from a later arrangement or whether they are connected to structures like type 3.4.3 above. Although the restoration works make it impossible to define the stratigraphic relationships with certainty, if we hypothesize an opus incertum wall, only later protected by a brick structure, it could be related to the walls that bound the square room 38-39-40 (the Republican atrium).  

5.2. Other Side in Opus Vittatum

MSU 10029
Rooms 44-46
Maximum visible height: 0.45 m (east face); maximum visible length: 2.50 m (east face); thickness: 0.56 m

Masonry structure is aligned north-south. The east wall is in opus testaceum, with bricks cut into triangles; the facing of the west wall is in small cardellino blocks. It joins the analogous MSU 10030 (with its south facing in brick; on the north face only a course of cardellino blocks is visible, which is restoration work).

MSU 10029 is in fact largely restored and it is impossible to state with certainty that the west wall was in fact built in opus vittatum in cardellino blocks (repair work done with modern mortar prevents us from determining the actual antiquity of the masonry). Moreover, its northward extension (by room 45) has small cardellino blocks on its east face as well.

There may well have been an opus testaceum socle in this structure also, at least on the east side (see type 3.4.3 above).

5.3. Other Side in Opus Reticulatum with Coigning in Blocks (Limestone)

This is the most common type among those structures that have a different facing on each side. It is difficult to explain why, however. We could suggest the chronological proximity to the other walls in opus reticulatum, but it might be just as valid to speculate that these structures were built at a time when there were large quantities of opus reticulatum tesserae available as result of demolitions.

5.3.1. Opus testaceum in roof-tiles

MSU 10057 (figs. 59, 60 and 61)
Rooms 32 and 33
Maximum visible height: 1.50 m (east face), 2.10 m (west face, heavily restored); maximum visible length 11.30 m (west face), 10.65 m (east face); thickness: 0.73 m

The masonry structure, aligned north-south, is the west side of the large apsidal room 33, and has two openings covered with arches (praefurnia) joining corridor 32.

The east side is faced in opus testaceum of trimmed roof-tiles, analogous to 10002 (cf. type 4.1 above). In the southern portion (from the south praefurnium as far as the avant-corps 10052), the twelfth course from the bottom (from the level of the subfloor roof-tiles) is composed of untrimmed roof-tiles, placed with their rims forming the facing. This course respects the praefurnium (it is only just above it) and evidently serves as the string-course, analogous to that of MSU 10002 (cf. type 4.1 above). Its absence in the remaining part is easily explained, in that the two praefurnia would have been enough of an indication for setting the level of the floor. There is another partial course of untrimmed roof-tiles below the previous one, separated by two regular rows.

On both sides, the arched lintels of the two much-restored praefurnia are built of rims of roof-tiles cut in rectangles (ca. 5-6 x 8-10 cm), in a manner analogous
to those elements employed in MSU 10001 (cf. type 5.3.3 below).

The west side is faced with opus reticulatum in limestone (regular blocks, with sides of 8-9 cm, set at a 45-degree angle). Occasionally cotto elements appear, made from roof-tiles (such as those used in 10001; cf. type 5.3.3 below).

The praefurnia and the juncture of the apse MSU 10054 have coigns in blocks of limestone and brick (one course of limestone alternating with two courses of brick; cf. type 3.4.2, above, and fig. 47).

5.3.2. Opus testaceum in roof-tiles and bricks

MSU 10054 (fig. 62)

Room 33

Maximum visible height: 1.40 m (south face); width of the opening (span) 4.42 m; height at keystone ca. 1.95 m; thickness 0.55 m

The shallow apse (the proportion in Roman feet is 15 of span to 7 of height at the keystone) forms the northern side of room 33. The internal face (south) is in opus testaceum of bricks and trimmed roof-tiles (heavily restored), while the north face (external) is faced in limestone opus reticulatum. It joins both the analogous structure on the east (MSU 10055) and the lateral walls of room 33 (MSU 10002 and 10057). In the more eastern part, the internal facing has a course of broken roof-tiles, positioned with the rims showing, to serve as the string-course; this is similar to what was found at MSU 10002 (type 4.1 above) and 10057 (type 5.3.1 above).

The binding is a pale beige-grey mortar, consisting of lime and sand with volcanic elements and, above all, small gravel (CM 99/68).

On the inside of room 33, there is a fragment, which probably belonged to the suspended floor, which abuts onto the apse at the point where there also survives a portion of cocciopesto revetment (fig. 63). If there had been such a floor actually touching the wall, there could have been no flue (intercapedo) to allow the circulation of hot air along the walls.

5.3.3. Opus reticulatum in cotto (terracotta)

MSU 10001 (figs. 64 and 65)

Rooms 33 and 34

Maximum visible height: 1.20 m (north face), 0.30 m (south face, restored at the ridge); maximum visible length: 2.95 m (north face); thickness: 0.46 m

The south side preserves a tiny portion of the original facing, in limestone opus reticulatum (tesserae 8 x 8 cm). The residual binding is mortar in very poor condition, yellowish in color and very insubstantial.

Because its northern face is so unusual, this structure is a very rare example of opus reticulatum in cotto, built using the rims of roof-tiles cut so as to give an L-shaped element. The exposed rim facing (6.5-7 x 7-8 cm) looks very similar to the stone tesserae. The upright of the L is inserted into the core of the masonry like the point of a pyramidal small block. Structurally, however, there is a certain lack of homogeneity, and the quantity of mortar is increased in order to fill the gap behind the “tessera” in cotto. These elements, which are made from roof-tiles in such a way as to resemble the tesserae of opus reticulatum, are used only in this masonry and in the lintels of the small arches of the praefurnia of MSU 10057. They otherwise appear sporadically (three or four examples) in MSU 10003 (east face), 10053 (east face), 10057 (west face), and therefore only in connection with the group of rooms 32, 33 and 34.

The structure joins the avant-corps in opus testaceum (MSU 10051 and 10052). Lugli had already stressed the rarity of this technique, which is essentially a faux opus reticulatum in cotto, finding a single comparandum in the temples (Tempietti) of Chieti, where, however, the tesserae are made of brick fragments. Another example can be found in Pompeii, IX, 13, 4-5, near the House of Iulius Polybius.93

93. “This form of opus reticulatum is very rare, but finds an analogy in the foundations of the church of Ss. Pietro e Paolo in Chieti, which are attributed to a Roman temple” (Lugli, col. 538 n1, referring to Ashby [sic], for which read R. Gardner, “The Via Claudia Valeria,” Papers of the British School at Rome 9 [1920] 102; cf. also Lugli [as n. 84] 487 n3). For Pompeii IX, 13, 4-5, near the House of Iulius Polybius, note that this opus reticulatum in
5.3.4. *Opus testaceum* in bricks

MSU 10010=280, 296, 446 (figs. 66, 67 and 68)

Room 37

Maximum visible height: 0.72 m (south face, external); 1.20 m (south face, internal); span 4.33 m; height at keystone ca. 2.02 m; thickness 0.76 m. South part analyzed.

This is an apse, with a central rectangular niche. At its ends, the apse joins two more rectangular niches and forms the basin of a thermal room (certainly a *frigidarium*). At about 1.15 m from the floor level, the thickness of the wall diminished, thereby creating a sort of platform or bench.

On the outside, the building is faced with a rectangular patch of *opus reticulatum*, immediately above the offset of the foundation, and blocks of *cardellino* and limestone (*tesserae* 8 x 8 cm; small blocks 20-22 x 9-10 cm; exceptional ones 30-40 x 9-10 cm; joints and beds in mortar 2.5-4 cm). It adjusts to the slope; there is a difference in height of 42 cm between west and east.

The internal part is entirely constructed in bricks cut into triangles, probably made from *bessales* (18-26 cm; thickness 3.5-4-5 cm; mortar beds 2.5-3 cm; mortar joints 0.5-1 cm). There are still traces of revetment on this wall: a layer of *cocciopesto*, crumbled brick for attaching the marble panels, some fragments of these same panels and marble chips sunk in *cocciopesto* for anchoring the bronze clips. The floor of the basin is at a lower level than the foundation offset of the external wall.

The binding is a compact mortar, grey-beige in color, composed of lime, sand and volcanic elements (crumbled tufa or black *pozzolana*?; CM 99/45 and 99/49).

6. Structures Set Against Earth (*Controterra*, with Only One Side Faced)

All the structures that are affected by differences in level between two areas, more or less accentuated, are constructed in this manner. In general, the builders would go below ground level to build hypogean spaces (e.g. room 32) or semi-hypogean (e.g. room 34), or simply channels for fountains or basins. In the first case, the wall is completely built against one side of the construction trench. In the case of the semi-hypogean rooms, however, building against earth is only up to a certain level, from which the wall then rises, with both faces exposed; the retaining wall for the residential block belongs to this second type, and creates the terrace above the garden.

6.1. *Opus Reticulatum*

MSU 10053

Room 32

Maximum visible height: 1.60 m (original, east face); length: 12.95 m; thickness: 0.76 m; apse: span 4.49 m; height to the keystone ca. 0.95 m

The masonry structure, aligned north-south, has a very shallow apse about half way along (cf. fig. 16). The east side is faced in limestone *opus reticulatum* (*tesserae* 8-9 cm), with coigning in blocks of the same material (ca. 23 x 8 cm). At the point where the apse springs, the blocks are shaped in such a way as to follow its form. *Tesserae* of *opus reticulatum* in tufa and *cotto* (rims of roof-tiles, cf. type 5.3.3 above) appear from time to time. The west side of the wall, on the other hand, is evidently constructed against earth (*controterra*), with slivers of limestone and mortar. The binding is an insubstantial mortar, yellowish in color.

The wall, which created a hypogean corridor accessible from the north, should be considered as a retaining structure, without an elevation above the floor level. The apse was built for two reasons, both exclusively functional: to withstand the thrust of the earth behind it and to increase the space for maneuvering near the *praefurnia* (cf. fig. 15).

Comparable are MSU 10062, 10047 and 10003 (the last two, however, are constructed *controterra* up to the floor level only; from there upward, they have an elevation). MSU 10047 is built against a wall, while the elevation of MSU 10003 above the floor level is regularly faced on both sides. Here, note in particular
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the presence of tufa tesserae together with limestone ones.

The wall that separates the residential block from the garden area must also have been built controterra up to a certain level. The slight natural slope was corrected in order to produce a small terrace, sustained by the wall in question, which was probably supplied with a vespaio (a loose stone structure to facilitate natural water drainage).

6.2. Opus Testaceum

MSU 10064 – Fountain (fig. 69)

Area 8

Space occupied by the fountain 10.35 x 9.51 m

On the north side the fountain structure breaks through and goes beyond the so-called perimeter wall. MSU 10064 relates to the south, exterior, wall of the fountain, which is analysed in its entirety.

The structure consists of three masonry rectangles, set one inside the other. The outermost one is formed of a wall (ca. 40 cm thick) with brick facing on one side only, while the other side of the wall is built against earth (controterra), out of rough calcareous stones. The north side is completely reconstructed, and it is by no means sure that the work was done as originally; at the moment of its discovery, it would appear that there was no more than a trace on the ground. The intermediate wall is 30 cm thick and faced on both sides. The space between these two walls forms a channel 70 cm wide, which is ca. 50 cm deep in relation to the present soil level. The innermost wall (30 cm thick) is only faced on one side, while its other side, which fronts on the center of the structure, is built controterra. It is arranged with four small semicircular niches (radius 75 cm), one in the center of each side of the rectangle. Between the innermost wall and the intermediate one there is a small gap (intercapedo) barely 5 cm wide.

The opus testaceum facings are composed of bricks cut into triangles, set in regular courses. Due to the restorations, it is difficult to analyze the mortar beds and joins, and also the quality of the binding agent. The walls preserve faint traces of a protective coating of cocciopesto. Two holes, through which passed a conduit, open in the southwest corner of the structure, one in the outermost wall, the other in the intermediate one.

Structure 10011 (=8007, 8008, 8020, 8032, 8033; Area 55; figs. 70 and 71) is constructed in an analogous manner: this can be interpreted as being a fountain basin, arranged with oval and rectangular niches, even if no water system was found during the recent excavation.

7. Heterogeneous Masonry Structures Built of Recycled Materials

These structures are only preserved now in the western zone of the villa and in part of the eastern wing of the quadriporticus. This is principally due to two causes. First, the depth of the earth covering the ruins diminished in the area of the residential block (a track passed that way and bits of mosaics had come to the surface). To the west, however, a deeper layer of earth permitted better preservation of the structures, where some rise from subfloor levels. Second, during the 1911-1914 excavations, many of the structures identified as “late” were demolished.

It is obviously impossible to provide accurate chronological indications for these walls on the sole basis of their construction technique, which is mainly irregular opus vittatum. The only indisputable fact is that they date to a period after the constructions that they altered. These are always works that were aimed at readapting pre-existing structures, with the creation of new rooms and a redistribution of the spaces. There was a marked preference for blocks of limestone and cardellino among the recycled materials, as they could be used with the greatest ease. Recycled brick was used to adjust the courses and as shims. The tesserae of opus reticulatum were also occasionally reused flat and not at 45-degree angle.

MSU 10015a=461 demolished (fig. 72); cf. type 3.3

Maximum visible height: ca. 0.30 m; length: ca. 5.90 m; thickness: 0.75 m; north-south alignment
These structures were restored in the course of the excavations in the 1970s, when their tops were identified. The walls, constructed contemporaneously with one another, were built to re-divide the spaces, making use of pre-existing structures, at a time when the basin (room 37) must have already been out of use and buried.

The poorly preserved facings show irregular reuse of blocks of cardellino and limestone (17-21 x 8-9 cm) and of bricks (20-27 cm, 3-3.5 cm thick). The better-preserved bricks were chosen for use in courses (the north face of 10015b and west face of 10040); broken ones were used as shims. The mortar (CM 99/69), where it can be traced, is compact, reddish-brown in color, composed of lime and sand, earthy, with volcanic elements and a small amount of fine gravel. The partially uncovered foundations were built in an irregular way, with stones, at times large, pebbles and recycled material. In MSU 422 (foundation of the wall 10015a=461) a fragment of a sculpture was also found (VH 179; inv. SAL 114451).

The much-restored masonry structure was built directly onto a roof-tile floor, which constituted the subfloor of the hypocaust; it seems highly probable that it was therefore a foundation structure, built, with others, in order to be able to divide room 33 into several smaller rooms.

The materials used are certainly recycled, set irregularly and of various sizes; small blocks and chips of limestone, small blocks of cardellino, limestone opus reticulatum tesserae (placed horizontally), and brick chunks. The binding (CM 99/69) is a very friable mortar, grey-beige in color, composed of lime and, above all, of sand.

The wall is set against MSU 10050 and in all probability is joined to 10065, but this cannot be verified on account of the coping added during restoration.

It is possible to see from archival photographs (SAL E 729; see D.1.2.2, no. 2) that at the moment of excavation these structures survived to a greater height. It is also relevant to note that from a certain level upward they displayed a fairly regular facing in small blocks (opus vittatum); this would confirm the hypothesis that the remains visible today originally served as foundations.

The two walls that support the architrave inside building 53, and the architrave itself, consist of recycled materials, set irregularly. The presence of corner stones is characteristic, as is the absence of regular horizontal courses.

8. **Specialized Opus Caementicium with No Distinction between Core and Facing**

MSU 10079=5003, 5004 (fig. 73)

Area 25 - piscina

Space occupied: ca. 24.50 x 12.90 m; depth in relation to the level of the surrounding terrain: ca. 2.00 m

The structure was analyzed in relation to the recent excavation, in its northwest corner (Sector V).

The large rectangular structure that occupies the center (not geometrical) of the garden is constructed entirely in opus signinum, both in the raised part and on the paved bottom.44 There are four rectangular external structures, two on each long side (north and south), partially buried and destroyed. The central part of the south wall has completely disappeared;

---

the stretch of north wall between the two rectangular structures has become detached and has slid some forty centimeters southward. There is an aperture in the west wall, low down, at ca. 4.20 m from the north corner, which joins to the drain conduit, regulated by a sump abutting onto the outside (1.20 x 1.80 m). The sump is accessible by way of two sets of foot-holes; each foot-hole is made of two cover-tiles (imbrices).

The masonry consists of a mixture of mortar and fine limestone rubble, laid thickly without any regularity and with no distinction between core and facing.

This type of masonry is used when a homogeneous and waterproof structure is needed, because of its very compactness, which is obtained by pounding the materials. The complete absence of traces of other coating should not surprise us at all. This way of building was in fact adequate for the purpose the structure was to serve (i.e., storage of water), and so there was no need for further protection on the walls or bottom.

**D.1. THE MASONRY STRUCTURES**

Samples collected from walls that were doubtlessly original (those discovered during our excavations) and from parts attributable with certainty to restoration, made it possible to improve our understanding of some previously suspect masonry sections. The extensive, large-scale reconstruction works were undertaken during Pasqui’s excavations (1911-1914), when they used a mortar that did not contain cement. For this reason it is extremely difficult to find the undoubtedly ancient and unadulterated mortar on the facings.

Comparison of the samples has also proved to be useful in the recognition of macroscopic differences in the ancient mortars, pertaining either to different construction phases or to the specific purpose(s) that a structure may have served. Although we do not believe that a slight variation of the blend can in any way signify a different building phase, it is nevertheless evident that the same materials were generally in use at the same time, but this assumption does not hold when mortar of a particular quality was required.

The collection has collated about 170 samples; only half of these have been judged fit for classification, in that they are unadulterated. Physico-chemical analyses have not been carried out on them; rather, we have limited ourselves to recording the macroscopic characteristics, that is to say, the color, the assimilated material, any inert elements present in the core of the masonry, and the granulometry. On the basis of such evidence, we have attempted a division into groups.

We found that most of the mortar samples display a slight binding capacity and are very insubstantial, because there is little lime present (materia macra). The mortar often appears much deteriorated, evidently because of the acidic nature of the earth at the site and because of the invasiveness of plants, which have impoverished it considerably. In some cases, the

---

95. Written by Maximillian Goriany and Monica De Simone


97. At times the reconstruction only concerned the wall facing where the core still existed.
binding identified has turned out to be simply clay mixed with sand.

In this rather depressing picture, the exception is provided by the structures MSU 10068 (=4007 and 4202), its foundation MSU 4215, and all the specialized mortars (i.e., cocciopesto, and/or preparation for plastering). The walls in opus reticulatum are on the whole built with a yellowish mortar, friable and not very cohesive; this is more or less the same as that found in the walls of room 33, which have one side in brick. On the other hand, the mortar of the basin of room 37 is different; it is greyish in color and has a base similar to the blend of the coating in cocciopesto, and therefore is of good quality. It is difficult to give an opinion on building 53, in which the modern binding has completely taken the place of the ancient mortar on the facing.

In addition to the presence of river sand in the mixtures, there is a volcanic component (which does not seem to be pozzolana, however, a material that is here only used in the cocciopesto). Probably this component can be identified as the so-called “pozzolanella,” a kind of sand recovered from the uppermost strata of tufaceous deposits.
D.1. The Masonry Structures
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Before presenting the pottery material uncovered in the 1997-1999 excavation seasons at the Villa of Horace, it is important to note a few general considerations which conditioned this study and affected, sometimes significantly, the possibility of identification, classification and dating of the finds.

The first observation concerns the deposition and the state of conservation of the pottery finds under examination. Primary deposition can only be ascertained in the uppermost levels, namely in the strata of late antiquity and the early Middle Ages. For example, in SU 450 and 1005, to cite the most striking cases, whole, or almost whole, items or ones which could be largely recomposed were found. The degree of fragmentation of the ceramic finds in most of the material from the other strata, however, is very clear proof of the secondary nature of their deposition. These fragments were often no bigger than 1-2 sq cm, so the diameter of the rims and bases could not be reconstructed in 80 percent of the cases. In addition, over half of the finds analyzed have surfaces that are washed and rubbed away or corroded (because of the high acidity of the soil), or else encrusted, thereby notably reducing the possibility of identification.

The second observation concerns the composition of the ceramic contexts. Most of the strata (about two thirds of the total) have been disturbed by excavation or by pillaging since antiquity (for instance, Sector I, Period IV, activity 37), or by modern trenches and/or earthworks that are connected with restoration or maintenance of the archaeological site (such as Sector I, Period VI, activities 47-48). This fact and the small extent of the area so far explored obviously impose considerable constraints on the elaboration and interpretation of the statistical-quantitative data, as the pottery sample analyzed cannot be considered wholly trustworthy. This research still serves a purpose, however, because knowledge of the stratigraphic sequence of the site will enhance the strategy and timing of future archaeological excavations.

The logical consequence of the situation at “Horace’s Villa” is that the majority of the ceramic finds analyzed can be categorized as “residual material” (namely, finds positioned in a stratum significantly later than their date of production and circulation); the percentage of effective dating material is thus reduced to 5-10 percent of the total. Thus it is evident that, in this situation more than elsewhere, the typological analysis and classification is of pieces that are wholly useless on their own. Consequently, the resulting chronological extrapolations have been made with these excavation data in mind, with the aim of reaching the most correct interpretation possible by way of the overall assessment of the contexts.

As noted above, only a small part of the excavated SU was undisturbed, or at least stratigraphically trustworthy (activities 1-26, in Sector I). Here the analysis of the pottery finds presents the diametric opposite of that just described. A very low, or at least fairly low, percentage of residual fragments is present, which makes reliable chronological definition more feasible. This last observation concerns the presence of certain ceramic classes. It now seems clear that the occupation of the villa continued and developed (in ways and rhythms that could be still better determined through further archaeological investigation) for the whole of late antiquity and the early Middle Ages. This affirmation is based on the attested classes of pottery, which delineate a chronological span from the fourth to the ninth centuries.

We must here consider more closely (not only typologically) the evidence from materials such as the Forum ware production, whose characteristics are wholly analogous with those of the contemporary output in Rome and Lazio. These are not only a sure chronological indicator but also an economic indicator, as they have so far been found only in high-quality deposits, attributable to a fairly high-class clientele.  


2. D. Romei, “La Ceramica a vetrina pesante altomedievale nella stratigrafia dell’esedra della
Another significant finding is the presence in some quantity of amphora material from the sixth to the seventh centuries (from Keay LII to various fragments of *spathia*, of a type not identifiable, but generically assignable to this period). This seems to indicate some sort of commercial traffic, spread over a long period of time, and in part unexpected.

Based on the data so far gathered, it is clear that this line of research should be followed up, in an attempt to reconstruct not only the history of the abandonment of the site but also of its reoccupation. The broader topographical framework, including links with the road system and other settlements of late antiquity and the early Middle Ages in the area, should be explored as well.

A further direction for this study stems from the evidence of various ceramic fragments that can be dated to the middle and late Republican period. These fragments, which come from Sector IV.2, SU 4217-4222 (as residues) and from Sector IV.1, SU 4013 (*VH-CC/12-13: fig. 3*), document with certainty the use of the site in that period.

Before proceeding with detailed illustration of the material, we must emphasize a problem of which we were aware during this research; that of trusting wholly to pottery for providing an absolute chronology for the SU levels, when the wall structures have undergone heavy restoration. For this reason, the study of the material has been carried out bearing in mind the overall characteristics of the contexts and the physical relationships between the strata, using the pottery to reconstruct an absolute chronological sequence with caution. This is all to avoid the risks deriving from an optimistic and misleading reading of the pottery data, which only permits us to establish a *terminus post quem*, with greater or lesser approximation.

**D.2.1. THERMAL ZONE (SECTOR I)**

**D.2.1.1. Period I**

*Activity 1:* Republican strata in room 38

The stratigraphy associated with this phase provides little ceramic material; it is chronologically homogenous and attributable to the late Republican age (second to first centuries B.C.).

SU 874: There are fragments of a black-glazed pottery base, Morel 300 type, belonging to an unidentified open shape, generically datable between the third and second centuries B.C., and an example of *Sutri A60 olla*, dating to the first century B.C.

SU 875: The only recognizable fragment is that of an *olla* with almond-shaped rim, typical of the late Republican period.²

*Activity 2:* Construction of the quadrangle (*atrium* with *impluvium*)

Little significant ceramic material emerged from the strata pertaining to this activity, just a very few fragments of common pottery sides, which are not attributable to specific shapes or types. We have more evidence as far as the stratigraphy of the *impluvium* construction is concerned, in particular from SU 644, which has produced a fragment of cup foot of Italic terra sigillata, of unidentified type.

*Activity 3:* The drain construction

The SU connected with this work did not produce ceramic material.

**D.2.1.2. Period II**

*Activity 4:* Preparation of the floor surface of the *atrium*

The extremely sparse ceramic material produced from the stratigraphy here is largely unidentifiable. Only SU 873

3. G. C. Duncan, “Roman Republican Pottery from the vicinity of Sutri,” *Papers of the British School at Rome* 33 (1965) fig. 34b.
yielded some thin-walled ceramic fragments, unfortunately not attributable to specific shapes or types.

**Activity 5:** Strata of material raising the level of the quadrangle

The strata connected with this activity yielded a certain amount of ceramic material, datable mainly between the Augustan and Flavian periods, with a small nucleus of residual material (consisting mainly of black-glazed pottery), dating to the late Republican period.

SU 629: The pottery material is both very scarce and in a very poor state of preservation. The surfaces have been washed away and therefore it is not identifiable.

SU 646: The only identifiable fragment is an example of an *Albintimilium 109*-type pan with rim *a tesa*, dating from the Augustan period, together with a fragment of a thin-walled cup, which has no decoration and is therefore chronologically unidentifiable. In the stratum, among the residues, there is also a fragment of a black-glazed ceramic cup rim, Morel 2615 type.

SU 631: No important material was found (only pot walls). The single recognizable fragment belongs to a thin-walled ceramic cup.

SU 860: One of the few identifiable fragments is the rim of a common kitchenware *olla* to which can be added a rim and wall belonging to a thin-walled cup, decorated *à la barbotine*, of the *Atlante 1/39* type, dating from the Augustan Age. In this level, as in the preceding one, the residual materials include some black-glazed pottery fragments, among which is the rim of a Morel 2900-type cup.

SU 865: The material is generally attributable to the early imperial period (*Italic terra sigillata*, thin-walled ware, etc.). In particular, some fragments of everyday kitchenware, such as the *Curia 101* pot and the *Curia 189 olla*, can be attributed to the Flavian period. This chronology was also suggested by a fragment of the wall of a vessel of African red slip ‘A’ ware, from a piece of unfortunately undetermined shape.

SU 870: There is one fragment of a plate of *Atlante XIX*-type *Italic terra sigillata*, datable to the first decades of the first century A.D., and a fragment of a *Curia 101*-type pot rim, found also in SU 865 (see above).

SU 1006: No identifiable material was found, just some common pottery wall fragments and fragments of common kitchenware.

The presence of joins between fragments from different strata and their typological and chronological homogeneity confirms the uniformity of the intervention and the rapid superimposing of the various levels of earthing-over (necessary for the creation of the mosaic floor of the *frigidarium*; cf. activity 6) in a fairly short span of time, perhaps to be placed in the first half of the second century A.D.

**Activity 6:** Creation of the *frigidarium* mosaic

The only stratum with identifiable ceramic material (SU 604) yielded just one important fragment, belonging to a *Curia 72 olla* of the Flavian period,

---

5. Olcese, 221, fig. 109.
8. Morselli and Tortorici, 216, figs. 255, 262.
10. Morselli and Tortorici, 216, fig. 253.
which is therefore to be considered the terminus post or ad quem for the dating of the activity. The other pottery and non-pottery material does not give us any further chronological indications.

**Activity 7:** The SU connected with this intervention did not produce ceramic material.

**Activity 8:** Material raising the floor level of room 50

SU 288: The most recent material is a cup of African red slip “A” ware, together with fragments of amphorae of the Dressel 2-4 and 9 types. Fragments ofItalic terra sigillata were also found, including the rim of a Conspectus 34.1-type cup, dating to between the Tiberian and Flavian periods, and an unidentifiable foot fragment, with a seal in planta pedis: MA [---] (VH 076, fig. 23).

SU 316: This layer contains common table- and kitchenware from the second half of the first century A.D., presumably from the Flavian period. Among these are a Curia 63-type bottle,\(^{11}\) cups of the Albintimilium 303, 315, 32-type,\(^{12}\) and Curia 105 and 148-type ollae.\(^{13}\) The residual material is scarce, particularly the thin-walled andItalic terra sigillata pottery, of which one fragment (VH 079) bears the seal C […] (fig. 23).

SU 319: This stratum unfortunately does not contain diagnostic material (only fragments of pot sides). A terminus post quem is established, however, by the presence of some fragments of plastering dating from the Augustan age (see Mols, D.9).

SU 327: It contains three fragments of rims and a wall belonging to a single example of Iberian amphora, Beltran II A type (cf. SU 333, activity 12), together with one fragment ofItalic terra sigillata wall. Among the marble fragments from this level, the presence of several relating to some small fragments of bardiglio is probably datable to the first century A.D. This marble is generally not used after this period, although it is occasionally recycled.

SU 337: There are two fragments ofItalic terra sigillata wall, which because of their fabric and glazing are perhaps datable to the period of Augustus or Tiberius. The same chronology seems to be confirmed by the other pottery elements found in this level, in particular some fragments ofAlbintimilium 37 and 41-type ollae attributable to the late Republican period.\(^{14}\)

**Activity 9:** The construction of the basin (37)

The SU relating to this work did not produce ceramic material.

**Activity 10:** The construction of the apse in room 51

Various ceramic fragments were recovered from the excavation of the fill (SU 313) of the trench in the foundations of the apse (SU 312). The material dates to the period between the third quarter of the first century and the first decades of the second century A.D. Fairly characteristic of this period are the Curia 105-type saucepan,\(^{15}\) the Albintimilium 175-type lid,\(^{16}\) and theolla, probably of local production, of the type VH-CM/14-15 (fig. 14); for the dating, cf. activity 15). The stratum also contains some pieces datable to late antiquity and the early Middle Ages, such as the Albintimilium 80-82-typeolla and the Albintimilium 305-type small cup.\(^{17}\) These last are certainly adulterating

---

11. Morselli and Tortorici, 216, fig. 253.
14. Olcese, 198-200, fig. 3.
15. Morselli and Tortorici, 216, fig. 256.
16. Olcese, 243, 245, fig. 54.
17. Olcese, 211, 282, figs. 40, 72.
elements, having ended up in the soil through the upheavals of the numerous excavations in the twentieth century.

*Activity 11:* The installation of a lead fistula in room 37

The SU relating to this work did not produce ceramic material.

*Activity 12:* The installation of a lead fistula in room 50

SU 318: Among the few pottery elements were found a fragment of Italic terra sigillata cup rim of the Atlante XXV, 7 type, datable to the Augustan/Tiberian period; three fragments of thin-walled pottery cup, of an unidentified type; and one fragment of Italic production amphora neck (perhaps to be attributed to the Tyrrenian area, because of the characteristics of the clay).

SU 333: There are two joining fragments of Beltran II A-type amphora rim (late Augustan Age – second century A.D., cf. SU 337), and one fragment of an amphora handle of African production, which cannot date from before the early imperial age on account of its morphological characteristics.

*Activity 13:* Construction of the walls of room 50

The one stratum containing pottery material (SU 266) offers only walls of amphorae of medium-large dimensions, probably produced in Africa and generically attributable to the early imperial age.

*Activity 14:* Construction of the mosaic and of the plastering of the frigidarium wall.

The only chronological evidence comes from the excavation of SU 834. Here was found a fragment of amphora, which, because of the characteristics of its fabric, is classifiable as Iberian production of the second half of the first-second century. A terminus post quem, which at first sight would seem to confirm this dating, is the presence in the stratum of some elements of a sectile pavement, triangles in slate and white marble, probably coming from the demolition of a floor of the early imperial period (see below).

*Activity 15:* Construction of the floor level in room 50

SU 261: Notable among the ceramic material are two fragments of Beltran II A-type amphora rim (of which one joins another fragment from SU 327: see above); one fragment of Curia 97-type olla; and one fragment of Albintimilium 175-type lid.

SU 274: Among the important fragments are the rim of an olla with out-turned and slightly thickened rim, short neck and shoulder marked by two parallel grooves; it is the VH-CC/1 type (fig. 2), datable from analogous pieces to the first century A.D. There are also two examples of rims of ollae of common pottery of the VH-CM/14-15 type (fig. 14). This shape, characterized by a rounded rim, tapering on the upper side, short neck, shoulder marked by a small listel, and cylindrical body, has been attributed to late antiquity on the basis of very few comparisons. Its presence in strata linked to activities datable to the first decades of the second century allows us to put back considerably the chronology thus far accepted.  

18. Luni II, tab. 132, 8, CM 4470; Piraino, fig. 232, 218.

19. Olcese, 253, fig. 58, 204; Angelelli and Perissinotto, 31, fig. 15, 102.

20. On the basis of my recent finds from Umbria it is now possible to date with good certainty this type to late Republican period (from the second to the mid-first century B.C.).
SU 321: Among the everyday kitchenware are some forms characteristic of the early imperial period, in particular one fragment of a saucepan, with rim a tesa, of the *Albimintilium 109* type,\(^{21}\) from a stratum dating to the early Augustan Age, and one fragment of *Albimintilium 175*-type lid, a shape somewhat characteristic of the Flavian period.\(^{22}\) The residual material includes one fragment of black-glazed pottery and several fragments of Graeco-Italic amphora. Among the marble finds, note the prevalence of types typical of the early imperial period, such as white Luni marble and *bardiglio*.

The presence of joins with fragments from SU 327 (cf. activity 8, above) provides the archaeological proof that the various activities belong to a single building phase.

*Activity 16:* Strata of material used to raise the level of room 50

SU 211: This has yielded one single example of pottery, a cooking-bowl rim attributable to the early imperial period.\(^{23}\)

SU 229: Among the few identifiable pottery fragments are two rims of pottery cooking lids, with raised edges (*VH-CC/51* and *CC/56* type: [fig. 11]), characterized by a shape typical of the early imperial age, and particularly of the Flavian period.\(^{24}\) The rim of an *Italic terra sigillata* cup of the *Atlante XXV* type, datable to between the first decades of the first century B.C. and the Tiberian period, points to the same chronology, as does a fragment of a thin-walled cup of an unidentified type, decorated à la *barbotine*.

*Activities 17–21:* No significant pottery elements were found.

**D.2.1.3. Period III**

*Activity 22:* No significant pottery elements were found.


The pottery material was all recovered in the excavation carried out in the foundation trench SU 647. Among the identifiable elements are an example of a *Dressel 2-4*-type amphora; two joining rims of *Dressel 1*-type amphorae; several fragments of *Italic terra sigillata*; and a handle and two pot walls belonging to a single example of a thin-walled cup of unidentified type. The early imperial chronology of this group of elements leads us to hypothesize that the foundation trench was filled with the excavated earth itself.

*Activity 24:* No significant pottery elements were found.

*Activity 25:* Strata of rubble inside room 50.

The SU levels relating to this work are strata of material used to raise the level of the floor. These consist of soil, probably taken from the vicinity of the villa, unloaded in various heaps close to one another, as is shown by the various joins found between ceramic fragments coming from stratigraphically distinct units.

SU 211: The only identifiable fragment is a sample of bowl rim, attributable to the early imperial age.\(^{25}\)

SU 255: This level contains a fragment of the rim of a pottery cooking-vessel (*VH-AC/2*: [fig. 21]), whose shape is not exactly analogous to the common categories of local production but is quite near to

\(^{21}\) Olcese, 219-221, fig. 43.

\(^{22}\) Olcese, 243, 245, fig. 54.

\(^{23}\) Piraino, fig. 228, 277.

\(^{24}\) Morselli and Tortorici, 216, fig. 257, 124.

\(^{25}\) Piraino, fig. 228, 277.
that of the examples of African red slip “D” ware.\textsuperscript{26} Note also the \textit{VH-AC/3} type (\textbf{fig. 21}), whose shape recalls that of the \textit{Ostia 216} type and is similar to an example from Lugnano.\textsuperscript{27} There are also examples of African production among the kitchenware, with one fragment of a Hayes 196-type saucepan (end of the second to the fifth century). Together with this body of later material, there is also a nucleus of residual elements, including thin-walled pottery (some with decoration à la barbotine) and numerous fragments of kitchenware. Significant among these are some rims of pans a tesa, typical of the early imperial age; the \textit{VH-CC/41}-type vessel (\textbf{fig. 8}); a type of \textit{olla} with rim thickened and slightly out-turning (\textit{VH-CM/10}: \textbf{fig. 13}); and another, with its rim thickened and folded outward, flattened on its upper surface and rounded on its exterior, with cylindrical body (\textit{VH-CM/13}: \textbf{fig. 13}).

\textbf{SU 262:} This stratum contains no typologically important material (a few fragments of amphora walls and handles, of unidentified production, and some table- and kitchenware walls).

\textbf{SU 271:} The material is exclusively residual. There are two exemplars of African red slip ware cup rims (one of which joins a fragment from SU 272: see below), of the \textit{Atlante XXV} and \textit{XXVII} types, datable to between the first decades of the first century B.C. and the Tiberian period. Among the common pottery, there are several examples of bowls, all characterized by the rim, thickened and rounded on the outside, and by the deep body (types \textit{VH-CM/18-20}: \textbf{figs. 15-16}).

This shape has precise analogies at Luni\textsuperscript{28} and at \textit{Albintimilium}.\textsuperscript{29} Also note the fragment of a pot rim, type \textit{VH-CC/41} (joining a fragment from SU 255: \textbf{fig. 8}). Most of the ceramic material, therefore, can be ascribed to the period between the end of the first century and the first decades of the second century A.D.

\textbf{SU 272:} In this stratum only residual elements were found, dated to the first and second centuries. Important are one fragment of \textit{Curia 145}-type pan rim;\textsuperscript{30} one fragment of African kitchenware rim, Hayes 196 type; and one fragment of \textit{Italic terra sigillata} cup rim, \textit{Atlante XXVII} type,\textsuperscript{31} which joins a fragment from SU 271 and is datable to the period between the Augustan Age and the second century A.D.

\textbf{SU 275:} This stratum contains a high degree of residual elements. It yielded one fragment of \textit{Italic terra sigillata} cup, \textit{Atlante XXV} type (\textit{VH-TS/1}: \textbf{fig. 20}), datable between the first decades of the first century B.C. and the Tiberian period, as well as numerous fragments of thin-walled pottery (perhaps from the Augustan period) and two amphorae, one of Graeco-Italic production (\textit{VH-A/2}: \textbf{fig. 1}) and one Dressel 8 (\textit{VH-A/6}: \textbf{fig. 1}). These are to be placed in a rather broad chronological span, between the second century B.C. and the first century A.D., along with a large quantity of walls, some of which probably belong to examples of Dressel 1 and 2/4. Among the common pottery, several fragments are attributable to the early imperial age, such as the Lugnano 83-type \textit{olla}\textsuperscript{32}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{26} \textit{Atlante delle forme ceramiche. I. Ceramica fine romana (Medio e Tardo Impero)} (Rome 1981) 68, \textit{XXIX}, 12, dating to 420-450; \textit{Luni II}, tab. 127, 16, CM 3303.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Piraino, fig. 245, 301.
\item \textsuperscript{28} \textit{Luni II}, tab. 127, 13, CM 8961.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Olcese, 260, fig. 62, 227.
\item \textsuperscript{30} Morselli and Tortorici, 215, fig. 258, from Flavian strata.
\item \textsuperscript{31} \textit{Atlante II}, tab. CXXXI, 10.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Piraino, fig. 210.
\end{itemize}
and the Curia 124-type lid.\textsuperscript{33} The local productions include the VH-CC/4 type (\textbf{fig. 2}), comparable with examples from Lugnano\textsuperscript{34} and Luni\textsuperscript{35} datable to the first century A.D. On the other hand, two fragments with hollowed rims, which are comparable to the Lugnano 200 type,\textsuperscript{36} are probably datable to late antiquity.

SU 283: The class mostly represented is common tableware, among which figures the VH-CM/12-type cup (\textbf{fig. 13}), characterized by a rim of four-cornered cross section and deep central grooving, flattened on top and slightly hollowed on the inside. This has analogies in Campania,\textsuperscript{37} at Luni,\textsuperscript{38} and at Albintimilium,\textsuperscript{39} all datable within the first century A.D. There is also a fragment of VH-CM/14-15-type \textit{olla} (\textbf{fig. 14}; for the chronology, cf. activity 15). Among the kitchenware, note the Curia 106-type pan\textsuperscript{40} and the VH-CC/28 type (\textbf{fig. 6}), similar to the previous one, which has analogies with examples from Cosa,\textsuperscript{41} Amelia,\textsuperscript{42} and Lugnano.\textsuperscript{43} There is also a VH-CC/26 \textit{olla} (\textbf{fig. 6}), which is comparable to a similar type from Lugnano.\textsuperscript{44} Furthermore, the African red slip ware cup rim of Hayes 8 type is also from the same time period, datable to between the end of the first and the middle of the second century.

SU 285: From this stratum we have only material from the early imperial period, clearly residual. Among these finds are a fragment ofItalic terra sigillata, unidentified thin walls and common pottery, and numerous fragments of amphorae, whose provenance unfortunately cannot be established. The only significant fragment is an example ofAlbintimilium 109 pan\textsuperscript{45} from the early Augustan period.

\textbf{Activity 26: Abandonment of the upper flat level of room 50}

SU 209: Among the few pottery fragments, there is an amphora (\textit{VH-A/7: \textbf{fig. 1}}), a variant of the Dressel 6 A type, datable to between the second half of the first century B.C. and the first century A.D. From the same chronological range are two fragments of basin rim, of which one is similar to the Hartley 2 type and one with thickened and molded lip, as the VH-CM/24 type (\textbf{fig. 17}). Dating is established by a bowl rim of common kitchen pottery, \textit{VH-CC/45} type (\textbf{fig. 9}), with deep belly, rounded rim and shoulder marked with grooving. This is similar to the Curia 387 type\textsuperscript{46} and related to the Hayes 63 type, produced in African red slip ware between the middle of the fourth century and the middle of the fifth century.

SU 220: This stratum contains several fragments of African kitchenware, of which the only identifiable piece is a Hayes 196-type bowl lid rim, dating to anywhere in a very long time span. There

\begin{itemize}
\item Morselli and Tortorici, 216 fig. 27.
\item Piraino, 298, fig. 230, 200.
\item \textit{Luni II}, tab. 194, 13.
\item Piraino, fig. 230.
\item \textit{Luni II}, tab. 128, CM 2894.
\item Olcese, 284-85, fig. 73, 313.
\item Morselli and Tortorici, 216, fig. 256, of Flavian production.
\item Dyson, 24, fig. 2, CF 16.
\item Angelelli and Perissinotto, 25, fig. 10, 50.
\item Piraino, fig. 227, 169.
\item Piraino, fig. 230, 199.
\item Olcese, 220, fig. 43.
\item Morselli and Tortorici, 312, fig. 270.
\end{itemize}
are two lid rim fragments of kitchenware, which are unfortunately not attributable to any particular type, although the morphology, with thickened and raised rim, would indicate the early imperial period.

Activities 27-29: No significant pottery elements were found.

D.2.1.4. Period IV

Activity 30: Excavation and refilling of a trench in room 39

SU 1005: This SU contains a considerable quantity of pottery material, presumably of primary deposition, attributable overall to late antiquity and the early Middle Ages. In addition to two fragments of spathia, fragments of ollae were found of the following types: Albintimilium 71-74 (fourth to sixth century), 202 (beginning of the fifth to the seventh century), and 204 (end of the sixth to the seventh century). The common pottery, probably of local production, seems always to be of a type of fabric characterized by an extremely high level of calcareous ingredients.

Activities 31-34: No significant pottery elements were found, except some fragments of Forum ware (SU 1220, activity 31), dating to the eighth to ninth century.

Activity 35: Partial collapse of the frigidarium structures

SU 433: A certain amount of pottery material was found, consisting of residues dating to the early imperial period. Among these are a Curia 61-type bottle rim and the VH-CC/3-type olla (fig. 2), comparable to examples from Settefinestre and from Cosa.

Confirming the dating are one fragment of a small jug base of Forum ware of unidentifiable type and several fragments of bowls of VH-CC/34 (fig. 8) and VH-CM/27 type (fig. 17). These are both characterized by deep hemispherical bellies and rounded rims marked all the way around with a groove, a characteristic shape of the common pottery of late antiquity and adopted in the heavy-glazed production.

Activity 36: No significant pottery elements were found. The only identifiable find (a fragment of white, monochrome majolica of the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries) must be considered to have been interpolated as result of agricultural activities in the last century.

Activity 37: Episodes of ransacking and destruction

SU 265: The level contains only pot sides, of which the identifiable finds are one fragment belonging to a casserole of African kitchenware, possibly of the Hayes 197 type (datable to between the end of the second and the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century) and a fragment of amphora side, whose fabric shows it to be of the Late Roman 3 production, datable to between the end of the fourth and the end of the sixth century.

SU 277: Among the recognizable ceramic finds there are only residual materials, including a fragment of an Italic terra sigillata cup, Dragendorff 24/25 type (dating to between the Tiberian period and the first quarter of the second century), and an example of a VH-CM/23-type basin, with thickened

47. Morselli and Tortorici, 216, fig. 252, of Flavian workmanship.
49. Dyson, 150, fig. 61, LS 72 type.
claudia angelelli

rim, rounded on the upper side, vertical lip and truncated ovoid belly (fig. 17).

SU 278: The ceramic material recovered is mostly residual. This includes one fragment of an olla\(^5\) (VH-CC/5: fig. 3), generically attributed to the first century, and one fragment of thin-walled cup rim of the Atlante 1/33 type, bearing decorations with beads and petals of the Atlante 117 type, dated between the time of Tiberius and that of Claudius. Among the important fragments, there is also, as part of the common pottery, a group of fragments of ollae, VH-CM/14-15 type (fig. 14) and basins, VH-CM/21-22 (fig. 15). Noteworthy kitchenware includes the pan with rim a tesa, VH-CC/32 type (fig. 7), which has distinct analogies at Settefinestre,\(^52\) from strata of the first half of the second century, together with several fragments of ollae, which are datable to the Flavian age on the basis of comparisons and which are characterized by a fabric very rich in augite and mica (VH-CC/22-23, VH-CC/30-31: figs. 5 and 7). This seems characteristic of the local ceramic production in the late Republican and early imperial periods found in this context. Of uncertain date are one example of an olla with turned-out rim, slightly rounded lip and short neck (VH-CM/2: fig. 12); an olla with thickened rim, flattened on top and bent outwards, separated from the body by a “throat” (VH-CM/11, fig. 14); and a basin (VH-CM/21-22, fig. 15). One example of a censer (VH-CM/33: fig. 18) can be dated on the basis of comparisons from between the end of the first to the third century.

SU 287: This stratum, although datable to medieval times, contains almost only residual material. Finds include a VH-CM/8-type olla, with thickened rim of quadrangular cross-section, rounded on the upper surface and slightly hollowed on the inside (fig. 13), which is comparable to examples from Amelia,\(^53\) and one with short neck and cylindrical, or cylindrical-ovoid, body (cf. SU 278, VH-CM/14-15, fig. 14). Of the same period are some fragments of a pan, with rim a tesa, Albinimillium 109 type (from strata of the early Augustan Age),\(^54\) and some fragments of Dressel 2-4-type amphorae. Dating to a later period, presumably the early Middle Ages, is a fragment of a bowl with the rim simply rounded and grooving on the lip (VH-CM/27: fig. 17).

SU 414: Among the common kitchenware are three bowl fragments, VH-CC/34 type (cf. SU 433, activity 26), and one olla rim (VH-CC/2 and CC/24: fig. 2), which is datable to the late Republican period. Among the coarse ware is a type of pitcher with rim bent slightly outwards, flattened and oblique lip, and short neck, on which a wide handle a nastro is fixed (VH-CM/3: fig. 12). Among the residual material of note are two examples of ollae, datable between the late Republican and early imperial period, and a plate-lid, VH-CM/34 type (fig. 18), with rim thickened and turned outward, rounded lip, and a shallow belly shaped like a truncated cone. Among the later material, there is one bowl fragment of African red slip “D” ware, datable to between the middle of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century. The dating is provided by two joining bowl fragments and one handle, of closed shape, in Forum ware (VH-FW/1: fig. 22).

---

51. Piraino, fig. 230, 201.
52. Carandini, 102, tab. 25, 4.
54. Olcese, 219, fig. 43.
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SU 434: The residual material yields an example of a rim of Pélichet 47-type amphora, dating between the middle of the first and the third century. Providing the date are a fragment of common pottery olla, with incised “wave” decoration, similar to examples found in Rome at the Crypta Balbi, dating to the seventh century,\(^55\) and a type of small amphora, probably produced locally, with a slightly thickened rim, grooving on the lip and separated from the neck by a little “throat,” and with a wide handle a nastro (VH-CM/6a: \(\text{fig. 12}\)); this is found also in other versions (cf. SU 447, below).

SU 447: Here we have the rim of a jug, VH-CM/1 (\(\text{fig. 12}\)), comparable to some examples from Ostia\(^56\) dating to the first century A.D. Among the cooking ware are one Hayes 196-type plate rim and one Hayes 197-type casserole bottom. Dating is provided by a type of small amphora, probably produced locally, with slightly enlarged rim, grooving on the lip and separated from the neck by a small “throat” (VH-CM/6b: \(\text{fig. 12}\)).

SU 448: Here there is only a fragment of the spout of an unidentifiable common pottery jug.

SU 450: The dating is provided by heavy-glazed pottery of the Forum ware type (VH-FW/2: \(\text{fig. 22}\)), found in large quantities (91 fragments in all). Among these are one fragment of base joining other fragments from SU 433 and SU 451 (VH-FW/3: \(\text{fig. 22}\)), and one cup, almost completely reassembled (there were 28 fragments: VH 047, \(\text{fig. 25}\)). Among the amphora material, there are one fragment of Keay LII-type amphora (VH-A/9: \(\text{fig. 1}\)) and one fragment of “carrot-shaped” amphora, Crypta Balbi 1 type (VH-A/10: \(\text{fig. 1}\)).\(^57\) Among the African red slip ware there are three fragments of Hayes 103-type bowl (beginning to the third quarter of the fifth century) and two joining fragments of Hayes 50-type bowl (third to fourth century).

The fine ware includes a type of small amphora, with a thickened and rounded rim (VH-CM/5: \(\text{fig. 12}\)), while among the coarse ware were found: one fragment of Lugnano 126-type olla;\(^58\) one fragment of Curia 387-type bowl (from early medieval strata); two fragments of carinate bowls (VH-CC/47-48: \(\text{fig. 10}\)); and two other fragments of the same type, but of an unusual shape (deriving from Hayes 61B?), possibly datable to the middle fifth to the sixth century (VH-CC/43-44: \(\text{fig. 8}\)).

SU 451: This level does not contain typologically important material, but the classes present (including red-painted pottery and Forum ware: VH-FW/3, \(\text{fig. 22}\)) are consistent with those found in the other SU of the same activity, particularly SU 450.

SU 822: This stratum includes one fragment of a rim of a casserole, with straight rim and deep carinate body (VH-CC/1: \(\text{fig. 2}\)), datable by comparison to between the end of the fourth and the sixth century;\(^59\) and one fragment of a

---


56. C. Pavolini, Scavi di Ostia. XIII. La ceramica comune. Le forme in argilla depurata dell’Antiquarium (Rome 2000) 74-78, fig. 19-20, 4-11.


58. Piraino, fig. 219, from a mid-fifth century context.

59. V. Carsana, “Ceramica da cucina tardo antica e altomedievale,” in Carminiello ai Mannesi:
common pottery jug (VH-CC/20: fig. 4), which has precise analogies with examples from the seventh century context of the Crypta Balbi.\(^{60}\)

**Activities 38-40:** No significant pottery elements were found.

### D.2.1.5 Period V

**Activity 41:** No significant pottery elements were found.

**Activity 42:** Strata of the collapse of the Roman and early medieval structures

SU 428: In addition to a fragment of Hayes 91A-type vase *a listello* (mid-fourth to fifth century), there is a type of small amphora, with thickened and rounded rim and handle *a nastro* attached to the neck (*VH-CM/4: fig. 12*); this too is datable to late antiquity.

**Activity 43:** No significant pottery elements were found.

**Activity 44:** Strata of collapse of medieval structures of room 50

SU 269: The only recognizable fragments are one fragment of *olla* (*VH-CC/27: fig. 6*) and a pan rim (*VH-CC/41: fig. 8*), dating to the early imperial age.

**Activity 46:** Strata of collapse and abandonment in the level plane of room 50

SU 202: This stratum yields a few fragments of African red slip “D” ware (largely pot sides; just one fragment of plate rim, of *Hayes 33* form, can be identified (dating to 200-250 A.D.). Included in the common kitchenware is one fragment of *olla* rim *a tesa*, of the

**Activity 48:** Modern archaeological interventions

Material uncovered in the course of the excavation of these strata is obviously all to be considered residual. Note, however, some finds which are particularly significant in that they are evidence of little-documented phases of the life of the site (especially the late Republican and early medieval periods).

Among the oldest ceramic material is one fragment of black-glazed cup base, Morel 320 type, with a central rosette stamp (SU 231), attributable to the *atelier des petites estampilles*.

The *VH-CM/34*-type plate-lid (*fig. 18*), with rim thickened and turned out, vertical lip, shoulder slightly carinate and shallow body, is datable to the early imperial period.

Notable among the material from late antiquity are an example of *olla*, with turned-out rim, short neck, and carinate shoulder, with “wave” decoration incised before firing (*VH-CM/16: fig. 14*), as well as a small jug (*VH-CC/19: fig. 4*), which has exact analogies with examples from Carminiello ai Mannesi.\(^{62}\)

The only evidence of the medieval period is the fragment of a handle *a nastro* belonging to a glazed pottery jug (SU 205, *VH-FW/4: fig. 22*). It is difficult to attribute the fragment to the sparse-glazed ‘A’ production or to the Forum ware production, as it is precisely at the handle, as at the bottom or on the rim, found also in other strata (cf. SU 275).

**D.2.1.6 Period VI**

**Activity 48:** Modern archaeological interventions

Material uncovered in the course of the excavation of these strata is obviously all to be considered residual. Note, however, some finds which are particularly significant in that they are evidence of little-documented phases of the life of the site (especially the late Republican and early medieval periods).

Among the oldest ceramic material is one fragment of black-glazed cup base, Morel 320 type, with a central rosette stamp (SU 231), attributable to the *atelier des petites estampilles*.

The *VH-CM/34*-type plate-lid (*fig. 18*), with rim thickened and turned out, vertical lip, shoulder slightly carinate and shallow body, is datable to the early imperial period.

Notable among the material from late antiquity are an example of *olla*, with turned-out rim, short neck, and carinate shoulder, with “wave” decoration incised before firing (*VH-CM/16: fig. 14*), as well as a small jug (*VH-CC/19: fig. 4*), which has exact analogies with examples from Carminiello ai Mannesi.\(^{62}\)

The only evidence of the medieval period is the fragment of a handle *a nastro* belonging to a glazed pottery jug (SU 205, *VH-FW/4: fig. 22*). It is difficult to attribute the fragment to the sparse-glazed ‘A’ production or to the Forum ware production, as it is precisely at the handle, as at the bottom or on the rim, found also in other strata (cf. SU 275).

### Bibliography

- **Ricci** (as n. 55) 369, fig. 10, 4-5.
- **il complesso archeologico di Carminiello ai Mannesi, Napoli (scavi 1983-1984), ed. P. Arthur (Galatina 1994) 248, fig. 119, 92.2, with further bibliography.
that there is most commonly attenuation of the coating, not always intentional. However, the characteristics of the clay seem to assign the fragment examined to a fairly late production phase (end of the tenth to the first half of the eleventh century), during which the Forum ware and the sparse-glazed productions still coexisted.63

Activity 49: Formation of strata of humus

SU 1000: This layer does not produce much pottery material (amphorae, common kitchen- and tableware, African cooking ware), and contains also one fragment of earthenware, building material and modern nails. Note the presence of an African red slip ware plate, Hayes 105 type (one fragment of rim and another fragment, which join), datable to the end of the sixth to the middle of the seventh century. This piece, in fact, although coming from the most superficial stratum, is one of the very few pieces of pottery found in the area of the villa which can be definitely attributed to this period.

SU 1200: Among the important pieces are a fragment of a thin-walled cup, Atlante 2/408 type, and a fragment of olla, VH-CM/9 type (fig. 13), with cylindrical-ovoid body, thickened and rounded rim, and shoulder marked with grooving. The latter has analogies with examples from Luni64 and Albintimilium65 that are datable to the early imperial age (between the first and the third century) and were fairly widespread in Flavian times. Among the early medieval elements, note the olla with triangular cross-section rim and vertical lip with “wave” decoration incised before firing (VH-CM/17: fig. 15).

D.2.2. The Quadriporticus, Sector IV.2

SU 4217 and 4222: These strata have yielded several fragments of thin-walled pottery, one fragment of the common kitchenware lid rim, Albintimilium 172 type,66 and some fragments with almond-shaped rims, characteristic of the second to first century B.C.67 There are also present some amphora fragments of the “Punic tradition,” van der Werff 1 type (VH-A/1: fig. 1), datable between the middle of the second and the first century B.C.68 Among the residual material, note a certain quantity of black-glazed pottery (Morel 2700 and 2900-type cups), two joining fragments of a carinate bowl of grey bucchero, and one parallelepiped-shaped loom weight (VH 173).

SU 4213: This level includes one fragment of rim of a “Punic tradition” amphora, van der Werff 1 type (for chronology, cf. SU 4217 and 4222), and one fragment of Amelia 105-type olla,69 datable between the second half of the second and the middle of the first century B.C. Among the residual material, there is one fragment of rim of a black-glazed cup, Morel 2784 type, datable to the middle of the third century B.C.

SU 4209: The important elements are a fragment of Albimintilium 21-type olla70 and one fragment of Albimintilium 109-type saucepan,71 which are both datable to the early Augustan age, and one fragment of a thin-walled cup, Atlante 1/19 type.

SU 4208 and SU 4206: No significant pottery elements were found.


64. Luni II, tab. 132.4.

65. Olcese, 199, fig. 31, 34-36.

66. Olcese, 244-245, fig. 54.

67. Angelelli and Perissinotto, 22, fig. 10, 32-38, with preceding bibliography.

68. Angelelli and Perissinotto, 17.

69. Angelelli and Perissinotto, 31, fig. 15.

70. Olcese, 193, fig. 32.

71. Olcese, 221, fig. 43.
SU 4201: Among the material providing dating are one fragment of *Albintimilium 85*-type *olla*\(^{72}\) and one fragment of an amphora with ring foot (not documented before the middle imperial period).

### D.2.3. Sector VI: Central Area of the Garden

SU 6010: This stratum is the layer of humus that formed after the excavations of the twentieth century. It contains a very little ceramic material, of which the only recognizable bit is a fragment of African kitchenware, of undetermined date.

SU 6014: No significant fragments were found. The only identifiable finds belong to thin-walled pottery vessels, of types that cannot be definitely determined.

SU 6016: This stratum produced a certain quantity of pottery, almost exclusively for everyday use. Among these can be identified one fragment of an *olla* with out-turned rim, dating to between the end of the second century B.C. and the beginning of the first century A.D.,\(^{73}\) as well as one fragment of lid with thickened rim, analogous to examples from Rome\(^{74}\) and from Amelia,\(^{75}\) dating to the last decades of the first century.

SU 6013: In the material from this stratum, which probably represents the cultivated soil of the garden in antiquity, there are some important fragments of thin-walled andItalic *terra sigillata*, generally datable to the early imperial period.

SU 6017: This stratum produced little material, but identifiable is one fragment of the rim of a jug of common tableware; the rim is triangular in cross-section and slightly out-turned, dating to between the second half of the first century B.C. and the first century A.D.\(^{76}\) Among the kitchenware is one fragment of lid with rim rounded and slightly raised outwards, of a type fairly widespread in contexts in the central Italic area, dating from the second century B.C. to the first century A.D.\(^{77}\)

SU 6019: This SU contains no significant ceramic material.

### D.2.4. Sector VII: North Area of the Garden

#### D.2.4.1. Period I: the early garden

**Activity 1:** The strata relating to this phase did not produce any ceramic material of importance.

**Activity 2:** SU 7042: Relating to the activity, there are some fragments of common pottery, among which is an *olla* of Dyson type PD 126,\(^{78}\) and a rim belonging to an *olla* of the *Luni* type XXX,\(^{79}\) both datable to the late Republican period.

#### D.2.4.2. Period II: the Flavian garden

**Activity 3:** SU 7021: The only recognizable fragments are those of a cup in common tableware (*VH-CM/28: fig. 18*), characterized by a thickened and rounded rim and shallow body, comparable to an example from Lugnano,\(^{80}\) and an *olla* with rim thickened and triangular in cross-section (*VH-CC/16: fig. 4*), which has analogies in examples from Cosa.\(^{81}\)

SU 7022: This layer contains material on the whole unimportant, except for the rim of a van der Werff-type amphora, of “Punic tradition” (*VH-A/1: fig. 1*), datable

---

72. Olcese, 211, fig.40, from strata of the fourth century.
73. Olcese, 192, fig. 32, 18.
74. Morselli and Tortorici 1989, 281, fig. 257, 125 and 128.
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76. Cf. Angelelli and Perissinotto, 33, fig. 16, 120, with bibliography.
77. Olcese, 244, fig. 54, 171, with comparative bibliography.
78. Dyson, 105, fig. 39, PD 126 type.
79. *Luni II*, 422, tab. 75, fig. 3.
80. Piraino, 319, fig. 246, 5: unfortunately there is no indication about the chronology.
81. Dyson, fig. 61, 82; cf. also Piraino, 298, fig. 230, 194.
to between the second century and the beginning of the first century B.C.  

SU 7027: This SU produces some fragments of a small thin-walled pitcher, *Atlante I/102* type, three fragments of an *olletta* with rounded rim, a fragment of Olcese 37-type *olla* with out-turned and hollowed rim, and some walls from amphorae of African production (probably of “Punic tradition”).

**Activity 4:** The strata relating to this phase yield no significant pottery material.

**Activity 5:** SU 7019: The only identifiable fragments belong to a cup with thin “egg-shell” walls, decorated with a wheeled motif (*VH-PS/2: fig. 19*), analogous to the

---


83. Angeloelli and Perissinotto, 24, fig. 10, 52.

84. Olcese, 198, fig. 35, 37.

85. Olcese, 198, fig. 35, 37.

---

86. *Atlante* II type 2/416, tab. XCIll, 14.

87. Angeloelli and Perissinotto, 31, fig. 15, 105.

88. Dyson, fig. 61, 82; cf. also Piraino, 298, fig. 230, 194.

89. Carandini, tab. 28, 6 and 28, 10; Olcese, 190, fig. 31, 14.
D.2.4.3. Period III: decline of the villa

Activity 10: SU 7037: The only identifiable piece is a rim fragment of African kitchenware, of the Hayes 182 type, datable to between the middle of the second and the middle of the third century.

SU 7038: Among the significant pieces are some rims of pans of African kitchenware of the Hayes 181 type (second half of the second to the middle of the third century) and of the 197 type (late second to the middle of the third century). The presence in the stratum of the coin VH 144, however, would lead to the lowering of the dating to the late fourth to fifth century (see Buttrey, D.11.3.2, no. 12).

SU 7039: The pottery present in this stratum is all residual. Among the identifiable sherds there is one fragment of a lamp with volutes and one of an olla with thickened and slightly turned-out rim, Sutri F20, A12 type, both dating to the early imperial age. There is, however, a follis of Constantius Chlorus dating to 297-298 A.D. (VH 123; see Buttrey, D.11.3.2, no. 4), an element which would lower by about a century the dating provided by the pottery.

2.2.4.4. Period IV: Medieval reoccupation

Activity II: SU 7004: the dating material is a handle of glazed Forum ware; among the residues is to be noted one fragment of pan rim, of Hayes 196-type African kitchenware.

SU 7010: The stratum yields exclusively residual ceramic material, including some examples of African red slip ware (of the Hayes 8 and 27 types, datable to between the last decades of the first and the second century), and a pot rim in African kitchenware (or an imitation of it), Hayes 197 type, dating between the second and the fifth century. Among the common kitchenware is attested a type of pan with rim a tesa (VH-CC/27: fig. 6), which finds an exact analogy in examples from Lugnano and Albitimilium, both datable to the Augustan Age; an olla with thickened rim of triangular cross-section (VH-CC/17: fig. 4); and an example of an olletta with out-turned rim (VH-CC/6: fig. 3), analogous to the type Luni II CM 6943, and a type of pan with banded rim and parallel grooving, slightly hollowed on the inside and with hemispherical body (VH-CC/46: fig. 9). Notable among the common tableware are two examples of cups (VH-CM/25-26: fig. 17), characterized by a thickened, banded and molded rim and hemispherical body, comparable with the Luni II type CM 2302.

SU 7035: There is a certain amount of residual pottery of the late Republican and early imperial age. The dating material consists of some fragments of common pottery, among which are a fragment of an olla with flattened rim and globular Curia 317-type body, two fragments characterized by a rim hollowed on the inside; a fragment of pan rim, thickened and slightly out-turned, and a
D.2. Pottery

fragment of pan, with rim thickened and flattened on the upper side,\(^99\) all datable to between the end of the fourth and the sixth century. Especially noteworthy are two fragments of pan with fillet under the rim, an imitation of the Hayes 91D form. There is also one fragment of a small cup in glazed pottery, whose state of preservation does not permit certain identification. The late antique chronology is confirmed, however, by two small coins datable to the fourth century (VH 092-093; see Buttrey, D.11.3.2, nos. 6 and 11).

SU 7036: The stratum contains only residual material, including one fragment of a bowl of Hayes 185-type XXX (datable between the last two decades of the first and second century); one fragment of Dressel-Lamboglia 16 lamp; and one handle of Dressel 2-4 amphora. These last are attributable to the Julio-Claudian period.

Activity 12: SU 7017: The stratum contains exclusively residual and mostly unidentifiable ceramic material, except for the bottom of a late Italic terra sigillata cup, with relief decoration, portraying a dog racing rightward.\(^{100}\)

SU 7033: This SU yields material that for the most part is not identifiable, except for the wall of a Forum ware vessel, datable to the early medieval period (eighth to ninth century).

SU 7034: This stratum contains material that is mostly unimportant and residual, among which are some fragments of ollae of common kitchenware, of the types Settefinestre 28, 14 and 29, 20-22, generally attributable to between the first and the second century.

D.2.4.5. Period VI

Activity 13: SU 7001: The SU contains some fragments of earthenware and glazed kitchenware. Among the residual material, to be noted are a rim of a black-glazed, Morel 2286-type cup, and a fragment of a bowl of Italic terra sigillata (VH-TS/2: fig. 20), attributable to the Atlante II, form XIX, 13 type.

\(^99\) Angelelli and Perissinotto, 25, fig. 12, 68.

\(^{100}\) M. Medri, Terra sigillata tardo italica e decorata (Rome 1992) 54, tab. 2, 4, type 2.1.2a; 254, subject 2.2.8.01.
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D.2. POTTERY


D.3. GARDEN MATERIAL

BY ELIZABETH R. MACAULAY

D.3.1. OLLAE PERFORATAE (FLOWER POTS)

During the excavations of “Horace’s Villa” at Licenza undertaken from 1999 to 2000, three ollae perforatae, or planting pots, were found in the garden area in front of the central staircase of the residence (Area 24). There is another pot known from the site, which is housed in the museum in Licenza. It apparently comes from one of the earlier excavations in the twentieth century. All four ollae perforatae will be discussed in this section.

D.3.1.1. Nearly whole flower pot: VH 148=SAL 114528

Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7040

This pot is almost entirely preserved, missing only a small section of its rim (figs. 1-3). The pot measures 14 cm in height. Its diameter measurements are: rim, 11 cm; mouth, 9.2 cm; base, 5.2 cm; and base hole, 2.5 cm. There are no side holes. It is red in color (Munsell 5 YR 6/6) and is made of porous, moderately coarse clay. In the fabric, there are black and white inclusions, as well as small bits of grog (less than 1 mm). The pot appears to have been fully fired, as the red color remains constant and uniform throughout the wall of the vessel.

The pot is slender in form with a small flared rim. This slender form is similar to pots that have been found at Pompeii.1 It is clear that the pot was wheel-made, as smooth wheel-run ridges are present on both the interior and exterior. The pot has a single hole in its base. Extra material located just inside the hole in the base of the pot indicates that the hole was placed before firing. The potter took little care when making this pot; although the pot can stand up and does not wobble, it is lopsided. Additionally, extra material on the side of the base was not smoothed out before firing. The pot was not broken before it was placed in the ground; it was found intact. The flower pot dates to the last third of the first century A.D., which accords well with the Flavian garden context in which it was found. For the context, see Gleason, C.3.4.2.

D.3.1.2. Flower pot base fragment: VH 187=SAL 114531

Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7051

This fragment of a flower pot base (figs. 4-5) was found in the rubble level above the ancient garden soil in SU 7051. It was identified as a flower pot base because it is clear that there was a purpose-made hole in the base. The fragment of the base measures 1.2 cm across. Based on a comparison with VH 148, the diameter of the base can be estimated to have been about 4.2 to 4.7 cm. The base hole was placed before firing, as extra material is present on the interior of the hole. The fabric of this pot is similar to the fabric of VH 148, though it is slightly lighter in color (Munsell 5 YR 6/8). The fabric, like that of VH 148, contains grog, small black inclusions and small light inclusions, and it is slightly porous. It cannot be determined whether or not there were other holes in the side of the pot. Because the two pots are of such similar fabric, it may be that VH 187 also resembled VH 148 in design and had only one hole in the base. Likewise, VH 187 may perhaps also date to the Flavian period. But a date cannot be assigned with absolute certainty, as this fragment was discovered in the rubble level.

D.3.1.3. Flower pot base fragment: VH 203=SAL 114529

Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7067

The diameter of the base is 3.5 cm (figs. 6-7); the base hole, 1.9 cm; and each of the two side holes, ca. 1.5 cm. The base is roughly made. The fabric is neither as coarse nor as porous as the fabric of VH 187 and VH 148. Its color is yellow-buff (Munsell 2.5 Y 8/2), and it is fully fired. There are at least three holes in this pot: one in the base and at least two on the side. One of the side holes is only partly preserved. There were probably at least three holes on the side of the pot,

1. Personal observation on July 10, 2001 at Pompeii. See Jashemski 1979, 239. The pot on the far right in her figure 350 is slender in form.
for in general flower pots that have multiple holes on the side have three holes.\textsuperscript{7} The extra material inside the base hole suggests that the hole was placed before firing. The holes on the sides also appear to have been placed pre-firing. Moreover, there are no known cases of side holes being placed on the side of a pot after firing. Generally, side holes are placed before firing,\textsuperscript{3} and this seems likely with VH 203. The form of the pot and the base is generally that of an inverted bottleneck. This pot was found turned upside down in the top level of the Flavian garden context to the right of the entrance from the atrium into the garden, on axis with the complete flower pot (VH 148). The pot dates to the last third of the first century A.D.

\textbf{D.3.1.4. Flower pot in the Museum of Licenza: SAL 39344}

This flower pot (\textit{figs. 8-11}) was probably found during earlier excavations, although there is no mention of it in the surviving documentation of the 1911-14 and 1930-31 excavations. It is impossible for us to know when and where the pot was found. It is 15 cm in height; the rim diameter at its widest point is 10.9 cm, and the mouth is 9.6 cm. The base is misshapen; as a result, the base diameter ranges from 3.5 cm to 3.7 cm. The base hole is also misshapen, and its diameter ranges from 1.7 cm to 2.1 cm. The size of the side holes range from 1.2 to 1.5 cm.

The design of this flower pot does not exactly match that of any of the other pots found at Horace’s Villa. This pot has four holes, three on its side and one in its base. The fabric is neither porous nor micaceous, but it has a few black inclusions and bits of grog (no bigger than 1 mm). It appears to be completely fired. The color is an orange-red (Munsell 5 YR 5/8). The body of the pot is slender, like many flower pots from Italy. Owing to the potter’s carelessness, it is slightly fuller on one side, and it wobbles when standing up. A similar slender form has been observed at Pompeii.\textsuperscript{4}

The pot has a noticeably long neck (2.5 cm) and an upright-collar rim. While the rim thickens outward to 3 cm, it remains straight on the inside. All of the holes were placed before firing. The side holes are placed about half-way up the vessel. It has light wheel ridges on both the inside and outside. The pot appears to have broken on the top quarter and was restored from fragments.

\textbf{D.3.1.5. Conclusions}

The flower pots from the new excavations are on axis with a planting pit and with an amphora reused as a planting pot. It is common to find planting pots and reused amphorae together in a Roman garden context; reused amphorae and planting pots, for example, have been found together along the Canopus at Hadrian’s Villa.\textsuperscript{5} The variation in vessel types probably indicates

\textsuperscript{2.} There are exceptional cases known at Pompeii and Fishbourne, where the pots have four holes on the side. For Pompeii, see Jashemski 1993, 62. Only one of the recovered planting pots at the House of the Ship Europa (I.xv.1-3) has four side holes and one base hole. At the House of the Hebrew (I.xi.14), one pot was found to have four side holes and one base hole (see Jashemski 1979, 239). During my own research carried out in early July 2002 in Pompeii’s storage rooms, I studied over forty purpose-made pots; only one of them (Inv. no. 28586) had five holes. Thus we may conclude that, of the numerous pots known from Pompeii, very few \textit{ollae perforatae} had five holes. For the general forms of Italian flower pots, see G. Messineo, “\textit{Ollae Perforatae},” \textit{Xenia} 8 (1984) 65-82. For forms of flower pots outside the Vesuvian region see P. Liljenstolpe and A. Klynne, “The Imperial Gardens of the Villa of Livia at Prima Porta: A Preliminary Report on the 1997 Campaign” \textit{Opuscula Romana} 22-23 (1997-1998) 127-147. For the planting pots at Fishbourne Roman Palace in Chichester (UK), see B. W. Cunliffe, A. G. Down and D. J. Rudkin, \textit{Chichester Excavations IX: Excavations at Fishbourne 1969-1988} (Chichester 1996) 148-149. Also see A. Down, “A Roman planter pot from Fishbourne,” \textit{Antiquities Journal} 69 (1989) 308-309, and B. W. Cunliffe, \textit{Excavations at Fishbourne, 1961-1969} (Oxford 1971) 26-27.\textbf{Two of the planting pots at Fishbourne appear to have five holes: FB86-D1146 has four side holes and one base hole; FB69-J2.4 has three side holes and a single base hole. A fourth side hole probably existed but does not survive.}

\textsuperscript{3.} Jashemski 1979, 239.

\textsuperscript{4.} Personal observation on July 10, 2001 in Pompeii’s storage rooms. See Jashemski 1979, 239, fig. 350.

\textsuperscript{5.} N. Hannestad, “Über das Grabmal des Antinoos: Topographische und thematische Studien im Canopus-Gebiet der Villa Adriana,” \textit{Analecta
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that they contained different types of plants, or
plants brought from different nurseries. The pots run
parallel to the stairs and path in the Flavian garden. Though the base fragment came up in rubble levels, it was also found on axis with the olla perforatae, a planting pit, and half of a reused amphora. As the olla perforata VH 203 was also found turned upside down, it is possible that the tilling of soil during the medieval period upturned pot VH 203 and destroyed pot VH 187.

The three olla perforatae found at Horace’s Villa in 1999-2000 are typical of the range of forms of planting pots found in Italy. The flower pot in the museum of Licenza (SAL 39344) is very similar in form to those found at Pompeii; its body is slender, and its side holes are smaller (1.4 cm) and cleanly made. However, its fabric does not match the typical micaceous Pompeian fabrics. The slender body and flared rim of pot VH 148 is also similar in form to the flower pots that have been found at the House of the Ship Europa and other locations at Pompeii, and at Boscoreale. But again the fabric of VH 148 does not match the typical Pompeian fabric.

It seems probable that olla perforata VH 148 was not a pot used for aerial layering, because it lacks side holes to provide drainage and air for the new roots. Rather, it probably housed a sapling or plant that was brought from a nursery. However, the planting pot

in the museum and the buff base fragment may have been used for layering and then planting, because they have side holes. The side holes enabled air to reach the plants’ roots when being layered and planted.

Nothing can be said about the place of manufacture of these pots. The range of fabrics found at Horace’s villa is unusual, as compared to the ensembles of flower pots found at sites such as Pompeii, Herculanenum, and Prima Porta. The rule of homogeneity is not surprising: Italian olla perforatae were generally made locally and used locally or at most regionally. There is no ancient kiln yet known from the Licenza area. The range of fabrics from Horace’s Villa may mean that these pots—and the plant materials contained inside them—came from nurseries in different locations throughout the region, or it could indicate that they came from the same nursery at different times. At the moment, the question must be left a non liquet. One way of addressing the matter in the future could be through new excavations of the garden and other nearby villas and their gardens; perhaps the heterogeneity found thus far is deceptive and with more data, the Licenza site, too, will revert to the norm of homogeneity.

D.3.2. The Sundial Fragment from “Horace’s Villa”

Sundials (solarium or horologium, sing.) are known from ancient sources and archaeological evidence. Ancient sundials marked twelve hours of daylight and were designed with respect to latitude. Vitruvius describes the major types of sundials and their geometric principles (Vitr. 1.6.6; 9.7.1-7; 9.8.1). Rome’s first sundial, located at the temple of Quirinus, dated to 291 B.C. (Pliny NH 7.213). Romans placed sundials in many public and private contexts across the empire. Beginning in the second century B.C., the wealthy included sundials in their homes. Sundials, a


7. Nurseries are known to have existed in the ancient world, but our evidence for them is limited and little scholarship has been done on them. Nurseries are thought to have existed in the Nile River Valley, at Jericho, and at Pompeii. At Pompeii, Jashemski identified the House of the Ship Europa (I.xv.1-3) as a “market-garden orchard,” which would have provided the inhabitants of Pompeii with fruit and other plants. See Jashemski 1993, 61 and Jashemski 1979, 249-265. The House of the Ship Europa, the active flower industry of Pompeii, and the range of gardens suggest together that there may have been Pompeian nurseries (See Jashemski 1993, 183-242 and 267-288). Many plants in Mediterranean gardens could be grown by planting a cut branch in the ground; however, in the case of more exotic plants, perhaps there is the possibility of a specialty nursery that imported potted plants for villa gardens.

common feature in both elegant and modest homes of Pompeii, were often found in the garden (fig. 12).9

A single fragment of a sundial was found during the Pasqui excavations (1911-1914) at the villa of Horace (fig. 13).10 The exact find spot of the sundial is unknown, although Pasqui did excavate in the garden area, including the piscina.

The sundial fragment is a piece of white marble of a fine grain with two intersecting lines inscribed on it. The use of marble suggests a sundial of higher quality than many of those found in simpler garden contexts at Pompeii. The more expensive sundial is consistent with other evidence for luxurious building during the Flavian phase of the villa.11

An incised hour line (10 cm) and a fragmentary day line (3.2 cm) are visible on the fragment (fig. 14). At the top of the piece, the two lines intersect at a right angle. The surface to the upper left of the intersection has been chipped away, so that it is unclear whether the day line continues in this direction; normally, however, day lines ran across the entire face of a sundial. The hour line continues unintersected. When comparing the incised lines of the fragment to sundials from the villa of Poppaea at Oplontis12 and from the villa of San Marco at Stabiae, the fragment appears to be from an area closer to the base than to the gnomon; the day line seen here was probably the second of three horizontal lines on the surface of the sundial. The curve of the fragment is steep at the top, but declines into a more gradual slope, which also suggests that the fragment was located near the base of the sundial (fig. 15).

The right angle of the day and hour lines also indicates that the vertical incised line on the surface was the meridian, or central hour line, of the sundial. Vitruvius’ explanation of the geometry of sundials shows that the meridian could only intersect the day lines at a 90-degree angle (Vitr. 9.7.2-6). The meridians of sundials known from Oplontis13 and Stabiae intersect the day lines at 90 degrees, thus following Vitruvius’ precepts (fig. 16).

The back of the sundial from Horace’s Villa is flat and triangular in shape. Because of the small size of the fragment, it is difficult to identify the original shape of the sundial with total certainty. The curvature of the fragment, however, allows the hypothesis that the sundial was spherical, one of the most common sundial forms.14 A clean cut along the side of the fragment suggests that the sundial was reused in antiquity. On the opposite side, it also appears to have been picked through in two places.

Based on the placement of sundials in Pompeian gardens and taking into account the areas excavated by Pasqui, the sundial was probably located to the north-east of the piscina. The shadow study done by M. Murata, which tracks the positions of the sun in the garden throughout the year, supports this theory; the best position for the sundial would have been along the central axis of the garden, northeast of the piscina where Pasqui excavated (cf. Gleason, C.3 and fig. 32).

10. In March 2000, Gleason identified a single marble fragment as pertaining to a sundial. It is stored in the SAL storehouse in the Santuario di Ercole Vincitore in Tivoli (cassette #270, Pasqui excavations, no inventory number).
13. Jashemski 1979, fig. 327.
14. For the curvature of spherical and conical forms of sundials at the meridian, see S. L. Gibbs, Greek and Roman Sundials (New Haven 1976) 122 and 219.
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D.4. THE “HORACE’S VILLA” BRICKSTAMPS AND THE BRICK PRODUCTION OF THE CENTRAL ANIO RIVER VALLEY

BY GIORGIO FILIPPI

D.4.1. INTRODUCTION

With the notable exception of “Horace’s Villa,” our knowledge of the stamped brick and tile production of the central Anio valley is still filled with too many gaps to permit anything more than a preliminary account.

The lack of a valid interpretative model for all stamped bricks that have survived from antiquity and the numerous unanswered questions draw our attention to two essential aspects of this kind of source material. We must bear both aspects in mind, if we are to use stamped bricks and tiles correctly for a historical reconstruction of archaeological sites and of the territory: the stamp’s meaning as well as its location and date of production.

The meaning of the stamp and the partial nature of the written text

The stamped brick or tile attests the ownership of the object at the moment of its production. From the beginning, the epigraphic text was partial, because— for obvious limitations of space—it necessitated a choice of how much to communicate to the person who was supposed to read it. Scholars have offered various explanations for the meaning and custom of stamping bricks. In particular, some consider it unlikely that products exclusively destined for one’s own everyday use were marked in this way. If this were the case, the stamp by itself would not be sufficient to identify the owner of the villa where it was found. In contrast, other scholars claim that the stamps—both of a public character as well as those made for the producer’s own use—can indicate “the ownership of the object being built, referring to the building to which the bricks belong and for which they were made.”

The place and date of production and of use

Since we have few data relative to the place and time in which stamped bricks were made, sold, and used, the study of the context in which the stamps were found can contribute the most to their proper interpretation. Therefore, a serious historical analysis must be based on an ensemble of documentary sources (literary, archaeological, and topographical).

D.4.2. HISTORY OF THE FINDS

Publication of the first brickstamp from Horace’s Villa (CIL XIV.4092.13=CIL XV, 1972a)

In 1887 Hermann Dessau published in CIL XIV a rectangular stamp, with letters in relief, carrying the text [---] Naevi, preserved by the German Latin philologist Alexander Riese (1840-1922). The entry gave the provenance as the ruins which were thought to belong to the Sabine villa of Horace near Roccagiovine.


4. In such a case, “è in linea di principio da escludere una loro comparsa sul mercato,” Manacorda 2000 (as n. 2), 132-133, 139, 141.
In 1891, the same stamp was inserted by Heinrich Dressel into the fifth chapter of CIL XV, among the fragmentary or poorly interpreted *latteres urbani*. The entry recorded two stamps, both with a lacuna at the beginning of the text and both carrying the same text, NAEVI. The first (1972a) was discovered near Licenza at “Horace’s Villa” and was taken by Riese to Frankfurt. The second (1972b=CIL XIV.4090.73), described by Stevenson, came from the territory of Grottaferrata and was kept in the museum of the monastery there.

Regarding the first stamp, since the name of the site of Horace’s Villa at Licenza is “Vigne di S. Pietro,” it is necessary to clarify the reason for the different toponym reported in CIL, which gives the find spot as the *colle del poetello*.

In 1857 Wilhelm Henzen and Pietro Rosa hypothesized that Horace’s Villa was located in a place called “Colle del Poetello” near Roccagiovine, where there are remains of a Roman villa. Their argument was based on the alleged derivation of “poetello” from the Latin *poeta*. In 1886 this hypothesis was demolished by Tito Berti, who pointed out that “poetello” in the local dialect simply meant “hillock” (“poggierello” in standard Italian).

To solve the long-debated question about the exact location of Horace’s Villa, archaeological excavations were undertaken from 1911 to 1914 on the Vigne di S. Pietro site in Licenza. The connection of Horace’s property with both Roccagiovine and Licenza can be explained by the fact that it was situated quite close to these two towns.

Although a certain amount of confusion remains about the exact find spot of the brickstamp, the available evidence strongly suggests that it must have been the villa in the Vigne di S. Pietro at Licenza.

The supplementation of the text—i.e., the addition of the praenomen Manius to the edition of CIL, which reports a lacuna—has been made possible by Pasqui’s excavations of 1911-14, whose finds are housed in the Museo Oraziano in the Orsini Palace at Licenza (fig. 1). Now, for the first time in the 90 years since the conclusion of Pasqui’s work, our epigraphical knowledge is extended.

In 1926 Giuseppe Lugli published the excavation results from the villa, utilizing the unpublished catalogue compiled by Pasqui. However, Lugli’s entries do not agree with the Pasqui manuscript and are the result of an erroneous interpretation of the data.

Pasqui’s catalogue, published for the first time in this report by Frischer (see G.1.12), includes (in *Category F: Construction Material*) 12 brickstamps that were housed in the museum at the conclusion of the excavations (fig. 1).

A direct study of the material, which is presently preserved in the storehouse of the Soprintendenza Archeologica per il Lazio, has permitted us to verify that, of the four examples cited by Lugli as certain identifications of the stamp in CIL XV, three are erroneous. Moreover, of the remaining six stamps

---

5. Mari 1994, 66 n34.
9. For the history of the excavations, see Frischer, B.4.
10. Since, as will be seen, the documentation of Pasqui’s excavations was changed in the publication of Lugli, until now the new acquisitions have not entered the scholarly literature. E. M. Steinby hesitantly considers our stamp (1972a) a variant of CIL XV.1315, in *Indici complementari ai bolli doliari urbani* (CIL XV.1) (Rome 1987) 136, 401.
13. Storehouse at the Santuario di Ercole Vincitore (Tivoli). I thank Dr. Maria Grazia Fiore for having granted me the opportunity to inspect the material on September 4, 2002.
recorded by Lugli as having a rectangular form and as unpublished, one has a semi-circular form, another is circular with a central disk and three can be identified from CIL XV.\textsuperscript{14}

The recent excavations conducted by the American Academy (1997-2001) have brought to light seven brickstamps belonging to two types that had been discovered earlier (indicated on table 1 with the abbreviation VH).\textsuperscript{15} Altogether, 27 stamps are known from Horace’s Villa. Of these, we have performed autopsy on 26. They belong to ten distinct types, of which four were hitherto unpublished (table 1).

Because of the rarity of the CIL XV 1972 a compl type and the limited area in which it has been found, we added to our catalogue two examples of the same type that are preserved in the Ashby Collection at the American Academy in Rome and in the monastery of San Cosimato at Vicovaro.

The first was arbitrarily attributed by J. C. Anderson, author of the catalogue of the Ashby Collection, to the “Tomba della Medusa” situated on the Via Tiburtina just outside the Porta Chiusa, on the basis of a presumably erroneous identification of Ashby.\textsuperscript{16} But in fact, we have to do with one of the two stamps (CIL XV.1051.10 and CIL XV.2031.4) discovered in that monument in 1839 and erroneously sought by Anderson in the Ashby Collection. Given the rarity and thus far otherwise unique provenance of the stamp, it is much more likely that it should be assigned to Horace’s Villa, which Ashby is known to have visited.\textsuperscript{17} The second is incised on a roof-tile fragment that comes from the archaeological area of San Cosimato.\textsuperscript{18}

D.4.3. Catalogue

D.4.3.1. Terminology and criterion of the publication of the stamps

Figure 2 shows the system for classification of bricks and roof-tiles. After the typological naming of the object and the codification of the fragment, the words “+ cut” mean that the piece (brick or tile) has a side that is sawed and may therefore have been used in a brick facing. The dimensions are given in the following order: height x width x thickness. In the case of fragmentary pieces, a portion of an original side that is preserved is considered as the width of the object for the purposes of measuring. The shape of the stamp follows: rectangular, horseshoe (semicircular with disc partially set in), and orbicular (circular with large, medium or small-sized disc, an orbiculus, set in). For the rectangular and horseshoe stamps the first measure is the height, the second the length; for the orbicular stamps, the diameter of the stamp is given first, and then that of the orbiculus. The height of the letters follows, and then the number of auxiliary lines which delimit the lines of the text, beginning from the outside. The number which precedes the transcription of the text refers to CIL XV; in the case of the unpublished pieces, “N.” indicates the place where the unpublished piece would have appeared in the CIL. The term “compl.” explains that the fragmentary or badly preserved text of the stamp as given in CIL XV or N has been completed.

\textsuperscript{14} Numbers 1 and 4 are unpublished and rectangular in shape; no. 3 is unpublished and horseshoe shaped; no. 5 (equivalent to CIL XV.129) is orbicular with medium-sized orbiculus; numbers 2 and 5 (equivalent to CIL XV.1211) are rectangular. The lack of autopsy of the finds has had negative consequences for the study of local production and brick circulation.

\textsuperscript{15} CIL XV.1972a=XIV.4092, 13 compl., N. 933/4.


D.4.3.2. “Horace’s Villa”

1. (LP2)
   fig. 3. Fragment (E) of brick, cm. 15.6 x 10.5 x 4.3.8. Orbicular stamp, cm. 7.5?: disc 3.6; letters 1.1, 0.9; aux. lines 2, 2.1.
   CIL XV.129
   Tert(ius) D(omitiae) L(ucillae) [ex f(liglinis) Can(inianis) op(us) dol(iare) fe(cit)]
   Tit(iano) [et Gall(lican)co(n)s(ulibus)]
   [((ramus palmae))]

2. (LP1)
   fig. 4. Fragment of brick (?+ cut), cm. 21 x 23.8 x 4.6. Orbicular stamp, cm. 9.3; disc 3.6; letters 1.1, 0.9; aux. lines 2, 2.1.
   CIL XV.129
   T[ert(ius)] D(omitiae) L(ucillae) [ex f(liglinis) Can(inianis) op(us) dol(iare) fe(cit)]
   Ti[t(iano)] et Gall(lican)co(n)s(ulibus)
   [((ramus palmae))]

3. (LP6)
   fig. 5. Fragment (H) of tile?, cm. 19.6 x 15.8 x 3. Horseshoe stamp, cm. 7.4, 3.5; disc 3.2; letters 0.8 – 1.3.
   N. 890/1
   L(uci) Braeti

4. (LP3)
   fig. 6. Fragment (E) of tile?, cm. 10 x 6 x 2.7. Horseshoe stamp, cm. 6.7?, 2.8?; disc 2.5?; letters 1.1 – 1.3?
   N. 890/1
   L(uci) Braeti

5. (LP5)
   fig. 7. Fragment (E) of tile?, cm. 25.5 x 19.5 x 2.5. Rectangular stamp, cm. 7.3?, 3.3; letters 1, 0.9.
   N.933/4
   Claud[iae]
   Epich[aris]

6. (L10R)
   fig. 8. Fragment (E) of tile?, cm 15.8 x 12.4 x 2.2. Rectangular stamp, cm. 3.6?, 3.4; letters 1, 0.9.
   N.933/4
   [Claud]iae
   [Epich]aris

7. (VH 204)
   fig. 9. Fragment (G) of tile, formed of two parts joined together, cm. 37.9 x 33.8 x 2.5-2.8. Rectangular stamp, cm. 8.9?, 3.3; letters 1, 0.9.
   N. 933/4
   Claudiae
   Epicharis

8. (L4R)
   fig. 10. Fragment (E) of brick, cm. 19.5 x 16 x 4.9-4.2. Orbicular stamp, cm. 10; disc 5.1; letters 1.1, 1.1; aux. lines 1, 2, 2.
   CIL XV.1033
   [Op(us) d(oliare) Doryph]or(i) Domit(iae) P(ubli) f(iliae) Lucill(ae)
   [Paet(ino) et A]pro(niano) c(o)n(s(ulibus))

9. (L3R)
   fig. 11. Fragment (E) of brick, cm. 18.2 x 13.6 x 4. Orbicular stamp, cm. 9.8; orb. 4; letters 1.1-1.3, 1; aux. lines 1, 2, 2.
   CIL XV.1210
   C(ai) Comin(i) Proc(uli) [dol(iare) ex p]r(aedis)
   Iuli Step(hani)
   Titian(o) et Squil(la) co(n)s(ulibus)

10. (LP4)
   fig. 12. Fragment (E) of brick, cm. 16.4 x 8.5 x 4.1. Rectangular stamp, cm. 6.3+, 3.7-4; letters 1.3, 1.1.
   CIL XV.1211
   C(ai) Comin(i) [Proc(uli)]
   fec(it ) Feli(x Caric(us)]
D.4. The “Horace’s Villa” Brickstamps and the Brick Production of the Central Anio River Valley

11. (L1R)

fig. 13. Fragment of brick (bipedalis or sesquipedalis), cm. 29.3 x 34.2 x 4.5. Rectangular stamp, cm. 11+, 3.9; letters 1.3, 1.1.

CIL XV.1211
[C(ai) Com]in(i) Proc(uli) fec(it) Felix Caric(us)

12. (L2R)

fig. 14. Fragment of brick, cm. 29.3 x 14.6 x 5-4.8. Rectangular stamp, cm. 7.1+, 2.4; letters 1.8.

[---]ILLI.

Two identifications can be proposed. In the first case, we may have to do with the stamp CIL XV.1340a [L. OPEILLI on the basis of the letters and the rectangular form with one line of text,\(^\text{19}\)] the use of the diphthong ei for i (=Opilli) is frequent in the Republican period.\(^\text{20}\) The second integration derives from CIL XV.2381b=XIV.4092.8 [C. Caecili Bathyl]lì, and is based solely on the interpretation Y of the first preserved letter (of which only the lower part of the straight stroke remains), since the form of the only reference copy is not transmitted.\(^\text{21}\)

\(^{19}\) It has not been possible to find intact examples for the two types CIL XV.1340a (L. OPEILLI) and 1340b (L. OPEILL or L. OPHELL). In the Vatican Museums, Marini Collection, rq. VI, inv. 68721; rq. IX, inv. 69155, are preserved two fragments of the variant c (L. OPHL[---]), which presents a palaeography clearly very different from our stamp. For various forms or variants of the writing of the gentilicum (Opilius, Opellius, Ofillius), see W. Schulze, Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen (Berlin-Zurich-Dublin 1966) 115, 276, 443, 452, 462.

\(^{20}\) The gentilicum Opilius is twice attested at Rome and once at Praeneste. CIL I.2.4.2319 hypothesizes the correction of the types CIL XV.1340b-c on the basis of the stamp L. OPILI (L. Opeli?), discovered in the excavation of the Republican house to the southwest of the House of Livia on the Palatine.

\(^{21}\) The text is the same as CIL XV.2381a=S. 457 from Tibur, but it is arranged on two lines, at the end of which is found a vertical palma.

13. (LP7)

fig. 15. Fragment of brick, cm. 17.2 x 23 x 3.2. Rectangular stamp, cm. 8.4, 3.6; letters 3.2-2.7.

N. 1370/1-1371
L(uci) Pomp(---)

14.

fig. 16. Rectangular stamp

CIL XV, 1972 a compl.

[M(ani)] Naevi

15. (LP8)

fig. 17. Fragment (C) of tile, cm. 21 x 34 x 3.1-2.9. Rectangular stamp, cm. 15.7, 2.5; letters 2-1.

CIL XV, 1972 a compl.

M(ani) Naevi

16. (L7R)

fig. 18. Fragment (H) of tile, cm. 17.3 x 14.5 x 3-2.5. Rectangular stamp, cm. 15+, 2.5; letters 2-1.

CIL XV, 1972 a compl.

M(ani) Naevi

17. (L6R)

fig. 19. Fragment (H) of tile cm. 14.1 x 14.5 x 3.2. Rectangular stamp, cm. 12.2+, 2.6; letters 2-1.5.

CIL XV, 1972 a compl.

M(ani) Naevi

18. (L8R)

fig. 20. Fragment (H) of tile cm. 14.3 x 11.7 x 2.9-2.7. Rectangular stamp, cm. 13+, 2.6; letters 2-1.7.

CIL XV, 1972 a compl.

M(ani) Naevi

19. (L5R)

fig. 21. Fragment (H) of tile cm. 17.5 x 24.4 x 3.1. Rectangular stamp, cm. 13+, 2.5; letters 2.2-1.7.
20. (L.9R)
**fig. 22.** Fragment (H) of tile cm. 15.8 x 8.6 x 3-2.8. Rectangular stamp, cm. 7.5+, 2.2+; letters 2.2.
*CIL* XV, 1972 a compl.
M(ani) Naevi

21. (VH 125)
**fig. 23.** Fragment (H) of tile cm. 22 x 17.2 x 3-2.6. Rectangular stamp, cm. 15.5, 2.6-2.4; letters 1.7-1.5.
*CIL* XV, 1972 a compl.
M(ani) Naevi

22. (VH 185)
**fig. 24.** Fragment (H) of tile cm. 9 x 13.5 x 3.4-3. Rectangular stamp, cm. 8.7+, 2.5; letters 2-1.7.
*CIL* XV, 1972 a compl.
[M(ani)] Naevi

23. (VH 201)
**fig. 25.** Fragment (H) of tile cm. 10 x 12 x 3. Rectangular stamp, cm. 5.3+, 2+; letters 1.7.
*CIL* XV, 1972 a compl.
[M(ani)] Naevi

24. (VH 136)
**fig. 26.** Fragment (H) of tile cm. 22.6 x 13.5 x 3-3.2. Rectangular stamp, cm. 6.8+, 2.6; letters ?
*CIL* XV, 1972 a compl.
[M(ani)] Naevi

25. (VH 035)
**fig. 27.** Fragment (H) of tile cm. 12.5 x 14.2 x 3.5. Rectangular stamp, cm. 6.5+, 2.6; letters 2.
*CIL* XV, 1972 a compl.
M(ani) N[ae]vi

26. (VH 189)
**fig. 28.** Fragment (H) of tile cm. 14 x 9.2 x 3. Rectangular stamp, cm. 6.5+, 2.6; letters 1.8.
*CIL* XV, 1972 a compl.
[M(ani) Na]ev[i]

27. **fig. 29.** Fragment of *dolium* cm. 22 x 36 x 11.5; height of lip 8, width 19.5. Two separate rectangular stamps:
a) cm. 3.2 x 12.5; letters 2.1-1.6
b) cm. 3.5 x 12.6+; letters 2-1.7
N. 2437/8
Favoniae C(aii) f(iliae) ((palma ds.))
Q(uinti) Fabrici Fel[icis]

**D.4.3.3. The Ashby Collection at the American Academy in Rome**

28. (AAR 5142)
**fig. 30.** Fragment (H) of tile cm. 14 x 9.2 x 3. Rectangular stamp, cm. 9.5+, 2.5; letters 1.9-1.8.
*CIL* XV, 1972 a compl.
[M(ani) Na]ev[i]

**D.4.3.4. Convent of San Cosimato (Vicovaro, ROMA)**

29. **fig. 31.** Fragment (H) of tile cm. 14 x 9.2 x 3. Rectangular stamp, cm. 15.6, 2.5; letters 2-1.
*CIL* XV, 1972 a compl.
M(ani) Naevi

**D.4.4. Typology of the Brick Material**

Most of the stamped material consists of *tegulae* which, in addition to being used for covering, were often cut up and used for the construction of walls. The typological inclusion of some not easily identifiable brick fragments in this class is determined by a series of assessments (thickness, presence of one side partially surviving, *impasto*, and comparison among fragments).

Some unstamped *lateres* used in the villa, which include *bipedales*, *sesquipedales* and *laterculi*
bessales, when examined directly (macroscopically) and then confirmed by laboratory analysis, are in an impasto very similar to that of the stamped tiles of the Naevius production.\footnote{22}

In one wall, the fragment of the rim of a dolium was even found.\footnote{23}

### D.4.5. Typology of the Stamps, Palaeography, and Epigraphical Form

The forms attested are rectangular (six types),\footnote{24} horseshoe (one type),\footnote{25} and orbicular (three types).\footnote{26} See fig. 2 for the schematic representation of these forms. The arrangement of the words is on one or more parallel lines (straight or curvilinear). Guidelines only appear in the orbicular types. The letters are in relief and are made with an incised wooden matrix. The writing is left to right.

Among the older stamps, that of Naevius has distinctive palaeographic characters, such as obliqueness, variations in height, irregular appearance of the lines and the divaricate form of some of the letters (M, N, V). The circular dividing sign can be felt by touch, because of the way in which the inscription was prepared on the matrix, that is, “in negative.”

As for the form of the texts, they can be grouped into two categories, on the basis of length and content:

- **A – Brickstamps of private producers.** This is the most numerous group, consisting of a simple onomastic formula in the genitive.\footnote{27} The dolium [Cat. 27] carries two separate and complementary stamps.\footnote{28}

- **B – Brickstamps of figlinae (workshops of which the name appears).** These bear a more complex and evolved text, typical of the Tiber area, with the generic denomination of the brick product (opus doliare), of the officinator, of the proprietor (dominus), of the places of production (figlinae), and the consular date.\footnote{29} To this type can also be attributed the simpler text of a stamp that contains the onomastic formula of an already well-known officinator, followed by the nomen servile of his own slave responsible for the production.\footnote{30}

### D.4.6. Prosopography of the Producers: Gentes Active in the Production of the Bricks (Domini and Officinatores)

A comparison of the family names (nomina) occurring on the bricks and tiles—which sometimes document the existence of individuals and families not attested by other sources—with those of other inscriptions (on stone, etc.) permits us to verify the diffusion of the gentes active in the brick industry and can contribute to the topographical identification of the places of production (figlinae).

Moreover, such a correlation makes it possible to formulate a hypothesis about the origin, mobility and rank of the individuals involved. We can also determine their economic interests in the region, both those resulting from what can properly be called “industrial” activity directed toward a relatively large marketing territory, and those primarily tied to serving the needs of their own fundi. For reasons

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{22} Analysis is in progress at the Gabinetto Ricerche Scientifiche of the Vatican Museums.  
\textsuperscript{23} Cat. no. 27. This class of large containers, used for holding agricultural foodstuffs, was manufactured in the figlinae together with bricks, tiles and other products (mortars, sarcophagi, etc.) with the same type of clay (heavy earthenware); see G. L. Gregori, “Un nuovo bollo doliare di Q. Tossius Cimber,” Epigrafia della produzione della distribuzione. Collection de l’École Française de Rome 193 (Rome 1994) 547-553.  
\textsuperscript{24} CIL XV.1211, 1972 a, N. 933/4, N. 1370/1-1371, N. 2437/8, [---]ILLI.  
\textsuperscript{25} N. 890/1.  
\textsuperscript{26} CIL XV.129, 1033, 1210.  
\textsuperscript{27} Six types: CIL XV. 1972a; N. 890/1, N. 933/4, N. 1370/1-1371, N. 2437/8, [---]ILLI.  
\textsuperscript{28} N. 2437/8: the two onomastic formulae include praenomen, nomen and cognomen (the male), nomen and patronymic (the female).  
\textsuperscript{29} Three types: CIL XV.129, 1033, 1210.  
\textsuperscript{30} This is Felix Caricus, slave of C. Cominius Proculus (CIL XV.1211), who appears in other stamps as officinator of Julius Step(hanus) in 127 A. D. (CIL XV.1210) and of Domit(ius) Lucil(ius) (CIL XV.1051): in general, see Helen, 120, 142.}
of manpower or management, many officinatores and domini could belong to gentes dwelling in the region only in the period when bricks and tiles were produced.

In the present investigation, special attention has been given to the stamps produced locally (products which, up to now, have not been found in the city of Rome) and the areas covered are the Augustan regions I-VIII (table 3).

**BRAETII**

*L. Braetius*

Owner of a production facility whose bricks have been found until now only at Horace’s Villa.

The status of the individual cannot be given with certainty (see D.4.7).

The family name is rare, attested for the first time in Regio I, with the exception of Rome, where it is present two times (see table 3); it can perhaps be related to the *Braetii of Regio VI*.

The uniqueness of the stamp and its close connection to the building history of the villa suggests the possibility that the *figlina* belonged to the owner of the *fundus* where the tiles were used.

**CLAUDII**

*Claudia Epicharis*

Owner of a production facility of bricks found to date only at Horace’s Villa.

This family name is extremely common in Rome and Italy, while in Etruria and Umbria it generally takes the form *Clodius*. It owes its enormous diffusion to the time of Claudius and Nero, who gave this name to their freedmen, from which it passed to their descendants.

The name *Claudia Epicharis* reflects a freedman origin and is the same as that of the woman who took part in the Pisonian conspiracy against Nero in 65 A.D., as described by Tacitus. But such facts are not sufficient in themselves for identifying the woman.

Women with the same name are otherwise attested at Rome in three funerary inscriptions (*CIL* VI.8411; *CIL* VI.29062; *CIL* VI.29081), but the onomastic comparisons do not furnish the basis for even a speculative identification (see Rudich, E.2).

Numerous males and females belonging to this *gens* appear on the stamps of the first and second centuries A.D. Among these can be noted the production of *Claudia Prima*, whose name appears inside a rectangular stamp (*CIL* XIV.4091.31=XV.2318), which was found in the territory of Praeneste and Tusculum.

On the basis of the uniqueness of the stamp and its close connection to the building history of Horace’s Villa, it is possible that the *figlina* belonged to the owner of the *praedium* where the tiles were used.

**COMINII**

*C. Cominius Proculus*

This individual is mentioned on three stamps (*CIL* XV.1051, *CIL* XV.1210 and *CIL* XV.1211), the last two of which were found at Horace’s Villa. *Domini* are *Domitia Lucilla* in the first and *Iulius Step(hanus)* in the second, which dates to 127 A.D. The third bears only the name of *Felix Caric(us)*, slave of *C. Cominius Proculus*.

---

31. Solin and Salomies, 37; see also *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, II, An-By (1900-1906) col. 2163.

32. A contribution to the resolution of the problem could result from an archaeometric analysis of the material used to make these bricks, the samples of bricks found in the nearby kiln of the locality known as Le Moglie, and local clays.

33. Stein, s.v. Epicharis, in *RE* XI (1907) col. 34. See Rudich, E.2.

34. Other female family members of the same *gens* are known to have been involved in the brick industry, active as *domini* or *officinatores*: *Claudia Marcellina* (*CIL* XV.934, 935, 936: 123-126 A.D.), *Claudia Prima* (*CIL* XV.2318: first century A.D.) and *Cl(audia) The(t)is* (*CIL* XV.937: end of the first century A.D.).

35. See note 32.

36. Helen, 120, 139, 142; Setälä, 134.
For the diffusion of the family, see table 3.

C. Cominius Proculus was undoubtedly the officinator on the estates of the two domini mentioned above.

The two stamps CIL XV.1210 and 1211 are mainly distributed in Latium. The presence in the ager Statoniensis of CIL XV.1051 together with a product of C. Iulius Stephanus makes it highly likely that the praedia of the latter were near the figlinae of the Domitii, to which the officinator C. Cominius Proculus and his slave Felix Caricus transferred between 127 and 135 A.D. 38

DOMITII

Domitia P. f. Lucilla

Daughter of Domitia Cn(aei) f(itia) Lucilla, she married M. Annius Verus and had two children, Annia Cornificia Faustina and the future emperor Marcus Aurelius.

The gens Domitia is attested everywhere and is especially tied to Regio VII because of vast possessions (including figlinae), which later passed into imperial hands. The first individual of note in this sector was Cn. Domitius Afer, who came to Rome from Gallia Narbonensis, and who invested substantial earnings from oratorical activity in some brick and tile factories. 39

The family’s practically omnipresent bricks constitute the foundation for the dating of many buildings in Rome and the surrounding area, starting from the time of Claudius. 40

At Licenza, two stamps from the figlinae of Domitia Lucilla (the younger) are attested: CIL XV.129, dating to the year 127 A.D., and 1033 from the year 123 A.D. 41

In the Tiber valley, some facilities have been identified in the ager Statoniensis, on the basis of some kiln waste and a wide range of products of the Domitii and of the figlinae Domitianae. 42 The figlinae Caninianae can be situated in the same area on the basis of the find of two stamps, CIL XV.118b, S.41. 43 The figlinae Caninianae also supplied Horace’s Villa with the bricks bearing the name Tertius, a slave officinator of Domitia Lucilla (CIL XV.129). 44

With regard to the provenance of manufacture of CIL XV.1033, linked to the name Doryphorus, likewise a slave officinator of Domitia Lucilla, the marketing territory must have comprised Rome and the territory of the Roman Campagna from Tibur to the Alban hills. The most northerly example in the Tiber valley was found in the territory of Capena. 45

FABRICII

Q. Fabricius Felix

This individual is mentioned in the second stamp on a dolium found at Horace’s Villa (see D.4.3, cat. no. 27). He may be identified with Q. Fabricius Felix known from the dolium stamp CIL XV.2437 (with a different matrix) from Rome.

41. For the prosopography: Helen, 100-102, 118; Setiäliä, 108-109.

42. Gasperoni, 205-219, 223-227. The rock inscription, CIL XI.3042 add., located in the territory of Bomarzo and mentioning the iter privatum duorum Domitianorum, conferred a certain importance to the fundus with a private access road owned by the two brothers Cn. Domitius Lucanus and Cn. Domitius Tullius, adoptive sons and heirs of Cn. Domitius Afer (see Gasperoni, 112-118, tav. XXV).


44. For the prosopography, see Helen, 118.

45. See Filippi and Stanco, 107. Other brick constructions owned by the gens Domitia are known in southern Latium.
One may infer a freedman origin and the role of officinator in a figlina of the gens Favonia mentioned in the first stamp.

The family name, attested only once in connection with brick and tile production and in the sector of the dolia, is documented in Latium, Umbria, and Etruria (see table 3).

FAVONII

Favonia C. f.

This individual is mentioned in the first of two stamps of a dolium found at Horace’s Villa; the stamp had the function of indicating the dominus and the officinator attached to the production (see D.4.3, cat. no. 27).

The family name is attested for the first time in the context of the producers of bricks and is unknown (except for Rome) in Latium, Umbria, and Sabina. It is present twice in Etruria, at Veii and Capena (see table 3). According to Dressel, the figlinae Faun(ianae), a brickstamp from which has been found in the interior of the ager Capenas, may be connected to the same gentilicium and interpreted as figlinae Fav(ianae) (CIL XV.211).

The lack of the cognomen of the woman could perhaps be interpreted as a sign of her fame in a local context.

IULII

C. Iulius Stephanus

This individual is mentioned on eight stamps of the years 123-132 A.D., one of which was found at Horace’s Villa (CIL XV.1210, with the consular date 127 A.D.). The family name is imperial and was widespread from the time of Caesar, Augustus, Tiberius, and Caligula.

Probably of freedman origin, Iulius Stephanus was dominus of praedia with an associated facility for the production of bricks and tiles, in which five officinatores are known to have been active, including C. Cominius Procclus and his slave Felix Caricus (CIL XV.1211; see above on Comini), who both appear in the stamps of Licenza.

The marketing area of the bricks of Iulius Stephanus is well documented in Latium, but the find of another of his stamps on a product in the central Tiber valley makes it very likely that the praedia were near the figlinae of the Domitii.

NAEVII

M’. Naevius

Owner of a production facility of bricks known up to now only from Horace’s Villa and San Cosimato. All the examples known of this stamp, whose rubbings coincide perfectly when overlapped, seem to come from the same matrix.

The social status of this individual cannot be determined with certainty since his name is incompletely transmitted (see D.4.7).

The family name Naevius united with the praenomen M’anius is not found in other stamps.

---

49. For the cognomen Stephanus see Setälä, 134 n2; H. Solin, Die griechische Personenennamen in Rom, vol. 3 (Berlin-NewYork 2003) 1267-1272, at 1270.

50. See above, note 30.

51. See above, note 37.

52. For the distribution of the praenomen Manius see Salomies, 35-37, 158, 187. We note here the curious circumstance that Horace, in his Satires, mentions a Naevius (without praenomen). This is doubtless a completely random coincidence, and there are no grounds for positing any relationship between these two individuals; see s.v. Naevius in RE XVI (1935), col. 1558. For an example where it is likely that Horace refers to a historical figure known from Trebula Suffenas, see F. Scarretta, “Una nota di realismo oraziano: Cervius, personaggio della VI satira del II libro,” Atti e Memorie della Società Tibrurtina di Storia e d’Arte 75 (2002) 7-17.
If the figlinae where bricks with the name Naevius were produced are the same as those operating in modern times in the locality called Le Moglie (see D.4.9) and those that were located on the praedium of Horace’s Villa, this could corroborate the hypothesis that Naevius was a late Republican owner of the property at Horace’s Villa, especially considering the fact that the products of M. Naevius were distributed in a very small area.53

The gens Naevia was rather widely distributed in various zones of ancient Italy (see table 3) in which brick production is known, especially in the late Republican and early imperial periods. The most important are situated in the Cispadane region (Emilia Romagna), between Parma, Piacenza, and Veleia (C. Naevi, L. Naevi) and in the area of Latium.54

The production of Rome and its suburbs, already noted by Marini,55 was classified by Dressel in CIL XV (1891) in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naevianae</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naeviorum tegulas</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naeviana</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Naevii were rather widely distributed over various zones of ancient Italy (see table 3) in which brick production is known, especially in the late Republican and early imperial periods. The most important are situated in the Cispadane region (Emilia Romagna), between Parma, Piacenza, and Veleia (C. Naevi, L. Naevi) and in the area of Latium.54

The production of Rome and its suburbs, already noted by Marini,55 was classified by Dressel in CIL XV (1891) in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naevianae</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naeviorum tegulas</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naeviana</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1947, M. E. Blake emphasized the importance of these productions, mainly distributed in the ager Tusculanus and exported to Rome. The tiles of various freedmen of the Naevii extended through the first half of the first century, although some stamps are late Republican or Augustan, to judge by the form of the letters.59

In 1974, E. M. Steinby considered it probable, “even if it could not be demonstrated with certainty,” that the stamps of the Naevii came from the figlinae Naevianae and she attributed the Augustan group of stamps to these.60

Based on the documentation CIL/post-CIL, the stamps belonging to the various productions of the Naevii in the area of Latium can be summarized as is seen on table 4.

Some Caii Naevii (domini or officinatores) have the same cognomina—Alexander, Dama, Demetrius and Philomusus—as people living...
in the same period who are attested on burial inscriptions from Rome. An identification of the first with the latter ones, or at least the existence of family ties, may thus be presumed.

The production of *M(anius) Naevius* seems to be unrelated to that of other members of the family in the nearby area of *Tusculum-Praeneste*.

From a preliminary analysis, based on the published data, the marketing area of these products was the Roman Campagna, from the lower Anio valley to the Alban hills, and this fact suggests that the workshops were in a more or less central position and that the distribution occurred by land. An interesting hypothesis of Felice Grossi Gondi associates this production with the *fundi Naevianus et Calpurnianus* mentioned in an inscription from the villa of Casal Morena in the *ager of Bovillae* (fig. 35). Some still unpublished examples recorded in the central Tiber valley and in the inner Cassia and Flaminia areas suggest a more complex and articulated situation regarding the topographical location of facilities, which includes the territory north of Rome. Indeed, as brick distribution along the river valley occurred downstream, failing further evidence, the place of discovery may become important for the location of kilns.

**POMP-**

*L. Pomp( )*

Owner of a production facility of bricks documented up to now only at Horace’s Villa and in the urban area of *Trebula Suffenas* (Ciciliano). The social status of this individual cannot be determined with certainty because his name is incompletely preserved (see D.4.7).

The family name, rendered in abbreviated fashion, offers various possible supplements, among which *Pomp(eius)* and *Pomp(onius)* are attested at *Trebula* and *Tibur*.

### D.4.7. SOCIAL STATUS, ROLE OF PERSONS AND CONDITION OF OWNERSHIP OF THE WORKSHOPS

The use of the “onomastic formula” in the *instrumentum* does not on the whole correspond to the evolution evidenced in other epigraphic sources; the absence, therefore, of other elements, such as the *cognomen* and the patronymic/name of owner, does


not constitute an indicator of social status and cannot be used as a chronological criterion.

Free men and freedmen, as well as slaves, were employed in the production of bricks, so it is not easy to establish the juridical status of these last on the basis of their gentilicium only.

In the group of stamps in category A, in which just one person is mentioned, it is not possible to establish either the conditions of ownership or possession (dominus or officinatores) of the factories, nor the social class to which the person belonged. It seems highly likely, however, that the one-name onomastic formula in the genitive (praenomen + gentilicium, or gentilicium + cognomen) refers in many cases to the dominus. It is possible, furthermore, that some people are not just freedborn, but that they also belonged to the upper-middle classes and were involved politically in the life of the municipium and the ager, as in the case of C. Biculeius Priscus, owner of a brick facility at Trebula Suffenas, who made the municipium of Tibur the heir of his property.66 The cognomina of Greek origin are normally to be attributed to officinatores. Of particular interest is the presence of a woman, Claudia Epicharis.

In the group of stamps in category B, several persons are mentioned, among whom it is not always possible to establish a clear relationship (e.g., the officinatores produce for the dominus, either as contractor or as employee of the dominus). Note the following examples:

*CIL* XV.129 bears the name of the officinatores (a slave of Domitia Lucilla) + the name of the figlinae Can(inianae) + the generic name of the production (opus doliare) + the verbal form (fecit) and the consular date (=127 A.D.).

*CIL* XV.1033 bears the generic name of the production Op(us) d(oliare) + the name of the officinatores (a slave of Domitia Lucilla minor) + the consular date (=123 A.D.).

*CIL* XV.1210 bears the generic name of production Dol(iare) + the name of the officinatores (C. Cominius Proculus) + the name of the owner of the praedium (*Iulius Stephanus*) and the consular date (=127 A.D.).

*CIL* XV.1211 bears the name of the slave (*Felix Caricus*) of the officinatores (*C. Cominius Proculus*) who actually made the product.

**D.4.8. Chronological Framework**

The chronology of the stamps from “Horace’s Villa” spans the first century B.C. to the second century A.D. (table 2).

Four stamps have consular dating (*CIL* XV.129=Cat. nos. 1-2; *CIL* XV.1033=Cat. no. 8; *CIL* XV.1210=Cat. no. 9). For the others, the chronology must be established by comparison of internal elements, such as the onomastic formula, the palaeography and the shape.67 This is because no precise excavation context is known. Hence, these stamps cannot be associated with dateable masonry structures or other finds, or compared with examples of the same type from dated contexts.

In our present state of knowledge, however, the contribution of palaeographic dating of brickstamps is rather limited; because of a lack of specific studies, it is difficult to attribute the inscriptions to well-defined styles or to reconstruct the evolution of a graphic scheme. However, it is possible to make comparisons between the graphic form on the stamps and that of datable inscriptions on stone, even if these are texts of a profoundly different nature. The palaeographic characters of the earliest stamps find analogies in Republican epigraphy, and with those bearing so-called “big and beautiful” letters typical of the Augustan period. The stamps with consular dating and those with a definite prosopographic reference also allow the graphic forms to be fixed within limited chronological periods.

The diffusion of a particular surname can also help to fix the dating within a brief span of time. For the dating of the stamp of *Claudia Epicharis* between

---

66. *CIL* XV.2380 a-b=XIV.4092. 6-7; *CIL* XIV.3654.

67. The following features suggest a date in the late Republican period: the one-name onomastic formula, the form of some of the gentilicia, the praenomen Manius, and some letter forms (see D.4.5).
the middle of the first century and the beginning of the second century (Nero-Trajan), the key is not the rectangular shape and the simple onomastic formula, which generally persist in city areas in all periods. Rather it is the cognomen of Greek origin, which does not survive long in Latin and Greek onomastics in Rome.68

It is generally considered among scholars that in Rome and in the Tiber valley there was a typological evolution in the shape of the epigraphic design, and that the dating of the semicircular stamps (see N. 890/1, cat. nos. 3-4) should be placed between the reigns of Tiberius and Nero.69 The evidence offered now, however, by comparing three semicircular, horseshoe shaped, stamps from the valley of the Anio, does not confirm this hypothesis (see D.4.9.3).

The chronology of “production” of the brickstamps does not necessarily coincide with that of “use.” Therefore, the limits of the chronological indications supplied by the stamped bricks are borne in mind whenever conclusions or general historical considerations are drawn.70

D.4.9. PRODUCTION AND CIRCULATION OF THE STAMPED BRICKS

D.4.9.1. Market areas

On the basis of the lesser or greater area of diffusion of the products, it is possible to identify a local market, the so-called municipal market. This includes productions of privati domini and smaller figlinae, which were distributed over a limited radius, and which rarely reached Rome. This market is to be distinguished from the wider “urban” market, of Rome and Ostia, the largest centers for the arrival and distribution of goods in the middle Tyrrhenian area in Roman times (fig. 35).71

The brickstamps, for the most part,72 distinguish in a fairly detailed way the commercial activity of

68. H. Solin, Die griechische Personennamen in Rom, vol. 2 (Berlin-New York 2003) 937. The cognomen Epicharis is found 30 times of which about 22 are between the first and second century, five are from the second and third centuries, and only three are between the third and fourth century.

69. Steinby (as n. 38), 19-20.

70. Bricks and tiles are materials that last a long time and have distinct uses. Bricks are used in floors, arches and—mostly in pieces—for masonry facings, while tiles serve as the covering of roofs, even if they are sometimes broken up, trimmed, and reused next to bricks, probably for reasons of economy. The possibility of dating structures by the stamps on bricks or tiles varies, depending on where these materials were used in the floors and walls (as facing), or for roofs. In the latter case it must be remembered that the material is portable, subject to wear, and easily removed and substituted.

71. The interpretation of the archaeological evidence (brickstamps) and of the local premises (raw materials and fuel) necessary for the production of bricks and similar products, together with the study of ancient and modern toponymy, have led E. Stanco and myself to assume that the area of the most important kilns supplying the Roman market was between Orte, Orvieto, Todi and Amelia. Here, all the necessary elements are present: navigable water courses, large quantities of fuel (wood, a very expensive resource but essential for the brick industry), and banks of the raw material—clay—which constitutes the bed of the whole basin of the Tiber. These are sufficient conditions for maintaining that the farther north a certain brickstamp is found, its kiln should be sought nearby. The hypothesis, therefore, that bricks could have gone up the Tiber as ballast in ships or as return cargo is shown to be without foundation; see Filippi and Stanco, 106. Many scholars, however, believe that the ca. 80 imperial-age figlinae doliares, whose whereabouts are not known and which are named on brickstamps from the excavations of Rome and Ostia, were situated in the city or the immediate suburbs.

72. There are, however, some rare examples of brick production limited to the specific needs of a given community, such as the military legions or some inhabited centers. The differentiated production of one dominus could come into this category, part destined for commercialization, and part for secondary private use, such as the construction of a villa on which the figlinae depend. Good examples are: the Villa of Settefinestre in Etruria (cf. D. Manacorda, as n. 2), the Villa of Bruttii Praesentes in the Sabine area (CIL XV.331=IX.4884), and
individuals linked by economic interests at a specific time and place of production; thus, our primary objective is the investigation of the workshops and the contextualization of the stamps with reference to the territory in which these workshops occur.

Previous studies on Rome and Lazio have been complicated by the ambiguity caused by the contrived grouping of the texts gathered in CIL XV, published in 1891. The large number of finds in Rome, resulting from excavations and systematic searching in the second half of the nineteenth century, in comparison with Latium vetus and the surrounding regions, has resulted in the use of the term “urban” opus doliare to indicate not only that the place of finding was in the city, but also that they may have been produced there.

Recently, however, the investigation of the stamped bricks and their topographical distribution in the valley of the Tiber has shown that the greater part of “urban” production took place along the valley at a distance sometimes more than one hundred kilometers north of Rome. The finding of one or more brick stamps in an area further away than any previous finds provided two important results: one, it demonstrated that the market extended at least for a radius as wide as that evidenced by these localities; and two, it enabled scholars to localize some of the factories.73

It must be noted that if the presence of a stamped brick at a particular site is not sufficient on its own to localize the factory, being a product of the “industrial” type with the stamp of an activity aimed at a fairly extensive market,74 the absence of such a brick is not proof of the contrary.

The fact that the brick stamps, which allow the identification of the producer/owner, the place, and/or the period of production, come from known factories gives the inscriptions their importance, both in support of and against accepted theories.75 In some cases the name of the producer/owner corresponds with the dominus of the villa where the brick was found.

The topographical location of the workshops and kilns, therefore, is fundamental for a clearer understanding of the production and the commerce of the bricks, for our knowledge of the gentes active in making them, and for better use of the epigraphical data.

D.4.9.2 Production workshops

As is well known, the brick industry is closely linked to the natural components of the territory (raw materials, watercourses, wood), and to the human resources available (including the economy of the fundi, manpower, industrial and marketing activities, roads, and transport).76 Any villa was, by and large, in a position to produce tiles, for which highly specialized manpower was not necessary; bipedales and dolia, on the other hand, were usually produced in the larger workshops. From an economic point of view, if a piece of land (praedium) was available, even a small one, as long as it had a bed of clay under


73. A new edition, therefore, of the brick stamps of Latium is to be hoped for, with criteria (epigraphical and topographical) different from those of CIL XV, along with new studies on prosopography and economic history in antiquity. This would require various phases of research and study. First, it would be necessary to gather and publish the greatest possible number of brick stamps from a particular region or a fairly extensive piece of territory. The second step would be to combine them in such a way as to find the places of production by means of an interpretative model of the distribution.

74. Since the rules of the market and of commerce in general are multiform and not to be placed into predetermined schemes, it often happens that in a zone where the existence of a Roman kiln is attested, brick stamps of various figlinae are found; for this reason identification and attribution to one of the known figlinae are all the more difficult.


76. Filippi and Stanco, 104-105.
it and a plentiful supply of water, the plant would have no expenses other than wood and manpower.

Since brick products are heavy, transporting them over land could markedly increase their price in comparison with the lower cost and greater speed of water transport. Thus, it has been observed that in the Tiber valley, kilns were generally positioned upstream and near the principal watercourse or one of its subsidiaries, in order to transport the bricks downstream. Downstream river transport was easier than upstream animal haulage, which was very expensive for heavy loads.

D.4.9.3 The Anio River Valley

Natural resources and environment

Clay material adequate for satisfying the demands of a principally local market is available more or less everywhere in the middle Anio valley, from Tivoli to Subiaco, even if in limited quantities. These small deposits were occasionally used by local kilns even up to the beginning of the last century. The abundant forests of the area provided the necessary quantities of fuel for baking the bricks. However, the clay deposits were not sufficiently large to be exploited economically for industrial purposes.

Unlike those in the valley of the Tiber, the clay deposits of the Anio valley are often in logistically difficult areas and are not suitable for high-quantity production and commerce. In fact, the morphology of the territory in the area is characterized by rough and tortuous paths, leading down to the via Valeria, which in Roman times was well maintained, but whose use for the heavy transportation of bricks was expensive. Water transport was not a possibility, because above Tibur, the watercourses, consisting of the Anio and its tributaries, were not navigable because of the small volume of water, which was mostly in the form of torrents.

77. A census of the brick kilns of the district is underway, in which in practically every town there is historical evidence of brick production. From 1900 to 1933, the period in which the railroad operated between Mandela and Subiaco, the transport into the central Anio valley of heavy material (including building material) occurred by train. Until 1950, there were five workshops in existence at Subiaco. One was a little south of the town in Via Monasteri (property Zappalà, today occupied by an electrical box) and four toward Affile in the locality of Canalis (property Caratinozzi). Near Agosta two have been noted, in the locality Strette-Santi’Iorio and Ittiole (property De Angelis). Large facilities have also been noted near the railroad station of Oricola (property of Fratelli Nitoglia).

78. The clays most commonly used for manufacturing tiles, bricks and similar materials are the grey-blue sandy ones, which are found along watercourses. The map of the clay pits “in use” or “abandoned” of B. Campioneschi and F. Nolasco, Le risorse naturali della Regione Lazio 6 (Rome 1980) fig. 36, 1:100.000, does not show any clay pits in our area; the clay pit at Arsoli, however, is mentioned at 335.


80. This led to a certain isolation of the area, also from the economic point of view.
The production of bricks took place, therefore, where there were deposits at hand sufficient for meeting a purely local market. This is shown by the positioning of the kilns, which was linked to the vicinity of the settlement (villa, vicus or castrum).

**Territory and documentary sources**

The geographical area in which “Horace’s Villa” lies is the valley of Licenza (vallis Digestiae, a tributary of the middle Anio valley). Licenza belonged administratively to the territory of Varia, situated between Tibur, Carsoli and Trebula Suffenas, through which passed the via Valeria. Considering the vastness of the area under consideration – the Anio valley from Castel Madama to Subiaco – the number of samples of stamps in relation to the number of unmarked bricks present in the territory seems very small. In fact, there have been very few finds other than those of “Horace’s Villa.” Some of these finds follow.

From S. Maria dei Morti near Marano Equo, on the left bank of the Anio, halfway between Vicovaro and Subiaco, comes a fragment of tile with an unprecedented brickstamp, *C(ai)l AuflIi* (fig. 32). The gentilicium *Aupilus*, which has no precedents locally and originates in the central Italian area, appears in an inscription from Hadria (Atri, Teramo) and in the variants *Aupilii* from Corfinium and *Afilius* from Praeneste, all from the Republican age. The palaeography and the onomastic formula indicate dating to the middle of the first century B.C. The formula is typical of the “one-name” stamps of private producers.

The territory of Anticoli Corrado, from which come some important Latin inscriptions, has yielded the *dolium stamp* *DEFRV*. Nero’s villa in Subiaco has not produced any stamped bricks so far. We also have little knowledge about the brick production in areas adjacent to the one under consideration, with the exception of the *ager Tiburtinus*.

From Trajan’s villa in the upper Anio valley at Arcinazzo, which is outside the territory under consideration but part of the district of Subiaco, products have been found from the age of Trajan also known in Rome, Grottaferrata and the *ager Praenestinus*. From a geographical point of view,

---

81. *CIL XV.357*. The administrative details of Subiaco (Sublagueum) in Roman times are not certain.

82. Subiaco, Museo di S. Scolastica, deposit, box no. 70. Fragment *H* of tile (?), formed of two matching pieces, which measure 24 x 18 x 3 cm: one side still has the original edge, 12.9 cm long.

83. Solin and Salomies, 27. *CIL I.3293* from Hadria; *CIL XIV.3049* = I. 68 add. from Praeneste. M. Buonocore, *Supplementa Italica* 3 (Rome 1987) 172, n39 from Corfinium. See *CIL VIII.25770*. The forms *Auffilemus, Aupilius, Ofilius* and *Ofillius* can be considered other variants of the same gentilicium.


85. Gregori 1999 (as n. 84) 36 n37, transcribes the text DEF.RV and proposes to interpret it with hesitations as *De (filiginis) Ru(fianis) or De (scil. filiginis) F(ari) Ru(fii)*.


In the area of Trebula Suffenas, bordering on our area and very similar from a geomorphological point of view, several brick facilities and two dolium stamps are known.88 Relevant in this regard are the figurinae owned by C. Biculeius Priscus, a member of the ruling class in Tibur.89 Two kilns have also been identified in the territory. The first, identified by C. F. Giuliani about 500 meters to the east of Ponte di S. Cecilia, was attributed by him to the gens Caecilia (as is known, the present-day town of Ciciliano derives from the fundus Caecilianus), whose products reached Castel Madama.90 No stamped products have been found at the second, discovered by F. Sciarretta near the Fontana dell’Acquaone.91

In the territory of Carsioli, CIL IX (1883) records 13 “urban” brickstamps of uncertain provenance, preserved at Arsoli, as well as two local productions.92

The ager Tiburtinus, including Hadrian’s Villa, can be considered a peripheral area for the “urban” brick market. The products found here were used locally but also formed part of the great Tiberine transportation and supply system that provisioned the city of Rome. The area was easily accessible because of particular topographical conditions such as the navigability of the Anio and its direct link with the Tiber, as well as good road connections.

Our stamps, even if quantitatively few, are representative for the research and topographical reconstruction of the kilns of the territory. Since we lack a systematic study of the brickstamps, and because little adequate archaeological research has been conducted, the absence from the territory of a certain product cannot be considered decisive for excluding the possibility that it originated here.

The first Roman kiln in the area was identified by Z. Mari, on the basis of much brick waste, blackish and over-baked, near the confluence of the Roscio stream and the Licenza river, in the locality known as Piani a Otto, a site previously noted by Lugli.93

The stamps of Manius Naevius are of strictly local production, distinct from the contemporaneous products of the Naevii of the areas of Tusculum and Praeneste. Many unstamped lateres, found in the masonry of “Horace’s Villa,” are of an impasto similar to that of the production of Naevius. On the basis of the very limited radius of distribution for

was given by Sandro Gabrieli of Arcinazzo Romano, and comes from the small valley between the villa and the cistern called “Le Peschiere.”

89. See above, note 66.
92. At issue are brickstamps preserved with inscriptions from Rome recorded by H. Stevenson in 1878: CIL IX.6078, 4, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 20, 21, 104, 151, 174, 211=XV.1019a.8, 364.11, 189.2, 842.11, 515a.10, 1229a.12, 282, 283.10, 1244b.24, 1648, 1499, 684.3. To these should be added CIL IX.6 and the twosignacula 6078.197= XV.8220, 6083.6=XV.779
the products, the kiln could have been in the Licenza valley. In this connection, it is worth noting that, at the beginning of the twentieth century, near the spring in the locality known as Le Moglie, very near “Horace’s Villa,” there was a functioning kiln for the production of bricks, in which vitrified waste materials of baking have been found. This kiln (fig. 33) could have been active in antiquity and may have belonged to the same fundus of the nearby Villa of Horace, making it likely that the kiln was prepared and used for the specific needs of one or more owners of the villa.

Another possible production site has been identified on the other side of the valley, near the top of Colle Franco, in the locality known as I Limiti. There a bed of clay is visible on the surface and a large quantity of tiles and coppi (semicircular cover-tiles), concentrated in a very small area, has come to light in the course of agricultural work.

The evidence of three stamps examined in our study helps us to narrow down the chronology of the semicircular form. The production of C. Aufilius, on the basis of onomastic and of palaeographic arguments, takes the use of the horseshoe design back to the Republican age and locates its occurrence outside the area of Rome. Mari’s convincing identification of Erasinus Aug(usti) Libertus, mentioned in the stamp of the Arcinazzo villa, with Trajan’s imperial freedman known from a funerary inscription on the via Appia, demonstrates the continued use of the semicircular form of stamp in the age of Trajan (98-117). On the basis of these considerations, the stamp of L. Braetius should be placed between the first and the early second century A.D.

From the first quarter of the second century A.D., there is evidence at Licenza of a change in the provisioning of bricks. The owner of the property seems no longer to use local products, or the kiln on the grounds of the fundus, but turns to the market supplied by bricks produced at industrial levels like those of Iulius Stephanus and of the Domitii, located in the central Tiber valley. Since these goods came from a distance and would have incurred transport costs, the choice of such a product must have depended on their higher quality and lower price when compared with the local products.

The paucity of the samples available so far does not allow us to establish whether such a purchase of bricks involved only one class of opus doliare, as, for instance, the bipedales, which must have been well manufactured to be used in the brick work, nor whether it was related to a crisis in the local “artisan” workshops as a result of competition from the “industrial” workshops in quality and price.

Certainly, the small local formations of clay were enough to satisfy the local market even in modern times, as is shown, for example, by the brick kiln C(asa) M(assimo) Arsoli, halfway between Vicovaro and Subiaco, set up by Clement X in 1670 and active until the end of the nineteenth century (fig. 34).


95. The stamps of Lucius Braeti and Claudia Epicharis, which are not found elsewhere, also suggest a possible local production. The factory of Lucius Pomp(onius)’, whose products reached Trebula, Sufanas, can be located between the Anio valley and the Empiglione valley; see above, notes 64-65. The stamps of these factories, mainly roof-tiles, were destined to satisfy the demands of the local market, gravitating to centers such as Varia and Trebula.

96. The site was pointed out to me by Sig. Antonio Muzzi of Licenza.


99. See above, notes 37 and 42.

100. Fragment of flat tile, with three sides surviving: cm 16.5 x 14.7 x 2.5. This kiln was at the center of the town and was set up after the plague of 1656.
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D.5. THE ARCHITECTURAL TERRACOTTAS

BY MARIA JOSÉ STRAZZULLA

The fragments of architectonic terracottas found in the excavations of “Horace’s Villa” at Licenza can be traced back to a single model plaque that functioned as a crowning *simā*. Reproduced in several variants, it was characterized by a motif in which palmettes alternated with small columns.

The pieces were mainly found in secondary deposits, in the vicinity of the colonnade of Area 35, to the west of the first pier, between the water channel (*s*) and the northern wall of the *frigidarium* 37-40. They were together with plaques of marble belonging to a phase of production that occurred “after the last quarter of the first century A.D.” (see Camaiani et al., C.5.2.1, activity 18) and therefore have to be considered earlier than this date. Fragment no. 12 was found inside the pool of the *frigidarium* (37), in a stratum of abandonment datable to the early Middle Ages (see Camaiani et al., C.5.5.1, SU 428, activity 42).

Some fragments of *simae* of this sort were also found in the excavations of the villa conducted by Pasqui from 1911-1914. The excavation inventories, found by Frischer (see G.1.12) in the archive of the Archaeological Superintendency of Lazio, register the find of a fragment on land belonging to Angeletti (parcel 1214 in the cadaster) and of six other fragments on land belonging to Caponetti (parcel 1213 in the cadaster), but do not give an exact location for the find-spots (for property lines in the early 1900s, see Frischer, E.4). These fragments were mentioned by Lugli, without notice of the land parcels.\(^1\) Two photographs found by Frischer in the archive of the Archaeological Superintendency of Lazio (SAL 10075-76; see Frischer, G.2.5) give a view of these fragments from the old excavation. This is fortunate, since the fragments themselves are no longer traceable. The photographs reveal that the fragments are characterized by a central motif of rampant panthers at the two sides of a kantharos and by the presence of a stamp MAMAT ISIDOR (M. Amat[jus] Isidor[us]).\(^2\) Since the Caponetti and Angeletti properties correspond to the bath complex, the quadriporticus and the garden, it is possible that the fragments in question were found, like all those from the 1997-2001 excavation, in the bath complex. But it should be stressed that, given the poor documentation of the Pasqui excavations, this is merely a possibility.

Also studied and included in this report are two fragments whose archaeological context is uncertain (even the date of their discovery is unknown); these are presently stored in the Santuario di Ercole Vincitore in Tivoli, where the Archaeological Superintendency of Lazio has its warehouse (see below D.5.1, nos. 9 and 13).

The plaques from the 1997-2001 excavation belong to five different types, distinguishable on the basis of the form of the palmette, of the upper termination, and, especially, on the basis of the central motif with the figure of an Eros, which ends below in shoots.

In all the fragments that have come to light, the lack of attachment holes permits us to exclude the possibility that they functioned as revetment plaques, while the documentation furnished by nos. 7, 8, and 12, which preserve the attachment of the lower-, or base-tile, clarifies that the form was beyond any doubt a *simā*. Such a function remains the most probable for the other fragments as well, where, however, the loss of the lower elements has made it impossible to verify the presence of holes in the bases.

Furthermore, in the case of Type I, the upper termination does not present the customary groove for the insertion of a crowning plaque above, a fact which suggests that the pieces functioned as the terminal decoration of a system of roof sheathing that was rather plain. A fairly close comparandum for this kind of arrangement is offered by the villa of Settefinestre in the territory of Cosa, where plaques analogous to

\(^1\) Lugli, col. 567, nos. 1-4.

those of Licenza (decorated with gorgon protomes, with lionheads alternating with palmettes, and also with a simple motif of palmettes under a denticular cornice) were found, mostly around the basis villae, near the southwest corner of the portico. In the case of Settefinestre, however, the contextual presence of antefixes and the lack, in the plaques, of a joint on the back of the tile have resulted in the reconstruction of a sheathing system that is more articulated. Here the plaques could have been immersed for revetting the architrave, while the slope of the portico’s roof was decorated only with antefixes. In our case the absence of finds relating to antefixes and the secure identification of at least one type of plaque as a sima permit its hypothetical reconstruction as the final element of a roof, most likely of a portico, in which the water drainage occurred on the two ends.

The pattern of palmettes alternating with small columns having a figural motif in the center is a well-known feature of a series of architectural terracottas, mainly simae but also including crowning plaques, whose chronology has been the subject of debate. Distinguished, even if sporadically, by the presence of manufacturers’ stamps directly incised in the mold, in the fundamental publication of von Rohden and Winnefeld, they are considered the predecessors of genuine Campana plaques produced at Rome and dated “to the last half century of the Republic.” However, prosopographical, functional, and compositional considerations led me to propose that the dating of these simae should be radically revised and moved down to the period between the second half of the first and the beginning of the second century A.D. The drastic reduction of figurative themes known earlier in the tradition of architectonic coroplastic corresponds in this period to a structural simplification that limited the use of decorative terracottas to the roof alone.

In recent years new finds have enriched the corpus of plaques that have palmettes and small columns, particularly with regard to the most common type, which has in the center two rampant panthers with thrysos, at the two sides of a kantharos. New pieces of evidence, coming from well-defined contexts and in some cases assignable to fairly precise building phases, appear to offer good confirmation of the hypothesis of the late chronology that I have previously proposed. It will thus not be inopportune to reexamine briefly the data we possess relating to the attestation of the type of sima with palmettes and small columns with a view to verifying their diffusion and chronology.

Besides being attested by numerous examples in collections, the type of plaque with palmettes alternating with small columns has been found in some sporadic discoveries in the territory of Rome and Lazio; rarely, however, are these part of well-defined stratigraphic contexts.

A plaque with rampant panthers and kantharos between palmettes and small columns, with a stamp [MA]AMAT [ISI]DOR, similar to that on one of the fragments from Licenza, was found among the remains of a villa identified in Rome on the Via Trionfale in the locality of Insugherata, together with bricks with stamps of [FLAM]MA/[AN]NI/AE ARES(cusae). It would be extremely interesting to be able to relate this last stamp to a small funerary plaque of a certain Annia Arescusa (CIL VI.4517) found in the second columbarium of Vigna Codini on the Via Appia. The tomb was in use starting from 10 A.D. and in general has been recognized as belonging to the familia of Marcella. Inside the columbarium another find of

4. Tortorella, 226ff.
5. von Rohden and Winnefeld, tables I-II.
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plaque with panthers, palmettes and small columns is attested. On the other hand, it is not so easy to determine the date of M. Amatius Isidorus, whose name is rendered with letters in relief and without margins, analogously to other stamps that are found on Campana plaques. The gentilicium, which was not very common, appears in some inscriptions from Rome pertaining mainly to freedmen, some of whom engaged in artigianal activities; lacking, however, is any connection with the manufacture of opus doliare.

In the context of the city of Rome, a first point of chronological reference arises from the use of a plaque of this type as the front of a small sarcophagus to which the inscription Epaphra puere capsas (rius) (CIL VI.6245) was affixed on a small slab of marble. The sarcophagus comes from the columbarium of the gens Statilia (room N), which was probably abandoned in 53 A.D. as the result of the suicide of the owner, Statiliius Taurus.

Plaques with palmettes and small columns have also been found in the Villa of Livia at Prima Porta. Some of these were reused as material for the subfloor of a pavement in opus sectile in room 3, which the excavators date approximately to the early years of the Julio-Claudian period but after Augustus.

Unpublished examples in the Museo Nazionale Romano come from the Tiber (inv. nos. 15285-15298), from Via S. Stefano Rotundo, from Via Portuense, and from the Catacombs of Domitilla. More important is the presence of this kind of plaque in a group of architectural terracottas related, when it was found, to the aedes Quirini on the Quirinal. The stamp on it, (C. CALPETANUS) FAVOR, offers a secure chronological reference to the Domitianic period, thereby documenting the circulation of the type at the end of the first century A.D.

Other plaques have been found together with sporadic material from a necropolis along the Via Latina at Bovillae; still others have come to light at S. Maria in Galeria, Via Clodia, and Ponte della Bufala, together with Campana plaques of various types. Fragments have been found at a villa in the locality of Monna Felice (Civitavecchia), the context of which is not datable with certainty.

10. von Roden and Winnefeld, 14*.
11. Tortorella, 227-228; Steinby (as n. 2), 190-191.
12. CIL VI.8805, 9405, 11519, 12683, 19871, 22730, 37822; see also Ostia, CIL XIV.44, with two individuals belonging to the corporation of the stipputores. In the second century the gentilicium reappears in Naples, Campania, and Sicily (CIL X.2042, 2043; 1153; 7211).
13. CIL VI.1011; Strazzulla, 412; D. Mancioli, “Sepulcrum: Statilii,” in Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae, vol. IV, ed. E. M. Steinby (Rome 1999) 299; M. L. Cudeli and C. Ricci, Monumentum Familiarum Stipputorium. Un riesame (Rome 1999) 120 n374. We cannot exclude the possibility that (with some confusion of terminology) this is the find to which the following citation refers: “a small sarcophagus in terracotta Museo Kircheriano 1, found in the columbarium near S. Maria Maggiore;” von Roden and Winnefeld, 16*.
16. Tortorella, 228 n21.
17. For the plaques, see G. Manca di Mores, “Terrecotte architettoniche e problemi topografici: contributi all’identificazione del tempio di Quirino sul colle Quirinale,” Annali Facoltà di Lettere Università di Perugia 1, Studi Classici XX, n.s. 6 (1982-83) 357 n39, table XII. This siting of the temple has, however, been recently contested in favor of one on the present Via Quattro Fontane. On the problem, see F. Coarelli, “Quirinus, aedes,” in Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae, vol. IV, ed. E. M. Steinby (Rome 1999) 185-187.
18. Manca di Mores (as n. 17), 347; Strazzulla, 411.
Simae of this type have also appeared in the rich residential contexts of the Alban Hills, including Marino in the so-called Villa of Voconius Pollio and in the Albanum Pompei, the villa considered to have originally been the property of Pompey, which then passed into the imperial fiscus. This villa was the object of a series of phases of remodeling, dated to between the end of the first century B.C. and the end of the first century A.D. The site has yielded both the usual type with palmettes and small columns, as well as a type of crowning plaque on which the palmettes alternate with six-pointed stars.

Outside Lazio, plaques with palmettes and small columns paired with the motif of the panthers and thysoi have been found in the villa excavated on the island of Giannutri. There, they were used to support the dating of one of the building phases to the late Republican period. In reality, the remains of the villa that are currently visible belong to an organic phase of architectural design assignable to the late first or early second century A.D., and there is no reason to suppose that the terracottas found here should be dated to an earlier building phase not otherwise attested.

A more precisely datable piece of evidence comes from Luni, where simae with palmettes and small columns were found in the Casa degli Affreschi and in the zone to the south of the forum (CM III stratum A). The contexts to which the simae belong have been securely assigned on stratigraphical grounds to the period between 50 and 70 A.D.

Finally, the presence of the type in Gallia Cisalpina at Faenza must be noted. Examples have been found in Via Cavour and under Palazzo Costa, where the excavation data appear to indicate a date in the second half of the first century A.D. At Pediano, near Imola, a local variant was found that regularizes and tends to improve the often rather vague design of the terracottas produced in the city of Rome.

In light of these comparanda, the case of Settefinestre can now be revisited. When the examples of the type from Settefinestre were published by M. G. Celuzza in 1985, there was understandable uncertainty about whether to date them to the late Republic on stylistic grounds (following the old theory of von Rohden and Winnefeld), or to put them at the beginning of the second century A.D. as part of the important building phase that affected the villa at this time. We can now resolve Celuzza’s doubts in favor of the latter dating.

In fact, all the plaques with palmettes and small columns—if rather second-rate, from a stylistic point of view—present a revival of motifs appropriated from the earlier repertory of the Hellenistically-inspired Campana plaques. The panthers with the thyros at the sides of a kantharos, the centaurs, and the winged figure riding a panther are all very similar to our examples in the treatment of the small columns and the slender proportions of the figure.


24. Gizzi (as n. 23), figs. 3-4.


30. F. Mancini, G. A. Mansuelli and G. Susini, Imola nell’antichità (Rome 1957) table XVI.

31. Celuzza (as n. 3) 92.

32. von Rohden and Winnefeld, tables I-II.

33. von Rohden and Winnefeld, table II.3.

34. von Rohden and Winnefeld, table II.4.
In particular, the simae of Licenza revive, in a form that is rather tired and cursory, a model present in Campania from late Republican Capua and well known in the Campana plaques from the early Augustan age.

To conclude, it must be noted that, evidently, the simae of this type continued to be used in the early imperial period as functional sheathing elements. They were inexpensive and at the same time showed minimal interest in iconography. It is thus surprising that we encounter the type especially in villas of great prestige such as those at Licenza, Prima Porta, Marino, Giannutri, etc., although it should be remembered that the excavation data for all these sites do not permit us to say with certainty in what sorts of buildings and architectural contexts they were used. Analogous to what is found with some exceptional Campana plaques, the use of our type is not infrequent in funerary contexts such as the columbarium of Vigna Codini or that of the gens Statilia. In the latter case, it appears in the form of a small sarcophagus, where it was doubtless the Dionysiac imagery that was decisive for its adoption.
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Type I

Sima decorated in the center with a nude, winged masculine figure (Eros), set almost in a three-quarter view. The arms, positioned symmetrically, are expanded to support some shoots. The lower limbs are wide apart, probably ending in vegetal shoots that culminated with an elongated flower. The head is slightly turned toward the right and shows hair that is short and wind-swept. To the sides is a motif of palmettes and small columns. The palmettes have seven fronds, of which the central one is rigid and the side ones have coiled leaves turned outward.

The upper termination is composed of a flat fillet, projecting and somewhat irregular (height 2.5 cm); the lower, preserved in two small fragments, also consists of a fillet that is slightly rounded (see nos. 7 and 8).

In contrast with the simae known from elsewhere, the upper rim does not have the usual groove for the crowning plaque. This suggests that the sima also functioned as the terminal decoration.

1) Plaque (crowning sima)

fig. 1

Present width: 73 cm
Present height: 20 cm
Thickness: 2.5 cm
Reconstructed width: 90 cm
Clay: rose-colored with large reddish inclusions, porous (plaques of Rome)
State of preservation: five fragments joined of the upper right part with the central figure of Eros, two pairs of small columns and palmettes to the right and a column-palmette pair to the left
Excavation data: SU 1242, Sector I.7, Area 35; VH 166

2) Plaque (crowning sima)

fig. 2

Present width: 24.5 cm
Present height: 18 cm
Thickness: 2.8 cm
Clay: as above, but with smaller and more regular inclusions
State of preservation: a fragment of the middle part remains with the winged figure, part of the lower shoot and of the right small column
Excavation data: as above; VH 215
Description: same mold as the preceding piece

3) Plaque (crowning sima)

fig. 3
Present width: 13.5 cm
Present height: 16.5 cm
Thickness: 2.6 cm
Clay: as no. 1
State of preservation: a fragment of the edge of the right side, with half the terminal palmette
Excavation data: as above; VH 214
Description: same mold as the preceding piece

4) Plaque (crowning sima)

fig. 4
Present width: 11 cm
Present height: 15 cm
 Thickness: 2.8 cm
Clay: as no. 1
State of preservation: a fragment of the upper part remains with a small column and the coiled leaf of a palmette
Excavation data: as above; VH 216
Description: same mold as the preceding piece

5) Plaque (crowning sima)

fig. 5
Present width: 7 cm
Present height: 5 cm
 Thickness: 2.5 cm
Clay: as above
State of preservation: a small fragment with an everted frond of a palmette
Excavation data: as above; VH 218
Description: same mold as the preceding piece

6) Plaque (crowning sima)

fig. 6
Present width: 5.5 cm
Present height: 8 cm
Thickness: 2.5 cm
Clay: as above
State of preservation: a small fragment remains with traces of an elongated frond of a palmette
Excavation data: as above; VH 219
Description: same mold as the preceding piece

7) Plaque (crowning sima)

fig. 7a
Present width: 8 cm
Present height: 7.3 cm
Tile thickness at the base: 4 cm; thickness of the plaque, 3 cm
Clay: as above, but with smaller and more regular inclusions, some micaceous
State of preservation: the fragment of the lower part remains with the rounded bottom fillet (height 2.5 cm) and part of the the lower shoot belonging to the central figure
Excavation data: as above; VH 220a
Description: same mold as the preceding piece (?)

8) Plaque (crowning sima)

fig. 7b
Present width: 11.5 cm
Present height: 3.5 cm
Thickness: 2.5 cm
Clay: as no. 7
State of preservation: a fragment of the lower part remains with the bottom fillet
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Excavation data: as above; VH 220b
Description: same mold as the preceding piece (?)

Type II

The fragment belongs to a plaque deriving from a mold that was different from that used for all the preceding pieces. The main difference is the form of the palmette, here with nine fronds that extend parallel to each other from a wide, molded base.

9) Plaque (crowning sima)

- Present width: 25 cm
- Present height: 14 cm
- Thickness: 2.8 cm
- Tile depth: 14 cm
- Clay: rose, rather compact
- State of preservation: a fragment with the right end and part of the tile remains
- Excavation data: from archaeological interventions after 1914 and before 1997; preserved at Santuario di Ercole Vincitore, Tivoli, in Cassetta UZ 1990.253, L24

Type III

The upper termination is decorated, not with a fillet, but a motif of wide and rounded dentils above a small cornice with a concave profile.

10) Plaque (crowning sima)

- Present width: 5.6
- Present height: 12
- Thickness: 2.7
- Clay: as above, with small and regular inclusions
- State of preservation: a fragment of the upper part remains, with a rounded dentil and the lower fillet. Below can be seen the pointed termination of the central frond of the palmette
- Excavation data: SU 1242, Sector I.7, Area 35; VH 221

11) Plaque (crowning sima)

- Present width: 5.5 cm
- Present height: 18 cm
- Thickness: 2.5 cm
- Clay: as above, with small and regular inclusions
- State of preservation: a fragment of the upper part remains with traces of the motif of rounded dentils, part of the small cornice with concave profile, and part of three right everted fronds of a palmette
- Excavation data: as above; VH 222
- Description: same mold as the preceding piece

Type IV

The fragment appears to belong to a sima analogous to those of the preceding types, from which it differs in the size of all its decorative elements, which are proportionately larger than those found in the preceding types.

12) Plaque (crowning sima)

- Present width: 11 cm
- Present height: 13 cm
- Thickness: 3 cm
- Clay: rosey, fairly compact, with reddish inclusions of various sizes
- State of preservation: the fragment of the middle part with a palmette remains; the central frond is preserved as are two pairs of everted fronds on the side
- Excavation data: SU 428, Sector I.3 Area 37; VH 013
Type V

A small fragment remains with a small column and part of a palmette to its left, with three rigid and oblique fronds, which grow out of a rectilinear base.

13) Plaque (crowning sima)

- Present width: 11 cm
- Present height: 10 cm
- Thickness: 9 cm
- Clay: rose
- Excavation data: from archaeological interventions after 1914 and before 1997; stored in Santuario di Ercole Vincitore, Tivoli, Cassetta UZ 1990.253, L18

Not Classifiable

14) Sima

- Present width: 9.6 cm
- Present height: 6 cm
- Tile thickness at the base: 2.7 cm
- Clay: yellowish, porous and friable with large reddish inclusions
- State of preservation: a fragment of the base tile remains with the attachment to the plaque above; it is illegible, but its pronounced projection excludes a classification with any of the preceding types
- Excavation data: SU 1242, Sector I.7, Area 35; VH 217
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D.6. MARBLES

BY CLAUDIA ANGELELLI

D.6.1. PARIETAL OPUS SECTILE

The revetment of walls using slabs of marble or other colored stone material (crustae: CIL VI.10237; Sen. Benef. 4.6.2, Dial. 1.6.4, Epist. 86.6; Plin. NH 35.3, 36.48; Ps. Quint. Decl. 9.17), often of varied sorts and arranged so as to form geometric shapes or complex figured motifs, was known as incrustatio in antiquity; this we know from numerous literary sources (Varro Men. 533; Proc. Dig. 8.2.13.1; Paul. Dig. 50.16.79.2) and inscriptions (CIL III.6671, IX.451, XII.935). Today, however, the expression commonly used is ‘parietal opus sectile’.1

The custom of lining walls with slabs of marble, already widespread in the Hellenistic world from the second century B.C. (Plin. NH 36.47), is documented in Rome from at least the first century B.C., as again attested by Pliny (NH 36.48: Primum Romae parietes crusta marmoris operuisset totas domus suae in Caelio monte Cornelius Nepos tradit Mamurram). Since what Pliny writes of here probably took place at the end of the Gallic Wars (51 B.C.), when Mamurra, praefectus fabrum the end of the Gallic Wars (51 B.C.), when Mamurra, praefectus fabrum and friend of Caesar, was very greatly enriched, we may date the introduction to Rome of the technique of parietal revetment in marble to around the middle of the first century B.C.2

This dating seems to be confirmed by a passage in the Menippean satire of Varro, written between 45-43 B.C. (Varro Men. 533). It is in this period, therefore, that panels began to take the place of the painted socles typical of pictorial styles I and II, often executed in imitation of the more costly polychrome marble revetments.

A profound change came about, probably in the Augustan age, with the massive exploitation of marble quarries (above all lunense, but also giallo antico, pavonazzo and africano, which appear abundantly in the great monuments of Rome, such as the Forum of Augustus). It is unfortunately rare to find the most ancient remains of wall revetment in simple slabs, because marble was a readily recyclable material, rarely surviving the sacking that inevitably followed abandonment. However, several extant Augustan monuments (in addition to the Forum of Augustus with the temple of Mars Ultor, mention must also be made of the Temple of Concord) attest the widespread use of marble wall revetment in plain panels during that period, although it was primarily employed for the decoration of monumental public buildings.

The increasing diffusion of marbles between the Augustan and Flavian ages led to the wider use of marble revetments, not just for most walls but also for floors, which had previously been created with other stones or in mixed materials. Probably in this period the use of wall decorations in simple marble slabs became widespread in private homes as well, even in “middle class” houses, as seen in numerous examples in the Vesuvius area (among these note the House of the Relief of Telephus at Herculaneum).3


2. Guidobaldi 1989 (as n. 1) 62.

3. In the same period, beginning with the reign of Claudius, according to Pliny (NH 35.3), another type of wall decoration developed, made with stone or stone-like material, the so-called interraso marmore. This technique, apparently similar to opus sectile, is characterized by an intarsia of marbles and vitreous pastes inserted into a support of slate or other material (usually limestone or white marble), hollowed out purposely to take the crustae. On this subject, see M. Bonanni, “Interaso marmore” (Plin., NH 35.2): esempi della tecnica decorativa ad
Revetments consisting of simple slabs become ever more elaborate from the second century onwards: evidence of this are great monuments such as the Pantheon and, in private architecture, the Villa Adriana at Tivoli. In these examples it is already evident that the panels are better delimited and the internal arrangement is enlivened with geometrical intarsia, or by moldings or simple raised edging.

Simple slabs continued to be used in parietal revetments until late antiquity, but ever more frequently alternating with a type of intarsia with complex motifs. These could be geometrical or with animal and human figurations, in accordance with a taste whose expression reaches its zenith in the last decades of the fourth and the fifth century A.D., with the extraordinary examples of the Basilica of Junius Bassus on the Esquiline and that of the so-called ‘Building outside Porta Marina’ at Ostia. In these, the figured compositions, in arrangements that are also symbolically complex, predominate over the smooth parts or the simple geometric sections.

In the excavation of an ancient building, it is very rare to find in situ marble wall coverings surviving whole. This is chiefly due to the depredations in the periods following the abandonment of the monument, but is sometimes the result of collapse due to factors such as lack of maintenance (bear in mind the weight of the marble slabs themselves, positioned vertically) or to natural disasters (fires, earthquakes, etc.).

It is much more usual, therefore, that the presence of marble wall revetments in an archaeological excavation is documented indirectly or must be reconstructed on the basis of clues. The traces left by the slabs in the mortar in which they were set and the holes of the metal clips used to anchor the slabs to the walls, as well as the numerous fragments and splinters of the slabs themselves, frequently found in the excavated soil, mark the presence of revetment panels. These fragments, however, although sometimes present in the excavated stratigraphies in quantities much greater than other more “canonical” classes of material (such as pottery, metal items, glass, etc.), are on the whole ignored. Even if they are recorded in the publication of an excavation, they are normally included in very broad categories, such as that of ‘non-sculptural marble elements,’ or even more generically as ‘construction materials.’ It is obvious that in this way further study of the overall corpus is hampered; not only is direct information on the decoration lost, but also indirect information on the function and the qualitative level of the rooms.

Such an example is the Villa of Horace. The fragments of small stone crustae—marble and non-marble—presented here are only a minuscule quantity compared with the exceedingly abundant material recovered in the course of Pasqui’s excavations of 1911-14. Those finds, at the moment of excavation (or, rather, of unearthing), were included among the construction materials or mixed up indiscriminately (and then stored) with the simpler architectonic or sculptural elements, together with the shapeless splinters, large slabs, steps, brackets etc.

The only information on these materials is supplied by Lugli, who, in the rapid listing of the finds from the excavations of the villa, also mentions “many crustae of colored marbles for the covering of socles and many fragments of moldings in rosso antico, giallo antico, bardiglio and in various marbles.” Some of this material was put together by Pasqui on four panels and displayed in the old Antiquarium in Licenza, without even a generic mention of their provenance.

Principally for this reason and because of the impossibility of reconstructing the stratigraphies to which they belonged, we have preferred to forego detailed analysis of this material. It has only recently been divided up, classified and stored in some thirty boxes, today held inside the storehouse of the Soprintendenza Archeologica per il Lazio at the Santuario di Ercole Vincitore in Tivoli (fig. 1).

intarsio in età romana,” in Marmi antichi. II. Cave e tecnica di lavorazione, provenienza e distribuzione, ed. P. Pensabene (Rome 1988) (= Studi Miscellanei 31) 259-282.


5. For both, see Becatti 1969 and Guidobaldi, Porta Marina (as n. 1).

In the present study, therefore, only the material coming from the 1997-99 excavation seasons is discussed, with the exception of some fragments of capitals from pilasters and slabs with relief decoration from the excavations of Pasqui, now displayed in the Museum at Licenza (figs. 2-4). These fragments, taken together, lead us to conclude that there was a decorative program of considerable value at the villa.

In the catalogue that follows, all those elements presumed to belong to parietal coverings are analyzed, namely molded slabs or those with relief decoration, pilasters, and moldings, but also simple slabs. This term is taken to cover all the whole or fragmentary marble elements worked simply, in such a way as to have one or more flat faces.7

In addition to specific information about the find-spots,8 the pieces under discussion are supplied with details of measurements (thickness, maximum and minimum dimensions, weight); type of marble (with complete identification in the case of the colored ones, and more generically in the case of the grey and white ones); and relative disposition and treatment of the flat surfaces (principal faces, edges). The dimensions are expressed in centimeters in the case of linear dimensions and are to be taken as indicative, except in the case of the thickness, which is always taken to the nearest millimeter, even for the thinnest crustae. The weight, where measurable,9 is expressed in grams, and taken to the nearest 10 gr, except for the smallest crustae.
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Capitals (Ca)

**Greco scritto**

**Ca-1. Inv. 75230**
Pilaster capital of Corinthian inspiration
Chipped along the edges. Broken on the two upper corners, just above the volutes. Back of the panel polished, edges finished with fine-ended chisel.
Dimensions: 29 x 25.5 x 2.3

**Ca-2. Inv. 75231**
Pilaster capital, of Corinthian inspiration
Whole example, slightly chipped along the edges. Back of the slab polished, borders finished with fine-ended chisel.
Dimensions: 29 x 23-24 x 2.3

**Ca-3. Inv. 62976**
Pilaster capital, of Corinthian inspiration
Example in three fragments, reassembled. Back of the slab polished, borders finished with fine-ended chisel.
Dimensions: 30 x 20 x 1.4

**Grey, medium-grained marble**

**Ca-4. Inv. 62973**
Pilaster capital, of Corinthian inspiration
Whole example, slightly chipped along the edges

---


8. These indications are missing from the lists with reference to examples Ca-1/4 and Lm-12/14, discovered during Pasqui’s excavations 1911-1914, because the exact find spots are unknown.

9. The fragments now housed in the museum have not been weighed, because of the practical difficulties involved in removing them from the supports on which they are displayed.
Back of the panel polished, borders finished with fine-ended chisel.
Dimensions: 29.5 x 20-28 x 2

The examples Ca-1/4, probably to be attributed to the decoration of a single room, unfortunately not identified, were summarily published by Lugli, who included a photograph of them. The same pieces have recently been reexamined, also rather rapidly, by Reggiani.

Analogous capitals, with central calyx and lateral leaves serving as volutes, are attested at Ostia and datable to the last years of the first and the first decades of the second century. There are also rather precise analogies with an example from the Museo Nazionale Romano, datable to the age of Hadrian; in this example, the morphology of the central calyx, which has expanded extremities, is similar to that of the present ones. The type of relief and the structural characteristics are different, however; they are rather more simplified in the Licenza example.

On the basis of analogies, dating to between the last decades of the first and the first years of the second century seems plausible.

Pilasters (Le)
White, fine-grained marble, with greenish veining (Pentelic?)

Le-1. Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7001
Broken on all sides. One face seems to preserve traces of molding. The tool marks are no longer recognizable because of the corrosion of the surface.
Dimensions: 4.4 x 2.2 x 0.7; weight: 20

Le-2. Sector I.3, Area 37, SU 428 fig. 11
Broken on all sides. The surface is molded, with the form of a segment of circle (diameter 4.8) and fillets (width 1), and is polished; the back face (in contact with the wall) is smoothed.
Dimensions: 7.3 x 7.3 x 1.5; weight: 380

Le-3. Sector I.3, Area 37, SU 414
Broken on all sides. Two matching fragments, similar to the preceding ones. Molded polished surface, reverse face smoothed.
Dimensions: 16 x 6.2 x 1.2; weight: 575

Le-4. Sector I.3, Area 37, SU 414
Broken on all sides. Similar to the preceding ones. Surface molded and polished; reverse face smoothed.
Dimensions: 7.4 x 7.2 x 13; weight: 190

Slabs molded and/or with relief decoration (Lm)
White, fine-grained marble

Lm-1. Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 220, VH 019 (figs. 5 and 11)
Broken on two sides. Two flat and smoothed faces, of which the one at the back still shows the raised bit left by the saw cut and traces of the mortar used to fasten the slab to the wall. Upper edge polished, in which there are two holes for metal clips (diameter 0.5 and depth 1.1; diameter 0.7 and depth 2.2). The different dimensions and the closeness of the two holes probably indicate maintenance work on the wall covering, or else reuse of this slab.
Dimensions: 10.8 x 7.6 x 3.6 (max)–1.9 (min); weight: 640

Lm-2. Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 220 (fig. 11)
Broken on four sides. Upper edge polished, one face molded with two cymae reversae and smoothed.
Dimensions: 8 x 3.7 x 2.2; weight: 170
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**Lm-3.** Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 220, VH 019 (figs. 5 and 11)

Broken on four sides. One face flat and smoothed; upper edge with traces of fine-ended chisel (perhaps indicating a reworking of the artifact). The face, molded with fillet and *cyma reversa*, is polished.

Dimensions: 11.6 x 9 x 2.5; weight: 450

**Lm-4.** Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1200 (fig. 11)

Broken on two sides. Two of the original edges remain, both vertical and finished, one with a gradine and the other smoothed. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and decorated with rectangular panelling, bordered with a double molding (fillet, *cyma reversa*). The back face, smoothed, preserves traces of the mortar (grey with volcanic elements in it) used to fasten the slab to the wall.

Dimensions: 11.5 x 10.5 x 2.5; weight: 1830

*White, medium-grained marble*

**Lm-5.** Sector IV.2, Area 23, SU 4201 (fig. 12)

Broken on two sides. Two flat faces, of which one is polished and molded (with fillet and *cyma reversa*) and the other smoothed.

Dimensions: 17.5 x 5.9 x 2.2; weight: 1120

*Greco scritto*

**Lm-6.** Sector I.5, Area 38, SU 822, VH 072 (figs. 6 and 12)

Broken on three sides. A curvilinear border worked with marteline. Two flat faces, of which one is polished and the other smoothed. On the right margin is still visible part of a circular motif, cut with the chisel.

Dimensions: 9.6 x 7.4 x 1.5; weight: 380

**Lm-7.** Sector I.3, Area 37, SU 424, VH 021 (figs. 7 and 12)

Broken on all sides. Two flat faces, of which one is decorated with three curvilinear concentric grooves, and the opposite one is polished.

Dimensions: 10.5 x 6.9 x 1.2; weight: 190

**Lm-8.** “Surface find” (fig. 12)

Broken on all sides, surface very corroded. Two flat faces, of which one is decorated with two straight grooves, of different widths (0.1 and 0.7), and a curvilinear groove (width 0.5); the opposite face is polished.

Dimensions: 9.8 x 5.5 x 2.1; weight: 240

**Lm-9.** Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 285, VH 073 (figs. 8 and 12)

Broken on all sides. Two flat faces, of which one is polished and decorated with a rectangular panel, of which one corner survives, bordered by a molding (fillet and *cyma reversa*). The back face is just rough-hewn.

Dimensions: 10.5 x 9 x 1.8; weight: 285

**Lm-10.** Sector I.3, Area 37, SU 448, VH 069 (figs. 9 and 13)

Broken on all sides. Two flat faces, of which one is polished and decorated with lozenge-shaped concentric panels, bordered by simple grooves of varying widths (0.3–0.7). The back face is just rough-hewn.

Dimensions: 8 x 9.2 x 1.5; weight: 280

**Lm-11.** Sector I.3, Area 37, SU 400 (fig. 13)

Broken on three sides; only a border is left, bevelled and finished with chiselling. Two flat faces, of which one is polished and decorated with straight and parallel grooving; the opposite face is smoothed. Traces of mortar on the decorated surface and the type of workmanship observed on the only surviving border indicate reuse of the slab of which it was a part.

Dimensions: 8.5 x 6.6 x 1.1; weight: 86

**Lm-12.** Inv. 75227

Slab in two fragments, recomposed, broken on all sides. Two flat faces, of which the back one is smoothed and the front one has relief decoration. The decorated area seems to have been divided into metopes (of dimensions which cannot be reconstructed), delimited by an astragal (height 1.1); the only surviving
metope is decorated with two crossed shields and bordered at the bottom with a *pelta*.

Dimensions: 24 x 29 x 1.5

**Lm-13. Inv. 75228**

Slab in two fragments, recomposed, broken on three sides. Only one of the original borders is left, worked with the chisel. Two flat faces, of which the back one is smoothed and the front one has relief decoration. The decorative area, bordered at the bottom with an astragal (height 1.1), is divided into rectangular metopes of various sizes (28.5 x 22.5, 13.5 x 22.5), decorated respectively with a shield and hexagon with inflexed sides.

Dimensions: 52 x 35 x 1.8

**Lm-14. Inv. 75229**

Broken on all sides. One face flat and one moulded, both polished. On the vertical side of the slab, from bottom to top: *cyma recta*, astragal, strip, astragal with *cyma reversa*. Part of a slab molding, decorated with panels.

Dimensions: 20 x 22.5 x 2.1

The examples **Lm-5/14** belong to a typology of parietal revetment panels that was fairly widespread in imperial Roman times, but has not so far been the subject of an overall study. The scarcity of attestations of elements *in situ* or of finds associated with datable stratigraphies has meant that such items have been attributed to a very wide chronological span, ranging from the early imperial age all the way to the paleo-Christian period, as we shall see.

If we analyze the data in our possession in chronological order, we observe that slabs similar to those presented here are still visible *in situ* at Pompeii, in the base of the *lararium* of the House of Caecilius Iucundus. At Ostia, numerous fragments of slabs of *greco scritto* with decoration in rectangular panels and inscribed lozenges with inflexed sides come from the late first century strata of the of the Thermae of the Swimmer. Other examples are known in Rome, in the *domus* over the Sette Sale and at the Villa dei Quintili (unpublished example displayed in the *antiquarium*), at Luni, and at the Villa di S. Vincenzino near Cecina. From these data it seems clear that the artifacts under examination were already widespread at the beginning of the imperial period, perhaps as early as the first half of the first century. Similar dating is also suggested by the marble revetment, so far unpublished, of some public buildings of the forum of Carsulae, in Umbria (consisting of two different series of *bardiglio* slabs with decoration very analogous to those above), whose dating seems no later than the Flavian period.

Another indication of the antiquity of these slabs is their very frequent presence in parietal revetments of late antiquity, where they are clearly recycled. Note, for instance, the *domus* of the Nymphaeum of Ostia, where the fountain is lined with slabs decorated with simple rectangular panels in *greco scritto*, visibly cut and adapted to new use. Also at Ostia, in the Nymphaeum of the Erotes, there is a slab of *greco scritto* decorated with a lozenge, inserted almost as an emblem in the very homogeneous parietal revetment...

---


15. Pensabene, 155 no. 637, interpreted as a pilaster capital.


in white and grey marbles, underneath the apsed niche of the wall at the back.\footnote{Pensabene, 348, fig. 4.}

Numerous whole or fragmentary examples of such artifacts, perfectly analogous to those just described, are found reused in the catacombs and other paleo-Christian buildings. These have been published in various volumes of the Corpus della Scultura Altomedievale.\footnote{Barsanti and Guiglia Guidobaldi, 119-121, tab. I-IV.} They are generally interpreted as \textit{plutei} and dated to the first half of the sixth century on stylistic grounds, on the basis of presumed analogies with the decorative motifs found on the slabs of the presbytery enclosures from Constantinople surviving in many Roman churches, in particular at S. Clemente.\footnote{Broccoli (as n. 22) 213-215, tab. XLIV, n157.}

The proposed chronology can be contested for a number of reasons. First, the moldings that frame the slabs are of classic type, completely different from those found on artifacts of Byzantine provenance or tradition, which have a characteristic band sloping obliquely outwards,\footnote{Melucco Vaccaro (as n. 22) 132-133, tab. XXXIV, XLVI, nos. 81-851.} unknown in Roman architectonic sculpture. The dimensions of the slabs, too, in particular the height (between 25 and 95 cm) and the thickness (mostly of 2-3 cm, but also of 0.5 cm), seem too reduced to belong to \textit{plutei} (see, for a comparison, the dimensions of the series of S. Clemente, of a homogeneous thickness between 5.5 and 7 cm and heights varying between 113.5 and 117 cm).\footnote{Barsanti and Guiglia Guidobaldi, 155-176, figs. 242-251.} Furthermore, some details of the decoration, for instance the \textit{urceus} which appears on a panel from S. Lorenzo fuori le mura,\footnote{The hypothesis would have to be verified by a systematic study of this class of product, which at this point is a desideratum.} or the \textit{peltae} on a fragment from SS. Giovanni e Paolo,\footnote{Assuming that this is the only possible use. A more exhaustive study could, for example, determine which of these panels, if any, have holes for the insertion of clips or other clear indications of their attachment to the wall. Other plausible uses for them (for instance, as round small open wells or skylights: my thanks to F. Guidobaldi for the suggestion) might also be discovered through such investigation.} do not belong to the Byzantine iconographic repertoire, as the authors of the volumes of the Corpus themselves observe. On the other hand, the Byzantine slabs have some decorative elements that are wholly absent in those examined here, in particular the fleur-de-lys endings to the corners of the lozenges and the constant presence of an internal motif.\footnote{The hypothesis would have to be verified by a systematic study of this class of product, which at this point is a desideratum.}

It seems evident at this point that the chronology of the fifth to the sixth century proposed in the Corpus must perhaps be taken as that of the reuse of the pieces. We cannot exclude the possibility, in fact, that the widespread reuse of these slabs in paleo-Christian architectural complexes was in some way encouraged by the contemporary diffusion of the Byzantine slabs, which have in common with ours the taste for the geometric division of the surface and the simplicity of the ornamentation.\footnote{Another issue to be resolved is the use of the slabs with relief decoration in parietal revetment. A more exhaustive study could, for example, determine which of these panels, if any, have holes for the insertion of clips or other clear indications of their attachment to the wall. Other plausible uses for them (for instance, as round small open wells or skylights: my thanks to F. Guidobaldi for the suggestion) might also be discovered through such investigation.}

Another issue to be resolved is the use of the slabs with relief decoration in parietal revetment.\footnote{A more exhaustive study could, for example, determine which of these panels, if any, have holes for the insertion of clips or other clear indications of their attachment to the wall. Other plausible uses for them (for instance, as round small open wells or skylights: my thanks to F. Guidobaldi for the suggestion) might also be discovered through such investigation.}
primary classification seems possible on the basis of the dimensions. Slabs up to 40 cm high, varying in length (cf. for instance our Lm-12/14) and between ca. 1.5 and 2 cm thick (such as Lm-5/14), were probably used as a fascia for dividing horizontally, above the socle,31 or else as a fascia running along the top. The same spatial arrangement survives, much later, in the highly refined decoration in opus sectile of the ‘Building outside Porta Marina’ at Ostia. Here the slabs with incised decoration are substituted by complex marble intarsia, in which the motif of the horizontal band decorated with peltae, lozenges or discs is repeated twice in its entirety.32 Another possible use for slabs of these dimensions is for revetting architraves or jambs (in particular for the fragments with a decoration of rectangles linked together in a series, although this is not attested at Licenza).

Larger slabs (one meter or more in height and 2.2-2.5 cm thick, such as Lm-1/5) may have been used in the lower or central part of the wall. These would be set next to each other (particularly when more complex sculpted architectural elements, such as capitals, are present in addition to the panelling), or they would alternate with pilasters.

Moldings (C)

Bardiglio

C-1. Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 288
Broken on two sides. One face is polished and molded with cyma reversa, the upper and lower bases and the back face are smoothed.
Dimensions: 11 x 3.3 x 2.8-2.4; weight: 220

White fine-grained marble

C-2. Sector VI.1, Area 24, SU 6007
Broken on two sides. One face is molded, with two cymae reversae. The considerable corrosion of the surfaces prevents analysis of the tool marks.
Dimensions: 8.1 x 2.2 x 1.3-2.2 ; weight: 170

C-3. Sector VI.1, Area 24, SU 6007
Broken on two sides. One face is polished and molded with cyma reversa, the upper and lower bases are smoothed. The back face does not survive.
Dimensions: 5 x 3.2 x 2.3; weight: 87

Giallo antico

C-4. Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1242 (fig. 13)
Broken on two sides. The molded face (with two cymae reversae) and the opposite one are polished, the upper and lower bases are smoothed.
Dimensions: 10.7 x 3.2 x 2.8; weight: 380

C-5. Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1242 (fig. 13)
Broken on two sides. The molded face (with two cymae reversae) and the opposite one are polished, the upper and lower bases are smoothed. The back face still has the raised bit left by the saw cut and traces of mortar used to fix the molding to the wall. It is not perpendicular to the lower edge of the molding, but slightly inclined, forming an acute angle with it.
Dimensions: 4.7 x 3.2 x 1.6-2.1; weight: 87

C-6. Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1242 (fig. 13)
Broken on two sides. The molded face (with two cymae reversae) and the upper base are polished, the lower base and the back face are smoothed. This last, which still shows the raised bit left by the saw cut, is not perpendicular to the lower edge of the molding, but slightly inclined, forming an acute angle with it.
Dimensions: 5.2 x 2.6 x 1.9-2.4; weight: 65

C-7. Sector VII.1, Area 25, SU 7001 (fig. 13)
Broken on two sides. All the faces, including the molded one (with two cymae reversae), are smoothed; the back face, furthermore, is not perpendicular to the lower edge of the molding, but slightly inclined, forming an acute angle with it. On the upper edge there is

---

31. Donati (as n. 18) 331-332.
32. Becatti 1969, 95-96, tab. LIII.
a circular hole (diameter 0.45, depth 1.3) for the insertion of a metal clip.
Dimensions: 17.5 x 4.2 x 2.5; weight: 480

Rosso antico

C-8. Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1200 (fig. 13)
Broken on two sides. The molded face (with two cymae reversae) is polished, the upper and lower bases are smoothed. The back face does not survive.
Dimensions: 4.7 x 3.4 x 1.05-2.1; weight: 52

C-9. Sector I.3, Area 37, SU 400 (fig. 13)
Broken on two sides. The molded face (with two cymae reversae) is polished, the upper and lower bases are smoothed. The back face does not survive. On the upper base there is a circular hole (diameter 0.5, depth 1.2) for the insertion of a metal clip.
Dimensions: 5.4 x 2.8 x 1.2-2.1; weight: 72

C-10. Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 200
Broken on two sides. The molded face (with two cymae reversae) and the lower base are smoothed, while the upper one shows traces of being worked with a gradine.
Dimensions: 11.5 x 3 x 4; weight: 420

C-11. Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1220
Broken on two sides. The molded face (with two cymae reversae) and the upper base are polished, the back face and the lower base are smoothed.
Dimensions: 7.5 x 3.5 x 2.9; weight: 170

The moldings, which served to divide the marble revetment into horizontal panels, are always characterized here by the most thorough workmanship; the two bases are smoothed or polished, and the external face molded with fillet and cyma reversa. The back face is generally smoothed but may be just rough-hewn, vertical or slightly oblique (in some cases, even sharply inclined), probably with the intention of helping the layer of mortar behind to adhere better. In some cases (cf. C-5) there is a raised bit, due to the saw cut; this shows clearly that these elements were cut from slabs of great thickness. Among the examples presented here, the moldings in giallo antico (C-4/7) and rosso antico marble (C-8/11) predominate; rarer are those in white marble or bardiglio (C-1/3). It must be emphasized that giallo antico and rosso antico, which are generally the materials most frequently used for making such artifacts, are found in almost canonical association with slabs of white or veined marble, and, respectively, with cipollino or giallo antico, which are also those most often found at “Horace’s villa” (see below).

Fillets (Li)

Palombino

Li-1. Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7001
Broken on two sides: one side is flat and polished. Two edges are ground and slightly bevelled.
Dimensions: 4.5 x 0.4 x 0.6; weight: 12

Giallo antico

Li-2. Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7001
Broken on two sides. Two flat faces, of which one is polished. Two smoothed edges, worked with fine-ended chisel but not ground, slightly bevelled.
Dimensions: 2.3 x 1.5 x 0.9; weight: 26

Li-3, 4. Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7001
Two similar fragments. Broken on two sides. Two flat faces, of which one is polished. Two smoothed edges, worked with fine-ended chisel, but not ground, slightly bevelled. Made from a pre-existing small panel (or fillet), because the visible surface of the panel—indicated by the inclination of the edges—is smoothed, while the reverse is polished.


34. On this, cf. Bruto and Vannicola (as n. 1).
Dimensions: a) 2.2 x 1.4 x 0.6; weight: 18; b) 4.3 x 6.1 x 0.7; weight: 86

Li–5. Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1218
Broken on two sides, two original edges survive, ground and slightly bevelled.
Dimensions: 5.2 x 1.7 x 0.7; weight: 25

Broken on two sides. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished. Edges slightly bevelled and finished with fine-ended chisel. Belongs to a crusta originally triangular or rhomboid in form.
Dimensions: 1.7 x 1.3 x 0.6; weight: 10

Giallo antico

T-2. Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7001 (fig. 14)
Broken on two sides. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished. Edges slightly bevelled and finished with fine-ended chisel. The crusta, irregularly triangular in shape, has one (or possibly two) sides curvilinear in line and a third side approximately straight.
Dimensions: 2.3 x 2.5 x 0.4; weight: 8

T-3. Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7001 (fig. 14)
Irregular edges, which are not enough to determine the overall shape of the crusta. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished. Edges slightly bevelled and finished with fine-ended chisel. Fairly regularly triangular in shape, with two sides slightly inflexed.
Dimensions: 2.9 x 2.6 x 0.35; weight: 7

T-4. Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7001 (fig. 14)
Broken at one end. Two faces flat, of which one is smoothed and one polished. Edges slightly bevelled and finished with fine-ended chisel. The small crusta, irregular in shape, has one straight side, one slightly curvilinear and one sinusoidal.
Dimensions: 3 x 1.2-1.9 x 0.41; weight: 9

It is difficult to determine whether the crustae T-1/4, characterized by their particular shape and extreme thinness (between 0.35 and 0.6), can be attributed to decoration in complex-motif opus sectile or to intarsio marmore. However this may be, the thickness, while not a definitive proof, is an

35. See note 1.
36. It is known that crustae of very elaborate and unusual forms are also found on floors (particularly
important indication for assigning such fragments to parietal decoration.

**Slabs (La)**

**Bardiglio**

**La-1.** Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 231  
Broken on all sides. Two flat faces, of which one is polished and one smoothed.  
Dimensions: 5.9 x 3.5 x 1.2; weight: 40

**Breccia corallina**

**La-2.** Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 231  
Broken on three sides. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one is rough-hewn; the latter still has the raised bit left by the saw cut.  
Dimensions: 9 x 6 x 2.1; weight: 170

**La-3.** Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7001  
Broken on three sides. Two flat faces, with no identifiable tool marks on account of the wear of the surfaces. One edge survives, ground and slightly bevelled.  
Dimensions: 3.2 x 2.5 x 0.4; weight: 20

**Cipollino**

**La-4.** Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1218  
Broken on three sides. Two flat faces, of which one is polished and one smoothed; one edge, worked with marteline and bevelled, survives.  
Dimensions: 4.5 x 8 x 1.5; weight: 170

**La-5.** Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1218  
Broken on two sides. Two flat faces, of which one is polished and one smoothed; two borders, worked with marteline, finished with fine-ended chisel and slightly bevelled, survive.  
Dimensions: 6.1 x 7.6 x 1.1; weight: 150

**La-6.** Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1218  
Three fragments, broken on all sides, belonging to the same slab. Two flat faces, of which one is polished and one smoothed; no original edge survives.  
Dimensions: a) 2.1 x 4 x 1; weight: 70; b) : 5.5 x 4.1 x 1; weight: 80; c) 5.2 x 1.5 x 0.9; weight: 70

**Giallo antico**

**La-7.** Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 231  
Broken on all sides. Two flat faces, of which one is polished and one smoothed.  
Dimensions: 5.5 x 4 x 1.3; weight: 43

**La-8.** Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 288  
Broken on three sides. Two flat faces, of which one is polished and one smoothed. Only one original edge survives, ground and slightly bevelled.  
Dimensions: 3.5 x 1.7 x 0.65; weight: 25

**La-9.** Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7001  
Nine fragments with two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished; no original edges survive.  
Dimensions: 0.45-0.9; weight: 340.

**La-10.** Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1218  
Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished; no edge surviving.  
Dimensions: 3.4 x 2.5 x 0.45; weight: 35

**La-11.** Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1218  
Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished; two original edges survive, worked with chisel and slightly bevelled.  
Dimensions: 1.8 x 3.3 x 0.7; weight: 40
Claudia Angelelli

Greco scritto

La-12. Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1218
Broken on all sides. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished; none of the original edges survive.
Dimensions: 13.5 x 11.5 x 1.6; weight: 430

La-13. Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1218
Broken on all sides. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished; none of the original edges survive.
Dimensions: 4.3 x 2.2 x 1.25; weight: 80

La-14. Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1218
Broken on two sides. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed an the other rough-hewn; two original edges survive, right-angled one to the other, ground and slightly bevelled. Corner of a revetment slab.
Dimensions: 3.9 x 4.8 x 1.1; weight: 90

La-15. Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1218
Broken on all sides. Two flat faces, one of which is smoothed and one rough-hewn; none of the original edges survive.
Dimensions: 3.7 x 4.5 x 1.1; weight: 50

White medium-grained marble

La-16. Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 231
Broken on all sides. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed, with traces of whitewash, and one is polished, with remains of grey-beige mortar containing pozzolana elements.
Dimensions: 9.2 x 6.2 x 1.4; weight: 120

La-17. Sector I.3, Area 37, SU 412 (fig. 14)
Broken on two sides; two original edges survive. One edge is ground, slightly bevelled; the other edge has a regular undulate profile, worked first with marteline and subsequently ground on its upper half, nearer to the exposed face. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished, both with traces of mortar, perhaps indicating reuse of the slab.
Dimensions: 22.4 x 3.8 x 1.7; weight: 340

La-18. Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 231
Broken on three sides, one edge surviving, curvilinear and worked with marteline. Two flat faces, of which one is polished, with conspicuous traces of grey-beige mortar containing pozzolana elements and ferrous oxide sediment (probably due to the presence of fastening clips). The other face, smoothed, has traces of whitewash painted on with a brush (the brush-strokes are evident); in some areas, small patches of violet pigment are present.
Dimensions: 18 x 15 x 1.8; weight: 520

La-19. Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 231
Broken on all sides. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished.
Dimensions: 19.7 x 7 x 1.8; weight: 480

La-20. Sector I.3, Area 37, SU 412
Broken on all sides. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one simply rough-hewn, on which can be seen traces of grey-beige mortar containing pozzolana elements.
Dimensions: 18.5 x 10 x 1.4; weight: 260

La-21. Sector I.3, Area 37, SU 412
Thirty-five fragments belonging to a single slab. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished. Edges worked with marteline and finished with flat-ended chisel, only in the upper half nearest to the exposed face.
Dimensions: max. 16.5 x 15 x 3.3; min. 1 x 1 x 2.5; weight: 3450

La-22. Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 320
Broken on two sides. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished. One original edge survives, ground and slightly bevelled.
Dimensions: 7.5 x 8 x 2.5; weight: 220
La-23. Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 261
Three slab fragments. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one rough-hewn; no edge survives.
Dimensions: a) 4.5 x 4 x 1.9; b) 2.8 x 2.9 x 1; c) 7.2 x 6 x 2.9; weight: 670

La-24. Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 288
Broken on one side. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished. Two original edges survive, of which one is ground and slightly bevelled, and the other is smoothed with fine-ended chisel.
Dimensions: 7.1 x 4.2 x 2; weight: 150

La-25. Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 261
Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one rough-hewn; no edge survives.
Dimensions: 8 x 6.3 x 1.4; weight: 340

La-26. Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 261
Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one rough-hewn. Broken on two sides; only one original edge survives, worked with fine-ended chisel.
Dimensions: 8 x 6.2 x 1.3; weight: 310

La-27. Sector I.3, Area 37, SU 412
Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one rough-hewn; no edge survives.
Dimensions: 14 x 6 x 1.1; weight: 132

La-28. Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 320
Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished. Broken on two sides; two of the original edges survive, of which one is worked with marteline and one is worked with fine-ended chisel.
Dimensions: 12.6 x 9.7 x 2; weight: 310

La-29. Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1218
Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished. Broken on three sides; only one edge survives, worked with marteline and finished with flat-ended chisel.
Dimensions: 5.4 x 4 x 1; weight: 240

La-30. Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1218
Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished. Broken on two sides; two edges, worked with marteline, survive at right angles to each other, on which are visible traces of mortar.
Dimensions: 11.6 x 10 x 1.4; weight: 410

Pavonazzetto

La-31. Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7001
Two fragments belonging to the same slab but not joining. Broken on three sides. Two flat faces of which one is polished and one smoothed. One edge survives, first worked with a marteline and then half-ground, towards the visible face of the slab, to permit better adhesion to the next slab.
Dimensions: a) 8.5 x 6.9 x 0.8; b) 7.3 x 5.8 x 0.8; weight: 360

La-32. Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7001
Broken on all sides; no original edge survives. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished.
Dimensions: 3.4 x 2.3 x 0.7; weight: 19

La-33. Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 320
Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and the other polished. Broken on three sides; only one original edge survives, ground and slightly bevelled.
Dimensions: 9.6 x 5.4 x 1.05; weight: 110

La-34. Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1218
Broken on all sides, no original edge surviving. Two flat faces, of which one is smoothed and one polished.
Dimensions: 5.4 x 3 x 1.6; weight: 120
Portasanta

**La-35.** Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7001

Two flat faces, one of which is polished, with many traces of mortar (perhaps indicating reuse of the fragment) and one is smoothed; no edge survives.

Dimensions: 5 x 5.7 x 1.2; weight: 67

Rosso antico

**La-36.** Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7001

Broken on all sides, no edge surviving. Two flat faces, on which no traces of tool marks can be identified due to the worn condition of the surfaces.

Dimensions: 1.6 x 2.5 x 0.4; weight: 12

D.6.1.2. Conclusions

On the basis of the marble types here present, the principal observation is that the variety is rather limited; there is in fact a prevalence of white or veined marbles (particularly Lunense), grey (bardiglio), and colored of the commonest types (giallo antico, pavonazzetto, cipollino, etc.).

Among the white marbles, fine-grained ones that may come from Carrara, and medium-grained ones, which are on the whole imported from the Aegean-Anatolian area, are especially predominant. Among the latter, fragments characteristic of Proconnesian and Parian marble have been frequently identified as well.

Of the commonest colored types, absolutely the most abundant are the giallo antico, pavonazzetto, and cipollino, which are among those most widespread and most often used in revetments from the earliest years of the empire, and the “greco scritto” marble, with white or grey ground, of the type from Tunisia that was introduced slightly after the beginning of the imperial age. Another marble found at the villa, but not in abundance, is breccia corallina. Surprisingly rare, however, is portasanta, one of the most widespread marbles from the early imperial age onwards.

The complete absence of Egyptian red porphyry and Greek green porphyry (used with a certain lavishness from the last decades of the first century) must be noted, as well as the so-called breccia “verde antico di Tessaglia,” which was exported only from the time of Hadrian onwards, of the “broccatello di Tortosa” and of the “fior di pesco” marbles, which were also mostly used in late imperial times.

As for the working techniques, the slabs are mostly characterized by having one face polished, which was intended to be visible. The opposite face sometimes shows the same treatment; more frequently, it is simply smoothed or left rough, with clear signs of the wire-saw cutting. The marks left by this instrument are easily recognizable: there is a series, more or less serried, of parallel lines, slightly oblique or curvilinear. On some slabs a raised bit, more or less thin, can be seen; this indicates the furthest point reached by the saw. To break off a slab, it was enough to reach 0.5-1 cm from the lower end of the block (2-3 cm for the thicker slabs), in order that the cut part could be separated with relative ease; this would leave a sort of listel with an irregular surface at the base.

Most of the fragments have clean cuts, with edges polished and slightly bevelled; in at least one case an undulate edge was found. The use of undulate joints is certainly not new in Roman architecture: note those of the granite columns of the Pantheon, of the Temple of Venus and Rome or of the Basilica Ulpia, or the columns revetted with marble crustae of irregular undulate shapes, such as found in the Fossa Traiana of Ostia. Examples such as these attest the very high specialization of Roman craftsmen in the cutting and working of these materials. The aim of this technical artifice was to make the join of two differently patterned elements as pleasing to the eye as possible. Such manipulation was often necessary after some technical problem had occurred, such as breaking during transport or mounting, or in those cases in which only reused and/or waste (i.e., not homogeneous) marble was available. Undulate joints in wall or floor revetments, particularly for the joining of slabs of homogeneous colour and type, seems so

---


far to be little documented. They have been found particularly at Brescia, in the floor of the left cell of the Capitolium and at Capua, in the floor of a domus of late antiquity that is largely made up of recycled material. Again at Brescia, they are found in the parietal revetments, still unpublished and under study by the present author, of the Roman theater, probably to be attributed to a decorative phase of the Flavian period, contemporary with that of the Capitolium already mentioned.

Overall, the chronology of the slab fragments we have presented would seem, in synthesis, not to go beyond the middle of the second century and may perhaps be earlier by several decades (i.e., belonging to the Flavian period), given the absence of the inserts of porphyry and the presence of other technical characteristics, such as the typology of the cuts, which are always very clean.

D.6.2. Pavements in opus sectile

Whereas many of the rooms in the so-called Villa of Horace show obvious traces of mosaic pavement, the remains of sectilia pavimenta are quite scarce. As is well known, this kind of flooring came into use as early as the first century B.C., when marble was not yet employed and when the patterns were small. Its use continued until late antiquity with the development of more or less complex decorative patterns and with the employment of various kinds of marble.


42. F. Guidobaldi and A. Guiglia Guidobaldi, Pavimenta Marmorei di Roma dal IV al IX secolo (Venosa 1994) 112-113, table II/I.

D.6.2.1. Pasqui excavations, 1911-1914

In the case of the earlier excavations at the Villa of Horace, the only relevant published notice is given by Lugli, who mentions a fragmentary pavement “with slabs of palombino and white marble, combined in a cross pattern” originating in “atrium A” (i.e., Area 8) and “from room B1,” (i.e., room 7). These were subsequently detached and reintegrated by Pasqui on a panel that was long stored in the Licenza museum.

Following the reorganization and remodeling of the old Antiquarium at Licenza, in the early 1990s, this panel—together with a great deal of other material found in the Villa of Horace—was transferred to the storehouse of the Archaeological Superintendency of Lazio at the Santuario di Ercole Vincitore in Tivoli, where it is found today.

The panel (fig. 10) measures 40.5 cm x 42.0 cm and contains a fragment of pavement in small format, consisting of squared tiles, 14.5 cm per side, set into the pavement with an axis of rotation of 45° in accordance with a design generally denoted Q. Due to the limited space afforded by the panel, only five complete tiles are preserved, of which the central one is palombino and four are made of a fine-grained white marble with blue veining. Each side of the central tile is contiguous to one of the sides of the tiles in white marble.

This ensemble was the original nucleus of the pavement, which repeated the same pattern over most of the surface of the floor. When the panel was created and the tiles were repositioned (set on a bed of plaster), the empty spaces and frame were filled in with eight foreign triangular pieces, of which four are made of a white-veined marble, two of palombino and two of greco scritto. These eight tiles were disposed without respect for what can be assumed to have been the floor’s original pattern.

43. Lugli 1926, col. 577.


The decorative motif of this pavement is the simplest of all known motifs. It is at the very boundary of the definition of the term *opus sectile* as it is commonly understood, since it is made of materials that are essentially the same color.

We do not know whether the pavement has been correctly reintegrated. In any event, such a *sectile* can be easily associated with the checkerboard pattern well known in the late Republic, especially in versions that are not entirely made of marble (e.g., slate and *palombino* in sharp chromatic contrast). Such versions are documented in the famous frescoed *triclinium* of the Villa of the Mysteries77 and in the house of Holconius Rufus in Pompeii. At Rome, it is found in the House of Augustus on the Palatine49 and in the *Domus Pactum eiorum*. At Tivoli, it is found in the *mensa ponderaria*.51

The association of *palombino* with white marble is rather interesting and could furnish evidence for dating the pavement. The presence of marble with non-marble materials in the context of a pavement laid at one time in a single phase sets the date back to somewhere between the Augustan age and the later Julio-Claudian period.52

Also noteworthy is the fact that the association of *palombino* with marbles of soft colors, such as white or dull gray, might seem unusual because of the lack of contrast that results from the juxtaposition of the two materials. But in fact this occurs with some regularity in several pavements datable to the last decades of the first century B.C. and to the first decades of the first century A.D. Among the examples that may be cited, there is a *sectile* from the Caserma di Via Anicia in Rome, with the exact same checkerboard design as the Licenza fragment, mainly executed with white marbles.53 At Ostia, there is the pavement from the *tablinum* of House C of the Casette Repubblicane, with a central rectangle surrounded by triangles of *palombino* and “gray-veined” marble.54 From Herculaneum comes the *sectile* of *tablinum 5* of the Casa dell’Atrio a Mosaico, with hexagons in *palombino* and *pavonazzetto*.55 At Pompeii there are two examples: the pavements (now lost) of *tablinum h* and of the *ala* of the Casa Anonima (R.VI.XV.14), and that of room *h* in the Casa di Cornelio Diadumen. All these floors have hexagons of *palombino* with triangles in *bardiglio*.56

Bernard Frischer, in a personal communication, notes that there is a contradiction about the findspot of the *sectile* fragment from “Horace’s Villa.” As mentioned above, Lugli put the findspot in Areas 7-8. But in Pasqui’s catalogue of the finds (see Frischer, G.1.12), preserved in the archive of the Archaeological Superintendency of Lazio, the same panel (“quadro con campione di pavimento a riquadri di palombino e di marmo bianco combinat a croce,” i.e., “panel with sample of pavement with squares of *palombino* and of white marble combined to form a cross”) is assigned to the property of Caponetti, parcel 1213 in the 1910 cadaster. But parcel 1213 does not overlap the residential part of the site where Areas 7-8 are located (see Frischer, B.1.9). Instead, it corresponds to the quadriporticus, garden and part of the bath complex. Adding to the spatial ambiguity is the fact

46. Guidobaldi 1994, 112.
47. Guidobaldi and Olevano, 228, tables 2 and 3.
49. Guidobaldi 1994, 249, fig. 29.
52. Guidobaldi 1994. See also Guidobaldi and Olevano, 231-234.
53. Guidobaldi 1994, 113 and table M.
55. Guidobaldi and Olevano, 233.
56. Guidobaldi, Trucchi and Olevano (as n. 48), 52, fig. 17.
that, as with all the finds from the Pasqui excavation, we have no information whatsoever about the exact location and depth, let alone the stratigraphic context of the findspot. Nor can we tell whether the fragments were found in situ or not. In other instances where there is a contradiction between Lugli’s report and the documentation of Pasqui’s excavation, it has always turned out that Lugli was in error. In this case, that would exclude the residence as the findspot. Hence all we may safely conclude is that the villa had this flooring somewhere in the bath complex or quadriporticus sometime during the period 30 B.C. to 80 A.D.

D.6.2.2. Excavations 1997-2001

In the recent investigations, the areas excavated have not yielded remains of sectilia pavimenta nor of tile impressions. From the excavated stratigraphy, however, there are several interesting finds worth mentioning, including fragments of palombino tiles whose shape cannot be reconstructed (Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7034) and triangles of slate (Sector I.5, Area 38, SU 834) which, judging from their thickness (1.5 cm to 2.0 cm), belonged to a floor rather than a wall revetment. These fragments might allow us to hypothesize the presence of other opus sectile pavements made entirely or partially of non-marble elements and, presumably, dating between the second quarter of the first century B.C. and the Augustan age.\textsuperscript{57}

Finally, several fragments of triangles of giallo antico (Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1218) and of fine-grained white marble (Sector I.5, Area 38, SU 834) have been found. These are difficult to interpret because the fragmentation does not allow us to identify their type and dimensions and, as a result, their purpose. One cannot, in fact, establish with certainty whether these were used in a lost sectile pavement or whether they were used as inserts in a black and white mosaic such as those present all over the site.

\textsuperscript{57} Guidobaldi and Olevano, 239.
Claudia Angelelli
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D.7. THE “HORACE’S VILLA” DATABASE OF ARCHITECTURAL FRAGMENTS

BY PHILIP STINSON

D.7.1. INTRODUCTION

The primary aim of this project is to record and archive the various architectural fragments that remain on the site of “Horace’s Villa.” These fragments have never been published; most do not have any recorded archaeological context whatsoever, and risk being completely forgotten over time. Secondly, the database and this report aim to assess the significance of the pieces individually and, if possible, to posit hypothetical locations for them in the structure of the residence and its associated outbuildings.

D.7.2. OVERVIEW OF THE OBJECTS IN THE DATABASE

The contents of the database (see volume 2) mainly include architectural fragments stored on the site, but also include fragments on display in the local museum at Licenza and in the Superintendency’s storehouse at the Santuario di Ercole Vincitore in Tivoli—58 pieces in total. The fragments that are currently stored on the grounds of the archaeological park fall into several categories by function and include: door thresholds (11); engaged columns (3); columns (15); capitals (2); cornices (1); drains (1); miscellaneous ashlar blocks (2); and unidentifiable fragments (2). The pieces in the museum at Licenza include: marble Corinthian pilaster capitals (4); marble wall revetment with geometric patterns in relief (3); and one ornate marble coffer or wall plaque. The third group is a selection of previously unpublished material from the Tivoli storehouse; notable pieces are a fragmentary white marble Corinthian capital, small columns of brecciated marble, roof-tiles, marble table legs, and other miscellaneous architectural moldings.

D.7.3. DISCUSSION OF PROVENANCE

The fragments currently located on the site and in the local museum have the highest probability of coming from the structure of the villa and its associated outbuildings. In particular, the marble wall revetments in the museum are similar in material and style to fragments of wall revetments excavated in 1999 (see Angelelli, D.6.1).

Much of the architectonic material located on the site was probably found during the excavation of the large drain of the villa running along the west side of the quadriporticus. As Frischer notes (see E.4), properties 1215a (Foschi Rocco) and 1214 (Angeletti) had a disproportionate share of the finds of architectural fragments, and the large drain runs through these properties. At some point before the Pasqui excavations, the architectural material must have been dumped there in a general cleanup of the site. Therefore, most of the fragments were found out of context.

Furthermore, none of fragments currently on the site are listed in the catalogue created by Pasqui and published by Lugli (see Frischer, G.1.12). Pasqui’s catalogue is organized by find-class (sculpture, pottery, inscriptions, etc.) and by the names of the people on whose property each item was found. The purpose of the list seems mainly to have been to compensate the property owners—hence, a lira value is always given for the items. The fact that most of the fragments that still remain on the site are utilitarian in function—and not marble—probably explains why they do not appear in Pasqui’s original catalogue; they simply had no monetary value to the property owners. But they obviously held little or no value to Pasqui either; otherwise they would have been taken to the old antiquarium in Licenza along with the marble pieces.

The provenance of the fragments from the Tivoli storehouse is solely established through a traditional association with the Pasqui excavations.

D.7.4. THE ARCHITECTURAL FRAGMENTS IN THEIR ARCHITECTURAL CONTEXTS

The fragments stored on the site are difficult to reconstruct in an architectural context (fig. 1). Only the three engaged column fragments (VHA 10, 19 and 36) have any special architectural significance. Tentatively, these fragments belong to columns that were placed at regular intervals along the interior walls surrounding the quadriporticus garden. Their flat sides abutted the shallow protrusions from the
wall that are extant and repeat at regular intervals. These are still visible today along the north and south interior walls of the quadriporticus.

**D.7.5. Photographs and Drawings**

One significant drawing of lost architectural pieces was recently discovered by Frischer and deserves comment here. The pencil on paper drawing resides in the SAR Archives in the Palazzo Altemps in Rome (fig. 2). The drawing is dated May 11, 1911, just three days after Pasqui’s excavations had begun on the 8th. At this time Pasqui’s team was excavating in the area of the so-called vivarium (structure 53). The drawing shows two, possibly three separate pieces. The upper two drawings are two views, a plan and elevation, of a column with one flat side. The note in the middle states, “11 May 1911 - column drum of local stone.” The lower left drawing might be the front elevation of this column, or another element. The two drawings at the top clearly depict an engaged column similar to the three engaged column fragments mentioned above. The section and dimensions nearly match, and therefore it seems reasonable to posit that the work is a legitimate field drawing made by Pasqui’s excavation team working at the villa site; it may have been drawn by his disegnatore, E. Gatti.  

The dimensioned sketch in the lower right corner of the sheet depicts a fragment of a Doric frieze. The triglyph and two guttae are clearly discernible, and half of a rosette carved in relief in the metope is preserved. The fragment can confidently be attributed to a large temple tomb at Colle Prioni, a hill about 2 km to the east of the villa site. It is not surprising to see the drawing on the same sheet with the engaged column from the villa, since we know that Pasqui was sending out teams to survey the ancient monuments of the surrounding area. Many plaster casts of this tomb’s Doric frieze were made by Pasqui’s team and were on display in the local museum until its reorganization in 1993; they are now in the SAL storehouse in Tivoli (fig. 3).

Several photographs of loose architectural fragments in the town exist in the archives of the Superintendency for Lazio. These photographs date to the time of Pasqui. The elements probably come from the monumental tombs in the area (figs. 4 and 5).

**Bibliography**
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1. SAR AS Pal. Altemps, b.18 fasc. 10, fol. 18. May 11, 1911, by E. Gatti (?), probably from the area of structure 53.

2. This information was provided by B. Frischer.

3. For the tomb at Colle Prioni, see Mari 1994, 17-76, at 71, no. 42 and figs. 16 and 17; cf. Lugli 1926, cols. 508-509, fig. 18 and Tav. 1. A similar fragment of a Doric frieze is used as spolia in a wall in Licenza; see Mari 1994, 70, no. 38 and fig. 18. See also the important study of M. Torelli, “Monumenti funerari romani con fregio dorico,” *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 2 (1968) 32-54.

D.8. THE MOSAICS

BY KLAUS WERNER

D.8.1. THE MOSAICS IN THE DESCRIPTIONS OF THE FIRST VISITORS

Since their discovery in the eighteenth century, the mosaics of the so-called Villa of Horace have always aroused a certain interest on the part of scholars, especially because they were the only viewable witness of the villa ascribed to the famous poet before the main excavations of the site by Pasqui, in 1911-1914. Thus it is not surprising that a long list of visitors attests to having seen remains of mosaics, if nothing else, when they came to the site in Licenza.

As early as the eighteenth century, De Chaupy mentioned the presence on the site of tesserae of pasta vitrea, predominantly blue in color, that may have come from a mosaic which probably decorated a wall.1 In the 1997-2001 campaigns, more such tesserae were found. Several small fragments of one or more pasta vitrea mosaics are housed in the Archaeological Superintendency’s storehouse in Tivoli, where there is also a fragment that was recomposed by Pasqui (Inv. SAL 00403250, fig. 1).2

The first time that a mosaic was observed and described in its architectural context was in a treatise of the Scottish painter Allan Ramsay, begun in the 1770s, left unfinished upon Ramsay’s death in 1784, and recently published by B. Frischer.3 The meander-pattern mosaic comes from Room 4, where it is still to be found today. The same mosaic was published by Ramsay’s acquaintance Jacob Philipp Hackert in 1780.4 It became fairly well known in the nineteenth century because Filippo Alessandro Sebastiani recorded it in a description of a trip he took to Licenza in 1828.5

In the nineteenth century two mosaics were reported that no longer exist. The first is a black and white geometric mosaic mentioned in 1819 by Antonio Nibby.6 The second was described in 1834 by Sir William Gell as a monochrome pavement whose border was decorated with animals.7 He is said to have

1. “J’ai dit ailleurs les nombreuses petites pièces de couleur, qui sont les débris des mosaïques, dont tous les entours sont semés, qui marquent que la magnificence de mode touchant les pavés, ne manqua pas dans le Chateau découvert.” (De Chaupy III, 354).
2. The recomposed fragment is noted by Lugli 1926, col. 577 n3.
6. “…il disegno semplice ed elegante si riduce ad una striscia negra leggera, che è la più esterna, seguita da una bianca, alla quale succede un’altra striscia negra, viene quindi una fascia larga bianca, e poi una negra e poi di nuovo una bianca, e finalmente una fascia di triangoli negri in fondo bianco colla quale termina la parte conservata del pavimento. Tutto questo non era che il contorno del riquadro centrale…la esecuzione è fina, e non si direbbe in alcun modo in opposizione colla era augustana.” A. Nibby, Viaggio antiquario nei contorni di Roma III (Rome 1819) 713.
7. “The ruins of this famous villa consist only of a mosaic pavement, and of two capitals and two fragments of Doric columns lying among the bushes….The pavement has been much ruined by the planting of a vineyard, and can only be
identified the animals as griffins. At any rate, like the floor noted by Nibby, this mosaic no longer exists. It was last described in 1912 by Webster Merrifield.

D.8.2. The Mosaics Today: The Difficulties of Analysis

For various reasons discussed by B. Frischer (see B.4.1), the restoration effected by Pasqui was guided more by “political correctness” than by the desire to recover the surviving remains. In several parts of the villa the walls in opus reticulatum are in large part the work of Pasqui’s restorations/recreations (see De Simone, D.1.2). For this reason it is not possible to date the mosaics according to the type of masonry used in the room they decorated. Worse still, the excavations undertaken in the villa prior to 1997 were not stratigraphic, which would at least have permitted a relative dating of the villa and its various phases. Therefore the analysis of the mosaics of the so-called Villa of Horace has to be based primarily on their style and motifs.

Unfortunately, various restorations made in the twentieth century have compromised the original compositions. Moreover, at various times fragments of mosaics have been found, isolated, and removed for storage without any record having been made of their find spot. Finally, some remains of mosaics mentioned by Lugli have completely disappeared both from the site and from the storehouse of the Superintendency. A great part of the following discussion will therefore have to remain tentative.

D.8.3. The Individual Pavements

D.8.3.1. Rooms 1 (Lugli G²), 4 (Lugli G¹), and 11 (Lugli I²)

The mosaics in these rooms are distinguished by their rich geometric decoration. All show signs of good workmanship, using, like all the mosaics, palombino and tufa for the white and black. That the three mosaics are contemporary is suggested both by the style and by the fact that they share the same module of 28 rows per Roman palm.

Room 1

The pavement covers an area that is 5.4 m x 3.5 m (fig. 2). Large parts have been restored in cement, which, however, does not make it impossible to reconstruct the overall design. As Lugli already correctly inferred, we have to do here with the decoration of a cubiculum, divided into two sectors by a strip of black triangles. The first sector is bigger and is based on an orthogonal composition of stars made of eight lozenges (fig. 3), with black ground, forming small squares with a white ground in the middle of the lozenges and on the diagonal. The second, smaller part of the mosaic consists of circles intersecting in such a way as to give the effect of a quatrefoil (fig. 4). Around both parts are borders made of simple black monochrome bands. The division of the two parts is marked by a strip of black triangles laid out apex to base in two series running in opposite directions that meet in the middle, where both bases touch and form a diamond (fig. 5).

8. As noted by Frischer 1991, citing Sebastiani, 395-396 (letter XVIII): “Mi aveva assicurato il sig. cav. Gell gentiluomo inglese, persona di vastissima erudizione, e già nota per le sue produzioni geografiche, che vi aveva rilevato un altro pezzo di mosaico ornato di piccoli grifi, ma o fosse, che il guidatore non lo conoscesse, o che quest’avanzo venisse distrutto, io non fui così fortunato da poterlo vedere.”

9. “…several feet square, of tessellated pavement, composed of alternate insertions of tiny squares of black serpentine and white marble...a handful of the little peg-shaped tesserae, perhaps an eighth of an inch square on the top and half to three-quarters of an inch long. The borders of the mosaic pavement were ornamented by black and white rhombs and triangles, and the tiling of one chamber was composed of a white ground with a border of black animals.” W. Merrifield, “A Visit to Horace’s Sabine Farm,” Classical Journal 8 (1912/13) 31-33.
The pavement pattern with a star formed by eight lozenges with a black ground is first attested in the Republican period. Only in the Augustan age do we find a white ground, and the motif itself becomes more linear in manner. The motif is then taken up again, in its original form with a black ground, from the second half of the second century A.D., but in such a way that the black fields do not have the same value as before. The older examples, of the Second Style, are thus far known from the House of Ceres at Pompeii, with a single star as the central motif of the tablinum, and from the House of the Cryptoporticus, where the motif is used in a pattern of divided fields. In a pavement of the early imperial period, now in the Museo Nazionale Romano, the square fields are lightened with other motifs.

It is important to note that in these examples the motif of the star made of lozenges functions only as the fill of a field—be it the central field or part of a bigger division—but not as a general pattern. This is encountered for the first time on a pavement from Lucus Feroniae, which for various reasons (including historical) is datable between 10 B.C. and 20 A.D., and which has the lozenges on a white ground. A second example, dating to the middle of the first century A.D., comes from Pompeii VII 5.16. Notwithstanding the fact that here, too, the lozenges are still on a black ground, we begin to sense a linearization of the design. This tendency is even stronger in the threshold of the tablinum of the House of L. Caecilius Iucundus, where the lozenges, the resulting squares, and the rhombi inscribed between the lozenges are rendered in a linear manner. The pavement is dated to the last phase of the city. Two pavements from Barcola that date to the third quarter of the first century A.D. continue this tendency toward a linearization of the pattern, though keeping the edges of the squares and of the lozenges filled with black. The original three-dimensional design of the pavement with star lozenges was then completely modified in a pavement from Russi from the beginning of the second century A.D. This mosaic introduces the motif of the braid accompanying—or, better, separating—the lozenges and the squares. Another floor with lozenges filled with black was found at the so-called Porto Fluviale of S. Paolo (Rome), which from its context can be dated into the Hadrianic period. Here, however, the fill is much lighter than what we find in the Republican period. Even lighter, and without fill, is the pavement from the Insula delle Muse at Ostia, datable to the 120s A.D. Finally, one of the floors of the so-called Hospitallia at Hadrian’s Villa near Tivoli presents the design in an extremely linear manner.

The strip of black triangles, which is used here to divide the two parts of Room 1 at Horace’s Villa, is also encountered in the floor of Room 4 for the fill of the swastikas. A simple row of triangles used as a dividing band is, on the other hand, found at Fregene in a pavement of the early imperial period and added

11. For the motif, cf. Blake 1930, 111ff.; Blake 1936, 190ff.; Salies, 26ff., 52-54, 120-127 (Rautensternsystem Ia); Lancha, 139-156; Donderer, 93-95 n33, 35.
13. Pernice, 62, pl. 25,5; De Vos (as n. 12) 57-58 n139.
17. Blake 1930, 64, 124, pl. 18,4; Pernice, 96.
18. Donderer, 93-95, nn33, 35, pl. 31-32.
22. Blake 1936, 80, pl. 11, 2. De Franceschini, 42 nHS8.
to the floor itself, at Aquileia in a floor dating to the second century A.D.\textsuperscript{23}

In the second part of Room 1, the motif of interlinking white circles on a black ground arises from the superimposition of the circles with their centers shifted. It has comparanda from the end of the Republican period to the end of the first century A.D., but the late examples tend to invert the colors.\textsuperscript{24} Similar examples can be found in pavements from Pompeii of the late Second and early Third Styles. In the late Second Style Casa delle Nozze d’Argento at Pompeii, the motif of intersecting circles is used on the pavement of an atrium.\textsuperscript{25} In the strip of one of the rooms around the atrium of the Casa del Citarista, which is probably also an example of the Second Style, we find flowers made of four tesserae inserted in the fields.\textsuperscript{26} The motif is also used on the threshold of the atrium of the Casa dei Gladiatori (late Second or early Third Style),\textsuperscript{27} and, with small squares in concave fields, and with the colors already inverted, on a pavement of the Casa del Marinaio (transition between the Second and Third Styles).\textsuperscript{28} An example from the end of the first century B.C. is found in the Casa di Championnet, where the motif is rotated by 45 degrees, as seen in the Casa delle Nozze d’Argento.\textsuperscript{29} The motif is taken up again in the third quarter of the first century A.D. in a cubiculum at Cividale. Here, too, we have a strip used in a way similar to that found at Licenza.\textsuperscript{30} From the last quarter of the century we have an example from Este, with inverted colors,\textsuperscript{31} and at Altino there is a pavement dating to the late first or early second century A.D. that likewise has inverted colors but also other motifs inserted in the resulting spaces.\textsuperscript{32} Finally, intersecting circles on a black ground are found as the center of a threshold in Ostia which is datable to ca. 130 A.D.\textsuperscript{33}

For the date of the mosaic in Room 1, see below, D.8.3.2.

**Room 4**

The floor of Room 4 (Lugli G\textsuperscript{1}) covers a space that is ca. 8.30 m x 5.40 m (fig. 6). Approximately half has been restored in cement.\textsuperscript{34} The absence of a dividing strip such as is found in Room 1 and the greater size of the room are more appropriate to an atrium than to a cubiculum. The pavement presents the motif of a simple meander with squares (fig. 7), constructed on a black line that is accompanied by a strip of black triangles laid out point to base. The margin is made of a strip of wolves’ teeth, beyond which are two black bands that run around a broad marginal band that is also black (fig. 8).

Whereas in the Republican period the motif of the meander (accompanied by, or consisting of, a series of triangles) is used as a threshold, etc., it is only in the imperial period that the motif is extended over the entire pavement as the basis of the overall

\textsuperscript{23} Fregene: G. Lugli, “Resti di edificio balneare nel campo delle Corse,” Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità (1929) 170, fig. 4 (for the motif of the lozenges in another room, see there fig. 3); Aquileia: Donderer, 48-49 n75, pl. 16.

\textsuperscript{24} For the motif, cf. Blake 1930, 83; S. Charitonidis, L. Kahil and R. Ginouvès, Les mosaïques de la Maison du Ménandre à Mytilène (Bern 1970) 87ff.; Salies, 15, 162-164 (Kreissystem Ilb); Donderer, 124 n13.

\textsuperscript{25} Pernice, 51, pl. 18.2.

\textsuperscript{26} Pernice, 69, pl. 36.6.

\textsuperscript{27} Pernice, 60-61, pl. 24.4. For another example of the use of the threshold, with colors inverted, in the Casa di Trifolomeo, see Blake 1930, 81, pl. 23.1 and Pernice, 82.

\textsuperscript{28} Pernice, 64, pl. 27.5.

\textsuperscript{29} Blake 1930, 109, pl. 24.4; Pernice, 97.

\textsuperscript{30} Donderer, 124 n13, pl. 42.

\textsuperscript{31} Donderer, 140-143, 153 n11, 15, 37, pl. 48-49.

\textsuperscript{32} Donderer, 17 n16, pl. 4.

\textsuperscript{33} Becatti, 123 n221, pl. 29 (Insula delle Pareti Gialle).

\textsuperscript{34} Sebastiani, 395-419 (letter XVIII); Frezzini (as n. 5) 89-90; Berti, 9-10, pl. A; Mazzoleni, 229-230, pl. 6; Lugli 1926, cols. 534-535, figs. 27-28; Blake 1930, 89-90, 106-107, pl. 24.2; H. Stern, “Ateliers de mosaïstes Rhodamens d’époque gallo-romaine,” La mosaïque gréco-romaine. Colloque international pour l’étude de la mosaïque antique, Paris 29 Août - 3 Sept. 1963 (1965) 239, fig. 19; Lancha, 107, 117 fig. 57bis; Salies, 25, 104 nK90; In Sabiniis, plate at the end of the volume.
design. The first example comes from an excavation of Guglielmo Gatti on the Via Aventina (Rome), discovered during the so-called reorganization ("sistemazione") of 1931. The design of meanders and squares accompanied by a strip of black triangles is also found employed here for a small strip opposite the pavement. The confirmation of a dating to the end of the Republican period—already suggested by the masonry in opus quasi reticulatum—came from a second pavement of the same complex that in turn corresponds to the well-known mosaic a cassettoni of the Villa Casali, whose creation in turn is dated to the end of the Republican period. The meander covers the entire pavement only in the tablinum of the House of Livia, discovered in the excavations of Pietro Rosa in 1869, but there it is composed of a strip of white triangles on a black ground, accompanied by a second band made of black rhombi on a white ground. Unfortunately, a pavement in the Casa del Peristilio in Agrigento is inadequately published and is dated only in a broad way to the first century A.D. on the basis of the surrounding structures. Here for the first time we glimpse a linearization of the design; as at Licenza, the meander itself is composed of a simple black line, and the strip of white triangles on a black ground accompanies only this pattern. A similar pavement at Barcola, dated to the third quarter of the first century A.D., uses the motif of a pair of triangles arranged base to apex in place of the simple triangles. They are also white on black. Yet another example comes from the Roman house under the baptistery of S. Giovanni in Florence, dated by the excavator to the first century A.D. This date is confirmed by its style, which is still more linear, with three black bands accompanied by white triangles on a black ground, and by the ‘Stars of David’ that are inscribed in the squares. A similar pavement in the Maison de la Cascade at Utica (in Tunisia) dates to the end of the first or beginning of the second century A.D. Here a wide polychrome marginal band has been added.

The motif of the wolf’s tooth as the border of a central rosette appears for the first time in Republican and late-Republican pavements at Pompeii. Only later, in the first century A.D., did it become common to use the motif as the border of a large pavement. The first example at Rome is a pavement from the Ludus Magnus.

**Room 11**

The pavement in Room 11 (Lugli 1, mistakenly given as G² at Lugli 1926, col. 547 fig. 31) covers an area that is 5.40 m x 2.80 m (fig. 9). Only a part of the northwest corner is preserved (fig. 10); the rest of the floor has been restored in cement. As in the case of Room 1, this room was probably a cubiculum. It is unclear why Lugli could say that “perhaps...

35. For the motif, cf. Donderer, 98-99 n45; Stern (as n. 34), 238-241; Salies, 25-26, 49-50, 74-76, 104-108 (Mäandersystem); Lancha, 105-109.

36. L. Morpurgo, “Casa con mosaici di età repubblicana,” Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità (1935) 248-253, fig. 2-3 (fig. 4 for the second pavement); Lancha, 107, fig. 57ter.


40. Donderer, 98-99 n45, pl. 33.

41. G. Maetzke, Florentia (Rome 1941) 69-72, pl. 12.b. For another mosaic of the same house, see also pl. 112.a; cf. Donderer, 199 n1875 (late Republican or early imperial).


44. Blake 1930, 106-107 (VII 1,20); 107 pl. 23,1 (VII 7.5).

45. Blake 1930, 107, pl. 24,2 (VIII 3,8); 107, pl. 39,2 (VIII 5, 16 & 38); 107 (IX 3,5).


47. Blake 1930, 90; Lugli 1926, col. 536, fig. 31; In Sabinis, pl. B.
because of the use for which the room was destined, its workmanship was rather shoddy." This could be due to Lugli’s confusion of the mosaic’s provenance, since in his text he erroneously assigned it to Room 9 (Lugli G2), which he described as "perhaps just a branch of a corridor." Of course, it is possible that Lugli was not confused but that the mosaic, having been found in Room 9, was erroneously reset in Room 11 after restoration. This, however, is quite unlikely, since the drawing that Lugli published of the mosaic correctly gives it a width of ca. 2.80 meters, a size that could not fit into the narrow corridor between Room 1 and Room 4.

The decoration of this pavement is made of a network of monochrome strips in black tesserae set obliquely, with white squares in the points of intersection. The border consists of a simple black band.

This motif, too, begins as a fill in a threshold or a field. It is used as the decoration of an entire pavement only in the imperial period. The first example of the motif comes from the entrance threshold of Pompeii VIII 2.3 (Third Style), where the bichromy is inverted, and the center of each rhombus is decorated with a quatrefoil. In the Casa del Poeta Tragico (Pompeii), the motif occurs as a smaller part of a larger orthogonal scheme. Inside the rhombi are inscribed swastikas or ivy leaves. The floor is dated to the middle of the first century A.D. In the Casa del Centenario (Pompeii), the motif is found on a threshold; in the resulting fields are inscribed squares and rhombi. The floor dates to the first century A.D. (Third-Fourth Style?).

As a pattern extended over the entire pavement—and not simply as the insert within a field—the motif had been known thus far only from the example at the so-called Ponte di Caligola (Palatine, Rome), datable to the Domitianic period. Afterwards, it is quite common in the Hadrianic age, found, for example, in one of the rooms of the so-called Hospitalia of the Villa Adriana; at Ostia, in the porticus of the Insula delle Muse, dated to 130 A.D.; and in the Insula delle Volte Dipinte, dated to ca. 120 A.D., with concave inserts in the rhombi.

D.8.3.2. New dating of the pavements of Rooms 1, 4, and 11 to the second half of the first century A.D.

As Blake and Salies have recognized, all three pavements are of the same manufacture and were created at the same time and thus cannot be dated separately. Blake attempts to retain the traditional “Horatian” dating for the group, although she certainly recognized the difficulties and reported that Miss Van Deman dated the reticulate structures in which the mosaics are located to a period later than Horace’s. It should by now be clear that the mosaics of Rooms 1, 4, and 11 cannot be dated earlier than the second half of the first century A.D. In favor of this new dating, which can loosely be called “Flavian” (with the understanding that the actual date may be anywhere in the period ranging from Claudius to Trajan), the following arguments can be adduced:

1. The motif of the star made of lozenges, which is found in Room 1, is found for the first time as the pattern of an entire pavement only at Lucus Feroniae (10/20 A.D.), where the ground of the corners is already white. The reprise of the dark ground (as in the first Republican examples) is encountered only starting from the middle of the first century A.D.

2. The motif of the meander with a band of triangles is found as a pattern structuring a full room only in the early imperial period in the pavement (to be sure greatly damaged) of the House of Livia. Here, however, we catch a

48. Lugli 1926, col. 536.
49. Lugli 1926, col. 547, fig. 3.
50. For the motif, cf. Morricone Matini 1967, 73-74 n69; Salies, 3-4, 109-114 (Bandkreuzgeflochte lb).
51. Blake 1930, 109, pl. 28,4; Pernice, 100-101.
52. Blake 1930, 110-111, pl. 27,4.
53. Blake 1930, 102; Pernice, 44, pl. 13,4.
54. Blake 1930, 102, pl. 47; Morricone Matini 1967, 73-74 n69, fig.29, pl. H3.3.15.
55. De Franceschini, 43-44 nHS10.
56. Becatti, 130 n257, pl. 33.
57. Becatti, 101-102 n183, pl. 33. Cf. also an example from the Insula di Bacco Fanciullo: Becatti, 16 n14, pl. 32 (128/138A.D.).
60. Cf. Salies, 26-27 (period of Claudius/Nero).
glimpse of the three dimensional feature that is typical of the Republican mosaics, which is still retained by means of a second band of rhombi and squares. The kind of linearization of the pattern such as is found at Licenza is seen only in later examples, e.g., in a pavement from Agrigento of the first century A.D.

3. Finally, the motif of Room 11 is first encountered as the decorative pattern of an entire room only in the so-called Ponte di Caligola, which dates to the age of Domitian. Thus at Licenza we do not have to do with precious “Horatian”-era mosaics but rather with pavements in every way typical of the second half of the first century A.D., when several Republican motifs had been transformed into proper organizational patterns and when certain features of the Republican mosaics (e.g., the black ground) had been taken up again in a classicizing manner.

D.8.3.3. The second “Flavian” group: Rooms 16, 17, 26, and 27

Another large group of pavements, which were apparently executed at the same time, are the mosaics to be found in Rooms 16, 17, 26, and 27. This conclusion is also supported by a technical observation: all the mosaics have a module of 18 lines on the Roman palm (22.4 cm).

Room 16: Intersecting diagonals (“Rautengitter”)

The pavement of Room 16 (Lugli C') covered a room that was ca. 5.30 m x 3.90 m in size (fig. 11). There are some modern restorations in cement. Once again, Lugli confused the numeration of the rooms. He speaks of “other crude mosaics with black and white bands, dating to after Horace, which are found in rooms I² (Room 11) and C¹ (Room 16), this last probably a medieval work of the Convento di S. Pietro.” Lugli clearly neglected to check his written report against observations made at the site.

The motif of intersecting diagonal lines found in Room 16 is composed of a rhomboid network in black on a white ground, framed by two simple monochrome black bands (fig. 12). Such patterns are often found from the Sullan period to the early Augustan age, and were revived in the second century A.D. in the time of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius.63

One of the earliest examples comes from the House of the Griffins on the Palatine, which dates to the Sullan period. Here the network is accompanied by a border in red, white, and black.64 Other examples come from the contemporary Republican ‘Domus under S. Pietro in Vincoli’;65 from Barcola, where a late-Republican or early Augustan mosaic has the rare feature of using squares instead of rhombi;66 from Cremona, where the pattern of the network has a meander as its frame, which is partly rendered in color and where the floor itself is dated to ca. the third quarter of the first century B.C.;67 from Imola, with a so-called wolf’s tooth border;68 from Reggio Emilia, with a meander as border and a late-Republican date;69 from San Severino Marche (undated);70 and from a house in Solunto (Second Style).71 There are also many examples from Pompeii, including the Casa del Labirinto (Second Style);72 one of the cubicula of

63. For the motif, cf. Donderer, 82-83 n10.
64. Morricone Matini 1967, 26-27 n12, fig. 9, pl. D.3.
66. Donderer, 87 n21, pl. 30.
67. Donderer, 131-132, n9, pl. 45.
the Casa delle Nozze d’Argento (late Second Style); the Casa dell’Ancora (Second Style); the entrance of VIII 2.16 (Second Style); and a cubiculum in the house VIII 2.34 (Third Style).

In the Hadrianic period there was a revival of the motif, as is attested, for example, in the decoration of one of the rooms of the so-called Hospitalia of the Villa Adriana. A mosaic from the the ‘Domus under the Baths of Caracalla’ dates to the end of the second century A.D. Here, one of the two lines of the networking runs parallel to one of the walls. A small white tessera denotes the point where the lines cross. Finally, from late antiquity we have at least one further example: a fourth century A.D. pavement, with typical large tesserae, from the ‘Domus under S. Teodoro’.

Room 17

Only a fraction of the floor of Room 17 (Lugli C2, C3) is preserved: a small piece of white mosaic found near the wall on the south side (fig. 13). This suffices, however, to establish a correspondence in technique between this pavement and those of the nearby rooms to the west (Rooms 26 [Lugli C4] and 27 [Lugli α]) and to the south (Room 16). The fragment in Room 17 is in urgent need of conservation before it totally disappears. For the date, see below under Room 27.

Room 26

The pavement of Room 26 (Lugli C4), which, like the following Room 27 (Lugli α), sits atop earlier structures, was not published by Lugli. Only the southern part of a much bigger room was found and preserved. The exact dimensions of the room are not known. The pavement has been heavily restored in cement. The remaining mosaic has a white ground and is decorated with a simple pattern of rows of black crosses of four tesserae diagonally arranged (fig. 14). Two black monochrome bands function as a border. The motif of black crosses on a white ground is attested from the late Republican period until the second century A.D. The examples begin with a pavement in the Casa dei Griffi, on the Palatine, which dates to the Sullan period, and another Republican example comes from the ‘Domus under S. Pietro in Vincoli’. A late Republican example is known from the house on the Palatine flanking the Scalae Caci found by Carettoni. From the last third of the first century B.C. comes a pavement from Brescia, and from the last quarter an example from Este. The Pompeian floors with this motif are generally later, dating to the first half of the first century A.D. Some examples from the last third of the first century A.D. were discovered in Brescia, to which can be added the pavement of the corridor of the so-called Hospitalia of the Villa Adriana.

73. Pernice, 51, pl. 17,1.
74. Pernice, 78, pl. 35,1.
75. Pernice, 76, pl. 33,3.
76. Pernice, 75, pl. 32,3.
77. Blake 1936, 81.201, pl. 14,3; De Franceschini, 46-47 nHS17.
78. F. Castagnoli, “Documenti di scavi eseguiti in Roma negli anni 1860-70,” Bulletino Comunale 73 (1949/50) 172, fig. 33.

80. For the motif, cf. Blake 1930, 85; Pernice, 140-141; Morrione Matini 1967, 25; Donderer, 83-84 n11 and 140 n10.
81. Morrione Matini 1967, 14-15 n9, pl. 2 and 28 n14, pl. 4.C.2.
82. Colini (as n. 65), 13, fig. 10-12.
84. Donderer, 110 nn32-33.
85. Donderer, 140 n10.
86. Blake 1930, 77, 115, 119-120, pl. 33,1; Pernice, 103-104 (Pompeii VIII 5.16 and 38); Pernice, 115 (VIII 2.20).
87. Donderer, 110 nn32-33.
88. Blake 1936, 80, pl. 9,1. S. Aurigemma, Villa Adriana (1961) 177, fig. 182. De Franceschini, 33-34 nHS1.
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Room 27

The room (Lugli α) measures 3.10 m x 2.60 m, and the pavement has been heavily restored with cement. The mosaic reverses what is seen in Room 26. Here we find a black ground with crosses made of four white tesserae. A simple white band makes up the border (fig. 15).

The pattern of white crosses made of four tesserae on a black ground is known from the late Republic to the second century A.D. One of the earliest examples, from Barcola, dates to the late Republican or Augustan period. Two pavements from Cremona can also be dated to the first century B.C. A similar floor from Val Catena dates to the late first century A.D., whereas two other examples from Aquileia date to the early second century A.D. The collapse of the building it decorated dates a mosaic from Trieste to sometime before the middle of the second century A.D. Another floor from Padova can only be broadly dated to the second century.

D.8.3.4. Dating of Rooms 16, 17, 26, 27

Given that Rooms 26 and 27 are clearly the result of a later building activity, which changed the original organization of the spaces they occupy, the entire group of pavements from Rooms 16, 17, 26, and 27 can only be ascribed to the end of the first or to the beginning of the second century A.D., when some motifs (particularly the networking pattern of Room 16) were revived. A dating this late is also in accordance with the presence of two versions of the same motif, that of the crosses, in rooms 26 and 27.

D.8.3.5. Mosaics in the Bath Complex area (Rooms 37, 40, 41 and 42)

Room 37

This area (not known to Lugli, since it was first excavated in 1997-99) is the apsidal basin of the frigidarium consisting of Rooms 37-40. Only small parts of the mosaic floor of the basin are preserved—just the areas in contact with the original marble revetment of the side walls (fig. 16). The individual tesserae of this simple white pavement have been set in an irregular manner. They are relatively small; there are 22-25 lines per Roman palm. The nature of this kind of floor resists a stylistic dating, which can in any case be determined for the basin itself from the stratigraphic excavations of 1997-99 (see Camaiani et al., C.5.2, activities 6 and 9). It may be postulated that the floor might have been laid independently of the other surviving pavements, since its workmanship is not otherwise encountered in the villa.

Room 40

In the case of Room 40 (incompletely known to Lugli, who labels it and the neighboring room 39 as γ) we have a mosaic with tesserae that are bigger than normal (13-14 lines per Roman palm) and in which are inserted, in regular rows, white marble chips that are triangular in shape. The border was formed of two white bands. Only two sections of the mosaic are preserved along the southern wall (figs. 17-18).

Mosaics with inserts of marble fragments on a black ground are found on floors dating to the first centuries B.C. and A.D. Regularized chips appear only at the end of the Second Style, and their arrangement

89. Donderer, 83-84 n11, pl. 29.
90. Donderer, 128 n2; 132 n15.
91. Donderer, 209-210 n5.
92. Donderer, 52 n84; 60 n103.
in a regular pattern is also encountered only in the Second Style. Irregular chips are found at the end of the second century B.C. in the so-called Casette Repubblicane at Ostia; in the structures found in the foundations of the Domus Augustana from the end of the second or beginning of the first century B.C., in the Republican 'Domus under S. Pudenziana', in the Casa dei Grifi of the Sullan period, and finally in the House of Livia dated to the early Augustan age. Chips of marble together with pottery fragments are seen in a pavement in Barcola from the late Republican period or the early Augustan age. Set with some regularity, these irregularly shaped chips are also found in the Republican late Second Style remains under the Ludus Magnus. The same situation occurred in Pompeii; the chips were at first set in an irregular way, and then in a regular way during the Third Style. At Pompeii, however, we lack examples of a regular organization of the pattern. This indeed appears to have occurred only in the late first century A.D., for example on a pavement from Val Bandon.

As for the date of the example from Horace’s Villa, the large size of the tesserae is not a dating element. Tessera size is known to depend on room function, and mosaics with tesserae of different sizes in the

95. For the motif, cf. Blake 1930, 60-66; Pernice, 133-134, 142; Donderer, 176 n1.
96. Becatti, 19 n22, pl. 4.
97. Morricone Matini 1967, 16 n7, pl. 2.B.
98. A. Pettrignani, La basilica di S. Pudenziana in Roma (Rome 1934) 24, fig. 7.
100. Morricone Matini 1967, 57 n55, pl. 13.
101. Donderer, 78 n5.
102. Colini and Cozza (as n. 46) 51, fig. 71.
103. Villa dei Misteri: Blake 1930, 53, pl. 11,1; Pernice, 134, pl. 21,3. Cf. Blake 1930, 61, pl. 11,3 (Insula Occidentale 13), pl. 13,2 (VII 7.5) and pl. 13,4 (VI 6.3); 65 pl. 13,3 (VI 9.5), pl. 13,1 (VI 13.16), pl. 14,1 (VIII 2.1), pl. 14,3 (VIII 2.29) and Pernice, 54-55, pl. 20,2 (VII 2.20).
104. Blake 1930, 60, pl. 18,2-3 (Pompeii VII 1.40); 61, pl. 18,1 (IX 8.6); 64, pl. 14,2 (V 1.26). Cf. Pernice, 134.
105. Donderer, 203 n10, pl. 59.

same house can date from the same time. On the other hand, the regular setting of the marble chips does appear to be a reliable dating element, suggesting that the Licenza mosaic falls into the first century A.D.

Room 41

This rooms measures 5.90 m x 2.01 m and was not known to Lugli. A small trace of a mosaic with two simple black bands can now be seen (fig. 19). The rest of the surface of the room has been restored in cement. The tesserae are rather small, measuring 20-21 lines per Roman palm.

Room 42

This room, 2.40 m x 2.50 m in size, was also not known to Lugli. The ancient remains consist of a simple white mosaic with 16-17 lines per Roman palm (fig. 20). The tesserae are accordingly of average fineness.

D.8.3.6. Mosaics in the storehouse of the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio in the Santuario di Ercole Vincitore, Tivoli

Some of the mosaics found at Licenza were removed for restoration and were stored first in the museum in the Orsini Palace in Licenza and then in the storehouse of the Archaeological Superintendency in Tivoli.

Mosaic with stars. Rooms 14-15 (?)

Lugli reported in passing a “panel with mosaic having black starry polygons on a white ground,” which he said came from Room H. On his plan, there is no such room, but he may have meant rooms 14 and 15, which he denotes as H¹ and H² respectively. The location of this mosaic today is uncertain.

Mosaic with stripes

Doubtful, too, is the provenance of another mosaic fragment that has been assembled and mounted on a panel (fig. 21). It has rather crude parallel stripes of white and black. Lugli explains that “other crude mosaics with black and white bands, from a period after Horace, are found in rooms I² and C¹, this last

probably a medieval production of the convent of S. Pietro.”

But later he states that the provenance of the mosaic was “predominantly [sic] from rooms C1 and C2.” The mosaic of Room 11 (Lugli I) is the pavement described above (D.8.3.1) with a network of monochrome strips in black tesserae set obliquely, with white squares in the points of intersection. The border is made up of a simple black band. It is true that only a small fragment of this survives, but what we have is incompatible in style and design with the framed fragment in Tivoli. The floor of C1 (Room 16) also survives, and it is largely intact. The framed fragment in Tivoli cannot be from this room either. As noted above, from C2 (Room 17) we have only a small fragment of a white mosaic, but given the fact that this mosaic belongs to the group consisting of Rooms 16, 17, 26, and 27, we may doubt that the framed fragment in Tivoli comes from C2. The provenance of the material assembled on the panel in Tivoli thus remains unclear.

If the find spot is doubtful, then so, too, is the date. There is a complete lack of comparanda from the corpus of Roman mosaics of the imperial period. We might think of a late date, given Lugli’s suggestion that it was created in the time of the hypothetical medieval convent of S. Pietro; however, even for so late a date we lack supporting evidence and comparanda. Nor does the fact that the tesserae themselves are of good craftsmanship favor a late date, unless we imagine the reuse of the tesserae of an earlier floor.

Fragments of wall mosaics in pasta vitrea

Tesserae of pasta vitrea (glazed tesserae) are found on another panel in the storehouse in Tivoli. Here again, Lugli does not furnish a provenance and indeed states that they have “various provenances.” The panel has a blue ground decorated with circles made of glazed tesserae that are black, light blue and green in which have been inserted concave stars of six points made of light blue glaze. In the resulting spaces are found small crosses composed of five orange tesserae (fig. 1). The lack of curvature, which, to be sure, might have been lost during the fragment’s reassembly on the panel, excludes an original location in a niche or vault. It ought rather to have decorated a wall surface, but for the existence and position of such a decoration somewhere in the villa we lack any clues.

Similar fragments which are much smaller were found on the site in the early 1970s. They may perhaps have belonged to the same original location as the large fragment on the panel in the SAL storehouse. Some of the materials are similar (glazed tesserae in blue, light blue, and green) but we also find seashells, as well as tesserae in dark blue, light green, yellow, ochre, white, and red (fig. 22). The only recognizable designs have a floral pattern. These fragments were found in a vaguely identified “thermal room” to the north of the frigidarium, but probably not in situ. The excavators indeed preferred the idea that the fragments had simply been deposited here and that they came from another room that was much more ornate and thus suitable for such a decoration. In any case, their colors—especially the blue—and the presence of seashells favor a location in the bath complex of the villa. Their surface, too, is flat and thus does not permit a reconstruction on a curved object like a vault or niche. This is another sign that they belong with the larger fragment reconstructed by Pasqui on the panel now in the storehouse in Tivoli.

This lack of good archaeological context forces us, once again, to give only a general date, which in this case is to the late first or early second century A.D. Comparanda are found at Pompeii in the Casa di Giulia Felice and in the Stabian Baths, which, moreover, are the first known examples of wall mosaics applied in

107. Lugli 1926, col. 536.


109. They have nothing in common with either the diagonal colored bands of pavement executed in the fifth century in Syria (P. Donceel-Voute, Les pavements des églises byzantines de Syrie et du Liban [Louvain 1988] 159-167, figs. 133 and 135), or the zigzag lines of the pavements of the church of S. Giovanni Evangelista at Ravenna, especially those from the crusade of 1213 (R. Olivieri Farioli, “I mosaici pavimentali della chiesa di S. Giovanni Evangelista in Ravenna,” Felix Ravenna 1 (1970) 169-222, figs. 29, 32, 36).


111. F. B. Sear, Roman Wall and Vault Mosaics (Berlin 1977) 108 n94, pl. 44.4.
bath complexes. Very similar fragments come from the baths at Aquileia as well.\textsuperscript{112}

Finally, mention should be made of six small fragments of black and white mosaic of good quality and of various provenances. In them we can recognize several geometric decorative patterns, but it is not possible to be certain of their original location in the villa, their design, and whether any might have belonged to the same pavement.

\textsuperscript{112} Sear (as n. 111), 26, 94 n67, pl. 39,1 (Casa di Giulia Felice); 94-95 n69, pl. 37,2 (Terme di Stabia); 100 n82, pl. 44,1.3 (Aquileia).
D.8. THE MOSAICS
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D.9. FRAGMENTS OF WALL PAINTING FROM “HORACE’S VILLA”

BY STEPHEN T. MOLS

D.9.1. BACKGROUND

During the 1998 and 1999 campaigns of the recent excavations at Horace’s Villa in Licenza, many fragments of wall painting were found. With one notable exception, all of them were found in destruction contexts and not in their original location. The purpose of this chapter is to publish the new fragments and to relate them to the fragments found in the excavations undertaken from 1911 to 1914 by Angelo Pasqui. As will be seen, the importance of the new excavations is that they throw much needed light on the material discovered earlier in the twentieth century.

D.9.2. FRESCO FRAGMENTS FOUND FROM 1911 TO 1914

The Pasqui excavations of 1911-14 brought to light a large number of fresco fragments, which were subsequently mounted on 38 square panels and put into the Antiquarium in the Orsini Palace in Licenza. In the early 1990s, these were divided into two groups: a larger group of twenty-eight panels was installed in the new museum in Licenza (fig. 1); a smaller group of the remaining panels was put in the storehouse of the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio at the Santuario di Ercole Vincitore, in Tivoli (fig. 2).

The scholarship on the frescoes found in 1911-14 is not extensive. In his publication of Pasqui’s results, Lugli’s treatment is purely descriptive. He assigns the fragments to the same period on the basis of style, but he does not assign a date, probably in no small measure owing to the alleged lack of documentation on find-spots, which made it impossible to associate the fragments with an architectural context. But, as Frischer shows (see E.4 and G.1.12), Pasqui’s unpublished catalogues of the finds securely locates the find-spot to the “grande Calidario” (i.e., room 33). Room 33 is dated by De Simone to her Period III (D.1.3.7) and by Frischer (see F) to his corresponding Period IIA of ca. 75/110 A.D.

M. Borda, in his brief comments on this material, agreed with Lugli but assigned a date in the late first century or early second century A.D. In equally brief statements reported by B. Frischer, V. Strocka and I. Bragantini agreed with Borda. In the most detailed study of the Pasqui fragments to date, R. Cappelli divided them into two groups: a smaller group datable to the early Augustan period; and a larger group assignable to the period of the Fourth Pompeian Style. It is our contention, however, that Lugli, Borda, Strocka, and Bragantini were correct: the fragments are stylistically and chronologically homogeneous and belong to the period of ca. 60-110 A.D. Since, as Frischer notes (E.4 and F), we know nothing about the context in which the fragments were found in room 33, we cannot securely narrow down this potential time frame to a specific moment. If, as Cappelli has rightly noted, two groups can be distinguished, it is indicative not of a difference in date but of craftsmanship; the fragments in Cappelli’s

---

2. SAL Inv. nos. 75-233 through 75-254 and 75-295 through 75-300.
4. On the find spots, Lugli could only write vaguely: “[the fragments] appartengono a più ambienti” (col. 568); cf. also col. 461: “mi duole di non poter pubblicare alcuna nota personale del Pasqui sulla villa. Non resta infatti che il Giornale degli Scavi, compilato più per uso amministrativo che scientifico e con varie lacune, dovute al fatto che il Pasqui prese molti appunti per suo conto, i quali alla sua morte non si sono più ritrovati, né in ufficio, né in famiglia. Certamente è questa una grave perdita, che rende mutila la storia dello scavo e che mi ha lasciato più volte perplesso se condurre a termine, o meno, il lavoro.”
5. M. Borda, La pittura romana (Milan 1958) 90, 266.
6. Frischer, 83.
7. Cappelli, 117-162.
Examples of early Second Style paintings with grotesque figures, variants of the grotesque figures in Herculaneum acroteria differ from the late Second Style griffins in that they are very slender and have long legs. They are much more closely related to Fourth Style examples. Moreover, in the blue triclinium or oecus of the Casa dell’Atrio a Mosaico in Herculaneum they appear as acroteria, together with acroteria in the form of half naked and half monstrous grotesque figures, variants of the grotesque figures in the Licenza paintings. In their high quality, these paintings from Herculaneum are also comparable to the Licenza examples. As Cappelli states, it is true that grotesque figures do appear in Second Style paintings. However, they rarely occur as acroteria, but are mostly seen in separate frames, as in the Casa di Livia in Rome. As acroteria they appear frequently in Fourth Style paintings, and it is therefore in this period of Roman wall painting that we must place the Licenza examples.

To the helpful comparisons Cappelli gives for the paintings from Licenza that she dates in the Flavian period, we can add recently published and sometimes strikingly similar examples from the Villa San Marco at Castellammare. As for the dating of the Licenza examples in the light of these comparanda (and, especially, in view of the examples from Castellammare), two hypotheses are possible: either (1) the Licenza paintings date to roughly the same period (i.e., the 70s-80s of the Flavian age); or else (2) the Licenza paintings are earlier, dating to the period 60-69, in which case they could be cited as further examples of the way in which Campania lagged behind the Rome area in the development of the Fourth Style.


The new excavations are interesting to scholars of Roman wall painting for several reasons. For the first time we have information about find contexts for fresco fragments from Horace’s Villa. The motifs in the newly discovered fragments are in many cases the same as those found earlier, so the new finds can suggest something about the context of the 1911-14 fragments. Moreover, the fact that the new fragments were found through stratigraphic excavation has given us information that helps to resolve the debate about periodization of the frescoes from Horace’s Villa. The new fragments are discussed in order of the area in which they were found.

D.9.3.1. Area 23

In 1998, three pieces of wall painting still in situ were found very close to each other in Area 23 (Sector IV.1) not far from the foot of the western...
D.9. Fragments of Wall Painting from “Horace’s Villa”

staircase leading from the western corridor of the quadriporticus to the residence (fig. 4). These three fragments are exceptional in that they are the only bits of wall painting still in their original location in the villa. The surface of the three fragments is painted with red ground without any design. The find spot is interesting: they are on a wall in opus incertum (SMU 4007) at a quota level below the floor constructed in connection with the installation of the long drain (SU 4015; for details see De Simone et al., C.4.3). This drain runs from the residential fountain of Area 8 to the main drain of the villa, which runs north-south just to the west of the quadriporticus. These fresco fragments were preserved because they were tightly packed by the material brought in to raise the surface for the new floor above the drain. The fragments thus belong to the first phase of the wall in Area 23, a phase the excavators date to no later than the first century B.C.

Also found in Area 23, farther south along the corridor, were eleven groups of fragments that fitted together. They come from a single context (Sector IV.2, SU 4208; see figs. 5 and 6) and were found face down, broken into fragments that can easily be joined. There is, however, almost no sign of any decoration left, probably because of the acidity of the soil. The fragments have a creamy white ground color and are all remarkably thin. They lack the preparatory layer, which makes it impossible to determine whether they come from the ceiling or the walls of the corridor in which they were found. A precise dating, too, is difficult, but the thinness of the plaster points to a date in the second or even third century A.D.

D.9.3.2. Areas 37-40

Areas 37-40 (Sector I.3-6) are architecturally related and thus will be treated together here. The fresco fragments can be divided into two groups: a large collection of mostly monochrome fragments reused as fill to raise the floor level in Area 38; and some randomly found fragments with decorative patterns.

Group I. Five cassettes full of fresco fragments were collected from Area 38 (SU 860). The fragments are small; most have a monochrome red surface, but some are in monochrome yellow. The few decorated pieces are seen in fig. 7. Some have chord lines, impressed in the chalk while it was still wet. Curls and vegetal elements in white and cream are also seen, some of which have white lines. The pieces with both red and yellow have a white dividing line. One fragment shows the depiction of a ceiling coffer.

The wear seen on the surface indicates that the fragments were reused in antiquity, and the excavators indeed interpret SU 860 as a fill layer designed to raise the level of the floor in Area 38 (see Camaiani et al., C.5.2.1, activity 5, dated to the late first or early second century A.D.). This gives us a terminus ante quem for the fresco of ca. 70/110 A.D. On grounds of style, we would assign these fragments to a somewhat earlier date than the other Fourth Style paintings from Horace’s Villa. Most probable is a date in the period 60-75 A.D., although it should be emphasized that we still have no definite original context. Possibly the frescoes may have decorated the walls of Areas 38-40, which before activity 5 was a single atrium-like space (see Camaiani et al., C.5.1). Certainly, the raising of the level of the floor of the room and its repurposing as the frigidarium of a bath complex would have necessitated a new treatment of the walls, and the earlier plaster may have been stripped off both to make way for new plaster on the walls and for use as floor fill in the same room.

Group II. A second group consists of random fresco fragments with decorations that were found throughout Areas 37-40. From Area 37 (SU 411) come two fragments of a garland in red, black, and
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cream on a white surface (fig. 8). The black flowers were painted quickly as a point above a V-form with curved sides; they resemble similar ones found in the 1911-14 excavations. Another fragment with white ground, from the same location, shows a stylized flower in dark red, ochre, and cream, which originates at the point of a wavy band (fig. 9). Three examples of a similar motif from the 1911-14 excavations have been published by Cappelli. Other examples are to be found on a panel in the storehouse in the Santuario di Ercole Vincitore in Tivoli.

In Area 38, two fragments from the same decorative program were found. They show very worn remains of green, yellow, and red paint. One of the pieces is slightly angled, not flat, which may indicate that it joined with the projecting stucco molding on the wall.

Sixteen pieces come from Area 39. They have yellow and violet plant motifs on a red surface, a palmette, and part of a garland (fig. 10). Nothing similar was found from 1911 to 1914, but in concept and design they clearly belong to the same period as the fragments found in Pasqui’s excavations.

Not strictly speaking fresco fragments, but of interest to students of Roman wall painting nonetheless, are two color balls, one in blue and one in brown, from Areas 38 and 40 (fig. 11). They are probably unused pigments used in painting frescoes.

D.9.3.3. Area 35

Most of the fragments with painted decoration found in 1998-99 came from Area 35 (Sector I.7), the colonnade running north-south to the west of the baths. Seven fragments of painted stucco relief (SU 1242), with alternating volutes and palmettes colored in red and black, come from the same decorative program as a group of fragments published by Cappelli. From the same deposit come two fragments with a yellow background and traces of white stucco, as well as a piece with flesh-pink that probably belonged to the representation of the nude legs of a person (fig. 12). These almost certainly belong to the decorative program present in many finds of the 1911-14 excavations in which we see the figures of poets and philosophers in the center of yellow panels. Finally, there are three fragments with parallel lines in red, black, and yellow, black and white.

SU 1242 is a rich context that also contains fragments of marbles and of decorative terracotta plaques. The excavators interpret it as a fill connected with raising and leveling of the surface (see Camaiani et al., C.5.2.1, activity 18) immediately prior to the construction of the colonnade in Area 35 (activity 21). The fragments from Area 35, found in a floor fill, were no longer in their original context. Nevertheless, the new information gleaned from the campaigns of 1998 and 1999 offers useful confirmation of the find spot of a number of Pasqui fragments, including fragments on panels 75-234, 75-235, 75-237, 75-238, 75-249, 75-250, and 75-297. As noted above, these (along with all the other fragments, for which the 1998-1999 excavations did not happen to bring to light any parallels) were reportedly found in room 33 of the baths (see Frischer, E.4).

SU 1239, which the excavators link closely in date and function to SU 1242, yielded three fragments decorated with a red line and a parallel band. Also found here was a fragment (fig. 13) with the same embroidery pattern as is seen on a piece published by Cappelli; the only difference is that the new fragment is a mirror image of the old one.

SU 1220 produced five white-ground fragments. One shows a column in yellow. The other four show floral motifs and lines. One fragment may have a wing decoration. A comparable wing is seen on a piece from SU 1225. This SU (also associated with
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15. Cf. Cappelli, fig. 24 O.

16. Cappelli, fig. 29, top row; SAL inv. no. 75-239 in the Licenza museum. Note that the flowers are not peacock feathers, as Cappelli describes them (145).

17. Cappelli, fig. 24 R; Licenza museum, SAL inv. no. 75-297.

18. Cappelli, 124-133, figs. 5-9 and 12. Cf. Licenza museum, SAL inv. nos. 75-234, 75-235, 75-237, 75-238, 75-249, and 75-250.

19. Cappelli, 147 and n38; fig. 24 P. Other finds by Pasqui, embedded on panel, SAL inv. no. 75-300 in the Licenza museum, as well as two panels in the storehouse in Tivoli show the motif running in both directions.
the construction phase of the colonnade in Area 35) includes other fragments with floral motifs on a yellow ground (fig. 14).

Fragments from SU 1213 have architectonic elements on a white surface within parallel lines and small bands. The sequence of colors is as follows: white, dark red line, yellow band with protrusions, green line, red band, dark red line, and white. A few pieces join and show a roughly painted aedicula. An architectonic motif, not easily recognizable given the poor state of preservation, is also seen on a fragment from SU 1200. The same layer has yielded a fragment with a white plant on a black surface. It has traces of pink, red, yellow, and blue.

D.9.4. CONCLUSION

Most of the fresco fragments found at Horace’s Villa in the excavations of 1911-14 and of 1998-99 have their best parallels in Fourth Style paintings of the early Flavian period (i.e., before A.D. 79). This includes the fragments dated to the Augustan period by Cappelli. The material from SU 860 (Area 38) also exemplifies the Fourth Style but is somewhat older than the rest of the material studied. It is possible that the fragments found in the quadriporticus were part of a redecoration of the walls in the second or third century A.D.

The new finds help us to understand the provenance in the villa of the fresco fragments brought to light in 1911-14. As noted, no record of their exact find-spot appears in Lugli’s publication of 1926. Frischer discovered in an unpublished document of the 1911-14 excavations that they had been found in room 33. At least, now we know that several motifs found on fragments from the 1911-14 excavations are similar to those coming from definite find-spots in the 1998-99 group (table 1). As this table shows, the bulk of the finds of 1998-1999 that are similar to those found in 1911-1914 come from Area 35, which is just to the west of room 33.

This data can be interpreted in one of two ways: either the 1911-14 finds were from the same location as the corresponding finds of 1998-99; or (since the 1998-99 material is all found in secondary contexts) some, if not all, of the 1911-14 material may have come from the primary ancient context. Unfortunately, it is impossible to decide this matter without new documentation about the 1911-14 excavations.

Thus far the villa has not yielded any fragment of decorated wall or ceiling fresco painting dating to the period in which Horace lived. But as already noted, not everything at the Licenza site postdates Horace: in area 23 were found three fragments of simple red ground fresco on an opus incertum wall that the excavators report is datable to the first century B.C.

20. Cappelli, 152.
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D.10. **MINIATURE MARBLE SCULPTURES**

**BY STEVEN LATTIMORE**

The three unpublished works of sculpture briefly presented here were discovered in 1998, during the course of excavations conducted at Horace’s Villa under the direction of Bernard Frischer. Their context was an early medieval robber pit within the Villa’s frigidarium, which has been dated to the Flavian period (figs. 1-2; for the context, see Camaiani et al., C.5.4.1, activity 37).¹

**D.10.1. YOUTHFUL MALE TORSO**

VH 041 = SAL 114580 (figs. 3-7)

Maximum preserved height 41.5 cm, width across shoulders 20 cm, distance from the elbow of the right arm to the tip of the middle finger 18 cm, width across hips 14 cm, width of neck at base 7 cm. Shiny crystalline white marble tinged with gray: certainly Greek, probably Thasian.²

The head is broken off irregularly close to the base of the neck. The left arm (maximum preserved thickness 5.8 cm), extending straight down from the shoulder, ends midway to the elbow in a somewhat irregular surface with gouging to receive cement; it has two holes whose diameters are 0.6 cm (towards the front) and 0.5 cm. The right leg ends at the top of the knee in a flat surface (maximum preserved width 5.8 cm) with gouging to receive cement; at the center is an iron dowel (thickness 0.8 cm). The supporting left leg is broken irregularly across the knee; the broken surface contains a projecting iron dowel. The right arm, intact but with a small crack in the upper arm, is bent at the shoulder and extends downward diagonally across the chest; there is a right-angle bend at the elbow, and the right hand rests flat on the left shoulder. On the left side, there is no trace of the attachment of the left arm or anything else. Near the top of the left hip, however, is a hole (diameter ca 0.8 cm) with the remains of an iron dowel. The penis, now missing, was a separate piece inserted into a hole 0.6 cm in diameter. The separation of the arms from the torso is cursory, as is the separation of the legs. The preserved hand is very flat, its fingers formless. The abdomen is round and protruding. The modeling of the back is very cursory, with the spine barely indicated.

The figure stood approximately 60 cm in height. The undeveloped musculature and protruding belly, accentuated by the deep curvature of the spine, show that the male figure is at most adolescent. The position of the right arm suggests the type of adolescent or pre-adolescent Eros, standing partly supported by a reversed torch, usually at his left side.³ This Eros apparently comes at or near the end of a sequence beginning with the creation of the reclining sleeping Eros in the Praxitelean circle of the 330s B.C.;⁴ the standing sleeping Eros may have developed almost as early.⁵ Neither type was exclusively or even primarily funerary, but in the Roman period the reversed torch was added to the standing type, now not invariably sleeping.⁶ Despite the skepticism of Hermany, the
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1. I am grateful to my colleague Professor Frischer for the opportunity to study and publish these sculptures; for his advice, including his invaluable advance work as evinced by the notes he furnished; and for the most congenial arrangements he made for my stay at Tivoli, August 6-8, 2000. I am also indebted to his collaborators Dr. Claudia Angelelli and Dr. Monica De Simone, for much additional help and advice. Finally, I have greatly benefited from discussing the sculptures with Professors Miranda Marvin and John Pollini.

2. The plausible suggestion of Dr. Claudia Angelelli. On Thasian marble, see Hermann, 73-100.


4. Söldner, 120-127 (Turin Eros); 351-361 (survey of the iconography of Eros).

5. Söldner, 323. An early example is the terracotta in Copenhagen: see N. Breitenstein, Catalogue of Terracottas, Cypriote, Greek, Etrusco-Italian, Roman (Copenhagen 1941) 52, no. 466, pl. 58; Hermany et al., no. 216.

6. Söldner, 445 n443. An early example is the terracotta in the Louvre: Hermany et al., no. 989.
reversed torch is usually a symbol of extinguished life.\textsuperscript{7} The funerary Eros \textit{par excellence}, the Eros with reversed torch is especially popular in Italy, although examples also occur in Greece.\textsuperscript{5}

The Eros with reversed torch, like its predecessors, usually turns to the left, as does the Licenza statuette (although not enough of the neck is preserved to indicate the direction the head was turned). The legs are usually crossed, but our copy is one of a considerable number of exceptions, since the left leg is the supporting one. Most examples are winged, but again there are exceptions, including free-standing figures;\textsuperscript{6} the Licenza statuette shows no trace of wings.

The most anomalous feature of the Licenza figure is the missing torch. Two similar statues, the Eros from \textit{Herculaneum} and another in Budapest (\textit{figs. 8-11}),\textsuperscript{10} show that the torch was not close to the left side,\textsuperscript{11} as is usual in reliefs, but some distance away, connected by a massive strut. The dowel at the top of the left hip of the Licenza statuette, unlike the others, does not seem readily explained in terms of ancient repairs and may be part of a very unusual way of connecting the attribute. It is also possible that the figure was an adaptation of the funerary Eros (e.g., for the decoration of a house or garden)\textsuperscript{12} and did not follow the usual format. In a personal communication, Frischer has noted that the closest parallel for the position of the right hand does not belong to a funerary Eros but to a bronze bust of Mars in Munich.\textsuperscript{13} It is also possible that the figure was carved as an Eros and later reworked.

The use of Thasian marble (if rightly identified here) in Italy (if the statuette was made there) might date to any period from the late Hellenistic onward.\textsuperscript{14} I can suggest no stylistic or iconographical criteria for a closer dating.

\textbf{D.10.2. NUDE FEMALE TORSO}

\textit{VH 042 = SAL 114578 (figs. 12-15)}

Maximum preserved height 37.5 cm, maximum width across hips 14.8 cm, maximum thickness (at hips) 11 cm.

Shiny crystalline white marble tinged with gray; certainly Greek, probably Thasian.\textsuperscript{15}

The head is broken off at the base of the neck. The right arm is almost completely broken off; the left is broken off along with part of the torso. Both legs are broken off at same level above the knees. The breasts are almost completely broken away. The buttocks are damaged, especially the right. A hairline crack starting just right of the neck forms a complete loop, passing under the right armpit. The surface is much abraded and the breaks at the neck and right arm are extremely worn. The work is very cursory. The torso is narrow with almost parallel sides, resulting in a tubular appearance. The swelling of the hips is

\begin{itemize}
\item The torch was also a later addition to the reclining type; see A. Dierichs, “Eros in Münster – Antike oder Neuzeit?,” \textit{Boreas} 18 (1995) 226.
\item See \textit{Stevens}, \textit{Isthmia VI. Sculpture II: Marble Sculpture 1967-1980} (Princeton 1996) 14 n76, no. 5. For several additional examples in Thessaloniki, see T. Stephanidou-Tiveriou, \textit{Trapezophora Tou Mouseiou Thessalonikes} (Thessaloniki 1985) nos. 18-20; a small relief in the Archaeological Museum of Mytilene (Old Building), no. 15257.
\item For several additional examples in Thessaloniki, see T. Stephanidou-Tiveriou, \textit{Trapezophora Tou Mouseiou Thessalonikes} (Thessaloniki 1985) nos. 18-20; a small relief in the Archaeological Museum of Mytilene (Old Building), no. 15257.
\item E.g., a statue in the Vatican: G. Lippold, \textit{Die Sculpturen des vatikanischen Museums} III, pt. 2 (Berlin 1956) 274, no. 3, pl. 125; a statuette in Athens: T. L. Shear, “The 1937 Campaign in the Athenian Agora,” \textit{American Journal of Archaeology} 42 (1938) 9, fig. 11 and “The Campaign of 1937,” \textit{Hesperia} 7 (1938) 351-352, fig. 36; a statue from \textit{Herculaneum}, Marchini (as n. 3) 392-394, fig. 29 (the reconstruction of a torch rather than bow and quiver is convincingly maintained against A. Maiuri, “Fanciullo Ercole da Ercolano,” \textit{Le Arti} 5 [1943] 175-179); on Eros without wings, see Hermary et al., 932, nos. 1007-1010, and 934.
\item For adaptations, see Söldner, 320-350.
\item See \textit{Söldner}, \textit{320-350}.
\item See \textit{E. Simon}, in \textit{Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicalae} II (Zurich and Munich 1984) 524, no. 169 s.v. Ares/Mars.
\item See Hermann, 80.
\item See note 2, above.
\end{itemize}
somewhat tentative. The navel is formed by a drill hole, but apparently some attempt was made to show the fold of flesh above it. Hard incisions mark the pubic triangle, the separation of the legs at front and back, and the division of the buttocks. The division of the buttocks is continued upward by two short diagonal grooves, forming a “y”. At the back, just below the neck, is a slightly raised flat worked surface, roughly square (3 cm).

The figure stood approximately 80 cm in height and supported the weight on the left leg. The shoulders bend slightly forward, and perhaps as a consequence the breasts are close together and slightly pendulous. The right arm was extended forward. These features suggest a miniature replica of the Capitoline Aphrodite, of which Felletti Maj recorded 101 copies; the Capitoline type is not always easy to distinguish from the Medici Aphrodite, another work very popular among Roman patrons. As an alternate possible source for the Licenza statuette, Frischer has mentioned another type of nude Aphrodite without the pudica gesture.

On the basis of my description of the small worked surface on the back, Pollini compared a small Aphrodite torso (approximately half life-size) of the Knidia type in Baltimore, tentatively dated to the first century A.D. Here, judging from the published description and illustration, the projection was once more substantial than that of the Licenza statuette, but is now broken off. Reeder takes the projection to be a remnant of hair “gathered into a short, thick mass,” noting this as a variant from the original, but Pollini convincingly identifies the feature as a type of neck support occurring on portraits of the imperial period. This may ultimately prove a useful criterion for dating the Licenza Aphrodite. Aside from the marble, I can suggest no other.

D.10. YOUTHFUL MALE HEAD

VH 044 = SAL 114579 (figs. 16-19)

Maximum preserved height 12.5 cm, maximum width 7.5 cm, maximum thickness ca 11 cm, distance between outer corners of eyes 5 cm, thickness of neck ca 7.3 cm. Shiny crystalline white marble tinged with gray: certainly Greek, probably Thasian.

The head is broken off at the top of the neck. The face is intact, but part of the head is missing on the right side, including the ear, where a vertical break starts at the jaw hinge and temple. There are many small cracks at the top of the head and damage to the front.


17. See Havelock (as n. 16) 76-80.


19. See E. D. Reeder, Hellenistic Art in the Walters Art Gallery (Baltimore 1988) 95, no. 20; fig. 20.2 shows the rear view with the projection below the neck. I am very grateful to Ryan Heilman, Registrar of the Walters Art Gallery, for finding the torso and furnishing information over the telephone.


21. See Hermann (as n. 2).

22. See note 2, above.
of the chin, tip of the nose, the left lower lip, and the
left side of the upper lip. The face has some small
abrasions.

The hair is in short curls, now very worn but also
cursory work, containing some drill holes. In addition,
at the beginning of the hairline, many small drill
holes form two rows running down to the top of the
preserved (left) ear. Similar drill holes are prominent
at the inner corners of eyes, and a small hole below
the nose, just left of center, also appears drilled. The
 nostrils are formed by larger drill holes. There is,
however, no drilling at the corners of the mouth.

The left ear is very flat, almost certainly intentionally.
The surface of the eyes is rounded, and the outer
corners are overlapped by the eyebrow muscles. The
lips are parted with a “breathing” expression. The
forehead is fairly flat but with some projection of the
lower part, especially just over the eyes; there is a
slight indentation at the bridge of the nose.

The figure stood approximately 75 cm in height
and evidently wore a wreath; the two rows of holes,
although extremely shallow (partly because of the
abraded surface), seem intended for its attachment.23
While metal attachments are fairly common in Greek
sculpture, the Roman preference was to “render even
difficult details in marble.”24 There are, however,
exceptions, such as an Athena head in the Vatican
storerooms with drill holes for attaching decoration
to the helmet, including a wreath.25 The Licenza head
is cursory work, and the sculptor’s willingness to
forego carving a wreath may have been specifically
motivated by the difficulty of carving such details in
Thasian marble.26

The head’s massive depth, overshadowed eyes, and
“breathing” mouth combine to recall fragments of
the pedimental sculpture from the Temple of Athena
Alea at Tegea, whose architect was the fourth-
century sculptor Skopas.27 The Tegea heads have
usually served as the basis for further attributions to
Skopas. Ridgway, however, has argued that Skopas
himself would have had little time to spare for the
pedimental sculpture while engaged in fashioning
the two cult statues and at the same time attending
to overall architectural supervision. A local workshop
must have been responsible for the style as well as
the actual carving of these heads;28 while some traits
of the heads appear earlier in the fourth century, the
Tegea heads “remain stylistically unique.”29 It is
rather arbitrary, however, to suppose that the sculptor-
architect devoted his attention to other architectural
details (the temple is admittedly both very large and
very elaborate, as well as innovative) to the complete
exclusion of the architectural sculpture, and it is more
likely that Skopas gave his assistants some stylistic
guidelines.30 It must be admitted, however, that the

23. Cf. W. W. Hyde, Olympic Victor Monuments and
Greek Athletic Art (Washington 1921) 162, fig.
30a and b (marble “Hoplitodromos” head from
Olympia); B. S. Ridgway, “Metal Attachments in
Greek Marble Sculpture,” in Marble, Art Historical
and Scientific Perspectives on Ancient Sculpture,
eds. M. True and J. Podany (Malibu 1990) 188,
fig. 4 (Apollo on the east frieze of the Parthenon;
an attached wreath is also suggested for a centaur
on the west pediment of the temple of Zeus at
Olympia).

24. B. S. Ridgway, “Stone and Metal in Greek
Sculpture,” Archaeology 19 (1966) 38.

25. G. von Kaschnitz-Weinberg, Le sculture dei
magazzini del Museo Vaticano (Rome 1937) 43; cf.
also no. 76 (a female head with unusual drill holes,
apparently for attaching a veil).

26. See E. B. Harrison, “Remarks on the Style of the
Getty Kouros,” The Getty Kouros Colloquium
(Athens 1993) 21: “this stone is unfriendly to
soft modilation and fine detail.” See also P.
Rockwell, The Art of Stoneworking: A Reference
Guide (Cambridge 1993) 27. It must be noted,
however, that sculpture found on Thasos does not
show hesitation over carving such details; see P.
Devambez, “Scultures Thasiennes,” Bulletin de
correspondence hellénique 66-67 (1942-1943)
200-214. For other sculpture in marble identified as
Thasian, see also Hermann (as n. 2).

27. Pausanias 8.45.4. The fullest discussion of the
Tegea sculptures is that of A. F. Stewart, Skopas of
Paros (Park Ridge 1977) 5-84.

28. Ridgway 1990, 14, 89; B. S. Ridgeway, Fourth-
Century Styles in Greek Sculpture (Madison 1997)
52.

29. Ridgway 1997 (as n. 28) 52; cf. “virtually

30. See L. Todisco, Scultura greca del IV secolo: Maestri
e scuole di statuaria tra classicità e ellenismo
(Milan 1993) 80-81. See also J. Boardman, Greek
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style of the Tegea heads has proved a very uncertain criterion for identifying copies of originals by Skopas; the closest parallels have been isolated heads,\(^3\) and the Licenza head might be added to these—whether as an athlete (wreath, cauliflower ear) or as Herakles, the tutelary divinity of athletes, who often assumed their attributes.

The Licenza statuette may be a version of the popular Herakles Lenbach, sometimes attributed to Lysippos\(^2\) and certainly of fourth-century origins. This Herakles type has a wide stance with the weight heavily shifted to the left leg, rests the lowered right hand on the upright club, and usually wears a wreath (carved in the marble examples).

The use of the drill on the Licenza head suggests a date in the late first or early second century A.D.
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D.11. COINS

BY THEODORE BUTTREY

D.11.1. THE MATERIAL

Two groups of coins constitute the numismatic material discovered in the excavations of the Villa of Horace, with possibly a third. The first (A) comprises the 82 pieces recovered in 1911-1916, the second (B) contains the 16 pieces found in 1997-1999. A third group (C) is the collection of 12 pieces currently on display in the museum of Licenza. Their provenience is unstated and they might simply be scattered local finds, although they are displayed along with material from the Villa proper and are chronologically consistent with Groups A and B.

D.11.1.1. Group A: coins found 1911-1916

These were identified by Pasqui and published by Lugli. They can no longer be found; it is reported that they were stolen from the old Antiquarium of Licenza in the early 1990s. A photographic record of the coins had been made in the 1970s (see Frischer, G.1.12.1) but it cannot be used now. Not only is the quality so poor as to compromise the identification of some of the coins, but in all cases the coins are photographed on only one side, making confirmation of anyone’s attribution impossible. For this group one must rely on the manuscripts and the printed record.

According to the manuscript catalogue (see Frischer, G.1.12.3) there were 82 coins all told, of which three were silver denarii, the rest bronze of various denominations.

One detail is striking: all of the coins were legible to some degree, and most to the point of being identifiable in the 19th-century catalogue of Cohen. This is in complete contrast to the difficult legibility of Groups B and C. It seems likely that more coins than these were actually found, but only these were sufficiently helpful to the excavator; the rest were ignored (or not recognized as coins). In fact, the records indicate that such was the case. Our information on the coins of Group A derives from three sources:

1. The handwritten Giornale of the excavations, 1912-1916 (see Frischer, G.1.12.1). These are the field-notes written up by Nicola De Rossi, which include references to the date and locus of finds, including the coins. The excavations actually lasted from May 20, 1911 to October 1, 1914, but the Giornale for 1911 is missing. De Rossi continued to note surface finds after the digging stopped in 1914.

2. Categoria Q. Monete antiche, the separate handwritten catalogue of the coins, with individual descriptions (see Frischer, G.1.12.3); it is anonymous, but presumably by Pasqui (not by De Rossi; it is written in a different hand). A few emendations, e.g. to Cohen numbers (hereafter C.), are by a second hand.

3. The publication of the coins by Lugli.

Each of these requires comment.

1) The Giornale

a] The total number of coins found cannot be extracted exactly, if only because of one entry, for 27 April 1912, which reads “Le monete unquantified. However, a total of something over 105, which would include completely illegible examples, fits well enough with the total of 82 identified in (2) and in (3) (see below). Thirty of the finds were originally noted but not described in the Giornale, or noted as illegible (e.g., 17 July 1912, “Nº 5 monete tutte illegibili”). Either these were later found to be partially identifiable, or other, more legible coins, which had not been noted in the Giornale, have found their way into the manuscript catalogue (2).

b] This then raises the question, to what extent do the coins of (1) and of (2) represent the same finds? It is probable that they do, and best practice would be to accept the readings of (2), which were done after study, over those of

1. Lugli 1926, cols. 588-590.
(1), which were made on the site and perhaps before cleaning. Still, these problems remain:

{i} Two pieces identified in the _Giornale_ are certainly not in (2), or are not so described: a find of 4 July 1915, said to be of Julian (later reattributed?); and even more clearly, that of 29 May 1913, a _sestertius_ of Hadrian with a three-figure reverse.

{ii} Twenty-five pieces described in the _Giornale_ can be more or less identified with entries in (2), at various levels of plausibility. This means that something over three-fourths of the coins whose discovery is noted in the _Giornale_ remain unidentified on the basis of that notation. Many were re-read, and subsequently included in (2), to a total of 82, but there is no way now to connect the two documents throughout piece by piece.

c) The _Giornale_ gives the locus, in terms of land ownership, for the finds of 1912-13, but not for those of 1915-16 (with one exception). Insofar as ownership is noted, the coins derived from the properties of Angeletti, M. Foschi and R. Foschi (with the occasional overlap of the Foschis; on the properties, see Frischer, E.4).

2) The manuscript catalogue

The handwritten catalogue proper of 82 coins, _Categoria Q. Monete antiche_, is written in a single hand and arranged in a single chronological order by emperor, without regard to the archaeological time or place of find. Or rather, this holds for nos. 1-71; the last 11 pieces presumably came to light subsequently, since they were added to the catalogue, by the same hand, in no obvious order. The descriptions of type and legend are very full through no. 66, but from there to the end, including the additional 11 pieces, they tend to abbreviation with some carelessness: e.g., for no. 69, the obverse legend is given as _MAXENTIVS tout court_; for no. 70 we find _MASSENTIVS_ (inscriptional Italian rather than Latin); and reverse types are mostly omitted.

a) The catalogue provides a column for _Provenienza_ for each coin, but this has gone unused for all but five pieces: nos. 36, 42, 45, 47, and 49. Of these, the last, a coin of Gallienus found on Angeletti’s property, does not match any legible or semi-legible piece reported in (1), though it could of course have been part of an illegible group, such as the eight which came to light on 11 July 1912. More important, the other four pieces are noted as “dal terreno Caponetti,” but the _Giornale_ includes no mention at all of digging in that holding, for the simple reason that the Caponetti land was dug in 1911, the records for which are missing from the _Giornale_. Again, either something has gone wrong in (2), or the coins of (1) and (2) are not altogether the same body of material.

b) The many numbers jotted otherwise in the _Provenienza_ column, by a later hand, form a running total from page to page. They are an estimate of the market value in lire of each coin, as given in Cohen, totaling an appraisal of L. 210 for the whole. (Cohen’s valuations are in gold francs, but at the time of publication both France and the Kingdom of Italy adhered to the Latin Monetary Union, an association of nations bound by a single currency. Thus, his valuations were equivalent to contemporary gold lire.)

c) The last 11 coins, added rather helter-skelter after the original chronological arrangement, are all noted as “_monete trovate in gruppo_” without any indication of a find-spot. However, Lugli assigned them to the complex of rooms ‘S’ (=rooms 44, 47, 48 and 49).

3) Lugli’s publication

Lugli’s published list3 is derived basically from (2), except that he has made a rearrangement after his no. 23 so that he could include in order the last (unordered) 11 coins of (2). However, he must have seen the coins, or have had access to further information about them, since at no. 27 he was able to provide a more detailed description of the _sestertius_ of Trajan than had been given in (2) no.24, and to attribute it correctly to C. 444.

a) A few errors can be dealt with, most notably the assertion in the text that 83 coins were listed, while his list runs only to 82.4

3. Lugli 1926, cols. 588-590.
4. There are two errors, which correct each other:

{i} Lugli’s no. 80, Maxentius, covers two coins which ought therefore to be 80 and 81; then his 81
More seriously, there are several problems of citation:

{i} No. 7, clearly described in (2) as a coin of Titus reproducing (“restoring”) a coin of Tiberius (for the deified Augustus), is included by Lugli under Augustus. This actually follows the unhistorical arrangement of Cohen, but confuses the chronology of the coin itself.

(ii) No. 13, a bronze coin of Galba, was referenced in (2) as “cf. Cohen 349”, an aureus, simply to indicate an analogous reverse type of military standards. This was reported by Lugli no. 13 as straight “Cohen 349”, but no gold was found at the Villa.

(iii) No. 25 in (2) (=Lugli no. 24), a bronze of Trajan, is referenced by Lugli as “Cohen 62 (?)”, also a gold coin. He apparently miscopied the correct reference from (2), Cohen 625.

c] Finally, Lugli usually gives only the imperial name and the Cohen reference, leaving it to the reader to go back to Cohen to discover what issue or type is actually to hand. However, for four pieces not given a Cohen reference in (2), he provides a more generous description: three “G.B.” (i.e. sestertii) of Trajan and Gallienus, and one “M.B.” (i.e. a dupondius or an as) of Gordian III. Only two of these can be correct:

- no. 27, “G.B.” of Trajan, given as “G.B.” also in (2) no. 24, is assigned by Lugli correctly to C. 444.
- no. 60, “G.B.” of Gallienus, is given as “G.B” also in (2) no. 49, wrongly. The type described, emperor sacrificing at tripod, does not occur as a sestertius, but as an antoninianus, RIC 1.186.618.

- no. 61, “G.B.” of Gallienus, is given correctly as “P.B.” in (2) no. 50, i.e. an antoninianus with reverse type Pegasus, RIC 1.155.282.

- no. 50 is indeed an as of Gordian, RIC 3.43.256b.

All of the above indicates that a precise description of all of the individual coins of Group A cannot be recovered today. But there seems no reason to question either the general run of attributions or the identification of the individual emperors, although it must be noted that there are some generalizations (e.g., “CONST...” covers Constantine and his sons).

D.11.1.2. Group B: coins from the excavations of 1997-1999

The sixteen coins of the most recent excavations, 1997-1999, are as a whole in poor condition. Ancient wear in circulation is taken for granted for all find coins anywhere; subsequent corrosion or deformation in the soil is normal; and the excavators have to

6. To summarize the corrections that should be made in Lugli (3),

- no. 5: for C. 3 read C. 4
- no. 13: for C. 349 read C. 269
- no. 18: for C. 25 read C. 125
- no. 25: for C. 62(?) read C. 625(?)
- no. 31: for C. 122 read C. 123

nos. 53-54 appear, wrongly, to include three coins
- no. 58 is apparently a dittography of no. 57
- no. 60 reads “G.B.” in both (2) and (3), but it must be an antoninianus
- no. 61 reads “G.B.” as against “P.B.” in (2), i.e. an antoninianus
- no. 80 includes two coins, here labelled as 80a and 80b.
clean the material properly for it to be read. That is all straightforward. The particular problem with the coins from the villa of Horace is the acidity of the soil. All of the ancient coins are of bronze (two coins are modern), and have been so deeply corroded that not only have the legends almost entirely vanished, but on most of the coins whole types have vanished, leaving in some cases only shadowy traces or nothing at all of the original impression. There is no way to recover what is lost, and few of the coins in Groups B or C below can be exactly identified.

Unlike Groups A and C, among the ancient and assignable coins of Group B there is a relatively high proportion (9 out of 12) struck in the late third-fourth century A.D. This enlarges the scattered finds of late coins reported earlier.

For the catalogue, see below.

D.11.1.3. Group C: coins in the museum of Licenza

These 12 coins do not correspond to those listed in Group A, and must be separate, presumably later, finds. Their relatively high level of legibility, compared to those of Group B, also suggests that coins in worse condition might not have been recognized as coins, or might have been discarded as useless.

One is an ancient imitation of a silver denarius (plated); the rest are bronze, badly corroded. Ten of the 12 can be dated to the first-second century A.D. Thus in scope they fall in the earlier part of the range of coin finds already established at the Villa in the Giornale (1) and in the handwritten catalogue (2).

This lot is unlabelled in the display case as to provenience, and might be local Licenza finds without any specific connection to the Villa.

For the catalogue, see below.

D.11.1.4. The excavations

Group A, 1912-1916. To work backwards from (3), Lugli must have used the handwritten catalogue of coins, but he did not have access to Pasqui’s excavation notes, which he believed to have been lost (col. 461).

He mentions the coin finds in an excavation context only once and in a general way (col. 557 and n1):

In base a questi elementi possiamo datare l’edificio [53] e in generale tutte le costruzioni di questo periodo, all’età tra i Flavi e Adriano, vale a dire alla fine del I sec., o agli inizi del II sec. d. C.

1. Si noti che nello scavo si sono rinvenute con eccezionale abbondanza monete di Vespasiano, Domiziano e anche Traiano, coincidenza che non è certo casuale.

From a numismatic point of view this is perhaps an overstatement. To be sure, there were ten Flavian coins (including the restoration of Tiberius [Augustus] by Titus), and four of Trajan. But the second century produced another 17 pieces.

Lacking the specific find-spots, Lugli was not able to assign the individual coins to more specific loci, except for a group of 11 (“12”) pieces which came out of the rooms marked ‘S’ (=rooms 44, 47, 48 and 49).

The Giornale (1) and the coin list (2) are now to hand, and provide better information on the precise find-spots, although as indicated above they are only partially useful, because they are incomplete or inconsistent in themselves. However, these are the pieces which can be assigned a find-spot from documents (1) and (2); the numbers are those of Categoria Q (2) / Lugli (3):

[a] Angeletti property

nos. -/ - Hadrian with three-figure reverse (reported find, 29 May 1913)

80/39 Marcus Aurelius @
74/45 Caracalla @
75/46 Julia Mamaea @
47/54 Otacilia @
53/63 Claudius II
56/66 Severina
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57/67 Diocletian
59/69 Maximian
65/75 Constantine
68/78 Constantine
69 or 70/80 Maxentius
+ not identifiable 40 pieces

These coins are mostly later third and fourth century; there is nothing from the first century, and only two pieces of the second century.

For the four pieces marked with the symbol @, see below under [b].

[b] Caponetti property

As noted above, the surviving portion of the Giornale does not mention digging in this area. However, four coins are tagged in the manuscript catalogue as discovered “in terreno Caponetti,” namely

nos. 36/40 Faustina II
42/50 Gordian III
45/51 Maximus
47/54 Otacilia @

Moreover, the final 11 coins in (2), nos. 72-82, appear to come from the same area. This is not stated in the handwritten catalogue, where they are noted only as “monete trovate in gruppo.” But in the introduction to his listing of the coin finds (3), Lugli localizes them in un gruppo rinvenuto tutt’insieme nell’ultimo scavo in una delle stanze S, quasi al piano, to wit (again with Categoria Q/Lugli numbers):

nos. 79/29 Hadrian
72/33 Faustina I
80/34 Marcus Aurelius @
73/36 Marcus Aurelius
74/45 Caracalla @
75/46 Julia Mamaea @
77/52 Philip I
76/56 Aemilian
78/57 Valerian
[78/58 Valerian] (apparently Lugli’s dittography of 78/57)
82/79 Constantine
81/83 Constantine II

To judge from the site plan, these rooms (Lugli S=44, 47, 48 and 49) should fall within the Caponetti property. But these coins are plainly not the same material as the coins noted in (2) as found “in terreno Caponetti,” although they accord with them in time-scale.

There is, however, an insoluble confusion. The finds from [b] include four pieces, marked @ above, which appear to be attested in the Giornale as independent finds from holding [a], while the handwritten catalogue assigns three of them to the gruppo which, according to Lugli, was found in rooms S (=44, 47, 48 and 49), therefore property [b]. Thus the Giornale for 12 June 1913 reports the single discovery of a coin of Marcus Aurelius with reverse type Salus (i.e., it was legible on site), in property [a] Angeletti; but an entry for such a type appears in the catalogue (2) only at no. 80 in the gruppo. It is of course conceivable that two different coins of similar description could be found, though it is difficult to understand why a piece identifiable at the site should be less legible after study. And it is hardly likely that this would happen four times. Absent the original find-spots, there is no way of disentangling this dual confusion, i.e., whether the coins were or were not found together, and whether they were found in property [a] or [b].

Note too that whatever the term “gruppo” intends here archaeologically, the batch of 11 coins cannot have been a hoard or any coherent lot. They are too disparate, and were struck over too long a period,

7. This is inferred from the fact that it is not reported in (2).
to have circulated together, and must be treated as individual losses.

[c] Rocco Foschi property

nos. 1/1 Republican *aes grave, triens*

15etc/15etc Vespasian
41etc/47etc Gordian III
43/48 Gordian III
49etc/59etc Gallienus
50-51/59etc Gallienus
55?/65 Claudius II
64etc/74etc Constantine
64etc/74etc Constantine

+ not identifiable 2 pieces

The *aes grave* is obviously out of step with the rest of the coins chronologically, but there is no reason why it should not have circulated in this area in the third century B.C. Otherwise, save for one the coins are all of the third and fourth centuries A.D.

[d] Mariassunta Foschi property

nos. 14/14 Vespasian
18/18 Domitian
34/35 Marcus Aurelius

+ not identifiable 4 pieces

[e] Rocco and Mariassunta Foschi property

(A joint holding, or excavator’s uncertainty as to the property line?)

no. 6?/6 Augustus

+ not identifiable 1 piece

[f] find-spot not given

nos. -/- “Giuliano” (found 4 July 1915)
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D.11.3.2. Group B: coins from the excavations 1997-1999

1. bronze probably third century B.C. or later Hellenic

   obv. --
   rev. --
   Sector Area SU Find no. Inv. no.
   IV.1 23 4030 2 VH 059=SAL 114509
   14 mm, with a thickish flan.

2. as (halved) first third of first century A.D.

   obv. head of Augustus or Tiberius
   rev. --
   Sector Area SU Find no. Inv. no.
   VII.1 24 7038 3 VH 145=SAL 114515
   24.5 mm on the cut. Both faces are worn smooth from ancient circulation. The flan identifies the general period of issue. Halved asses of Augustan and Tiberian striking have been found in very large quantities along the German frontier, and to a certain extent in northern Italy, but not commonly in central Italy as here.

3. as 119-138 A.D.

   obv. head of Hadrian Hadrianvs] AV[gystvs
   rev. standing figure
   BMCRE 3.437-486, mint of Rome
   Sector Area SU Find no. Inv. no.
   I.2 50 261 1 VH 055=SAL 114508

4. follis 297-298 A.D.

   obv. head of Constantius I r. CONSTANTIVS
   nob [c or caes]
   rev. VOT / XX / Θ
   RIC 6.360.88a or 89a, mint of Rome
   Sector Area SU Find no. Inv. no.
   VII.1 24 7039 1 VH 123=SAL 114513

5. follis probably late third-fourth century A.D.

   obv. --
   rev. --
   Sector Area SU Find no. Inv. no.
   1.5 38 832 1 VH 058=SAL 114537
   thin flan, illegible.

6. follis 347-348 A.D.

   obv. head of Constans CONSTANS P F AVG
   rev. probably two Victories
   e.g. RIC 8.253-255.78 etc.
   Sector Area SU Find no. Inv. no.
   VII.1 24 7035 1 VH 092=SAL 114510

7. follis 347-348 A.D.

   obv. head of Constantius II. d n constan]TIVS P F AVG
   rev. VOT / XX / MVLT / XXX
   Eastern mint, e.g. RIC 8.433.45 (Heraclea)
   Sector Area SU Find no. Inv. no.
   I.4 40 615 3 VH 057=SAL 114536

8. AE 3 348-361 A.D.

   obv. head of Constantius II, Gallus or Julian
   rev. falling horseman
   Sector Area SU Find no. Inv. no.
   I.3 37 429 1 VH 014=SAL 114505

9. follis fourth century A.D.

   obv. head r.
   rev. --
   Sector Area SU Find no. Inv. no.
   1.5 38 800 2 VH 038=SAL 114506
10. *follis* later fourth century A.D. \(\text{fig. 10}\)

- obv. young head r.

- rev. --

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>SU</th>
<th>Find no.</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VH 049=SAL 114507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. bronze probably fourth century A.D. \(\text{fig. 1}\)

- fragment

- obv. --

- rev. --

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>SU</th>
<th>Find no.</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7035</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VH 093=SAL 114511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. *minim* late fourth/fifth century A.D. \(\text{fig. 1}\)

- obv. --

- rev. --

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>SU</th>
<th>Find no.</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7038</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VH 144=SAL 114514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. 20 centesimi 1921

- obv. Italia head l.

- rev. flying figure of Liberty

- mint of Rome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>SU</th>
<th>Find no.</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 060=SAL 114538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. 10 centesimi 1942/XX

- obv. head of Victor Emmanuel III

- rev. fasces etc.

- mint of Rome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>SU</th>
<th>Find no.</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VH 061=SAL 114539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. bronze illegible \(\text{fig. 1}\)

- obv. rev.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>SU</th>
<th>Find no.</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 068=SAL 114540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. illegible \(\text{fig. 1}\)

- obv. rev.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>SU</th>
<th>Find no.</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7034</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 102=SAL 114512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Index by Sector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>SU</th>
<th>Find no.</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VH 049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VH 057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VH 038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IV.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4030</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VH 059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>VII.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7034</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VII.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>VII.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7035</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VH 093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>VII.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7038</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VH 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VII.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7038</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VH 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VII.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7039</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>IX.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>IX.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VH 061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Index by Inventory Number**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>SU</th>
<th>Find no.</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VH 038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VH 049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VH 057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IV.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4030</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VH 059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>IX.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>IX.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VH 061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VII.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VH 092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>VII.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7035</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VH 093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D.11. Coins

D.11.3.3. Group C: coins in the museum of Licenza

All coins from the mint of Rome

1. probably probably earlier first century A.D. 
dupondius

obv. head l., probably Julio-Claudian (brassy flan)
rev. --
inv. 62945

2. dupondius 71-79 A.D.

obv. radiate head of Vespasian or Titus r.
rev. f]ELICIT[as pvblica
e.g. BMCRE 2.160.696, 74 A.D.
inv. 62941

3. as 81 A.D.

obv. head of Domitian r.
rev. Minerva striking r. trp cos vii] DES VIII PP
BMCRE 2.355.268
inv. 62947

4. dupondius first-second century A.D.
or as

obv. --
rev. --
inv. 62940

5. as 98-117 A.D.

obv. head of Trajan r.
rev. --
BMCRE 3.150-225.724-1055
inv. 62942

6. as 119 A.D.

obv. head of Hadrian r. imp caesar] TRAIANVS
HADRIANVS [avg
rev. Aeternitas r. PONT MAX TR POT COS III
BMCRE 3.411.1172
inv. 62944

7. sestertius 119-121 A.D.

obv. head of Hadrian r.
rev. Pietas standing r., altar before
BMCRE 3.416.1198-1202
inv. 62943

8. denarius original issue 125-128 A.D. (ancient plated forgery)

obv. head of Hadrian r.
rev. Spes l.
for the original issue, BMCRE 3.292.417-420
inv. 62936

9. as 163-178 A.D.

obv. head of Marcus Aurelius or Commodus r.
rev. Victory moving l. with wreath and palm
e.g. BMCRE 4.559.1085; etc.
inv. 62938
10. *as* second century A.D.

obv. Hadrian? r.
rev. divinity seated l. holding cornucopae
inv. 62939

11. *radiate* 297-298 A.D.

fraction

obv. bust of Maximian, Constantius or Galerius (*r*).
rev. VOT / XX / [ ] in wreath
*RIC* 6.359-60.75 etc.
inv. 62946

(*) officina A is not attested for Diocletian in this issue.

12. *radiate* 297-298 A.D.

fraction

obv. bust of Diocletian, Maximian, Constantius or Galerius r.
rev. VOT / XX / [ ] in wreath
*RIC* 6.359-60.75 etc.
inv. 62937

Index by Inventory Number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62936</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62940</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62944</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62937</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62941</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62945</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62938</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62942</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62946</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62939</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62943</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62947</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.11.3.4. Synoptic list of Villa of Horace coin finds

A. 1911-1916, with Lugli number and find-spots (as recoverable from the *Giornale*).
   a] Angeletti property
   b] Caponetti property
   c] Rocco Foschi property
   d] Mariassunta Foschi property
   e] Rocco and Mariassunta Foschi property

B. excavations of 1997-1999

C. museum of Licenza as of June 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type / Period</th>
<th>Inv. no.</th>
<th>Find-spot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roman Republic <em>aes grave</em></td>
<td>A1 [c]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Greek third-second century B.C.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Republican bronze</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Republican bronze</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Republican bronze</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Octavian and Caesar</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>A6 [e]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Augustus or Tiberius</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(Gaius) Agrippa</td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Claudius</td>
<td>A9</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Claudius</td>
<td>A10</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Claudius</td>
<td>A11</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>probably earlier first century</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Galba</td>
<td>A12</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Galba</td>
<td>A13</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Vespasian</td>
<td>A15-17 [c]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Vespasian</td>
<td>A14 [d]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Vespasian</td>
<td>A15-17</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vespasian</td>
<td>A15-17</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vespasian or Titus</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>A7</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>A18-22 [d]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>A18-22</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>A18-22</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>A18-22</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>A18-22</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>A18-22</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Nerva</td>
<td>A23</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>first-second century</td>
<td>A24</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Trajan</td>
<td>A24</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Trajan</td>
<td>A25</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Trajan <em>AR denarius</em></td>
<td>A26</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Trajan</td>
<td>A27</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Trajan</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>*Hadrian</td>
<td>A-- [a]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Hadrian</td>
<td>A29 [b]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Hadrian</td>
<td>A28</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Hadrian</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Hadrian <em>AR denarius</em> (plated)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[C]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D.11. Coins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Emperor/Title</th>
<th>Reference to Coin Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Hadrian</td>
<td>[C]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Hadrian</td>
<td>[C]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Antoninus Pius</td>
<td>A30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Antoninus Pius</td>
<td>A31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Faustina I</td>
<td>A33 [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Faustina I</td>
<td>A32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>A39 [a] or [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>A36 [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>A35 [d]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>A34, 37-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>A34, 37-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>A34, 37-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius or Comodus</td>
<td>[C]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Faustina II</td>
<td>A40 [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Faustina II</td>
<td>A41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Lucius Verus</td>
<td>A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Commodus</td>
<td>A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Commodus AR denarius</td>
<td>A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>second century</td>
<td>[C]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Caracalla</td>
<td>A45 [a] or [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Julia Mamaea</td>
<td>A46 [a] or [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Gordian III</td>
<td>A50 [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Gordian III</td>
<td>A48 [c]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Gordian III</td>
<td>A47 or 49 [c]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Gordian III</td>
<td>A47 or 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Maximus</td>
<td>A51 [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Philip I</td>
<td>A52 [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Otacilia</td>
<td>A54 [a] or [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Otacilia</td>
<td>A53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Trajan Decius</td>
<td>A55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Aemilian</td>
<td>A56 [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>** Valerian</td>
<td>A57 [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Gallienus</td>
<td>A59-61 [c]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Gallienus</td>
<td>A59-61 [c]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Gallienus</td>
<td>A59-61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Salonina</td>
<td>A62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Claudius II</td>
<td>A65 [a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Claudius II, posthumous third century</td>
<td>A63 [c]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Severina</td>
<td>A66 [a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Diocletian</td>
<td>A67 [a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Diocletian or colleague</td>
<td>[C]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Maximian</td>
<td>A68-73 [a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Maximian</td>
<td>A68-73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Maximian</td>
<td>A68-73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Maximian</td>
<td>A68-73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Maximian</td>
<td>A68-73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Maximian</td>
<td>A68-73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Maximian or colleague</td>
<td>[C]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Constantius I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>probably late third-fourth century</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Maxentius</td>
<td>A80a [a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Maxentius</td>
<td>A80b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>A76-77 [a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>A74-78 [a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>A79 [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>A74-78 [c]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>A74-78 [c]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>A74-78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Claudius II, posthumous fourth century</td>
<td>A64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Constantine II Caesar</td>
<td>A81 [b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Constans Aug</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Constans Aug</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Constantius II Aug</td>
<td>A82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Constantius II Aug, Gallus or Julian</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>fourth century</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>later fourth century</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>probably fourth century</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>late fourth-fifth century</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>twentieth century</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>twentieth century</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* find reported in the *Giornale* for 29 May 1913, but not recorded in either the manuscript catalogue nor Lugli.

** omitting Lugli 58 as a dittography of his no. 57.
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D.12. SMALL METAL OBJECTS FROM RECENT EXCAVATIONS (1997-2001)

By Archer Martin

These small finds from the excavations at Horace’s Villa represent a selection of items retained by the excavators and thus do not form a characteristic assemblage. For example, nails usually make up a significant portion of small finds, with iron nails normally outnumbering copper alloy ones, but only one example (a copper alloy nail fragment is included here). On the other hand, this selection contains some unusual pieces, such as a button. These are seldom found in Roman contexts. It is particularly intriguing to find a lead slingshot missile, a decidedly military item, in a villa in Italy, in a context of the first to second century A.D.

D.12.1. JEWELRY

Finger rings were made of various materials in the Roman world, with shapes of varying articulation. Two finger rings of copper alloy were found at Horace’s Villa.

Finger ring 1

The simpler one fits into Henkel’s group I.3.A.IV.1 (i.e. metal rings, in which the metal is bronze, without a stone and with a plate, which is raised above the hoop) or Beckmann’s Type 20.¹ This is essentially a first-century type, although some divergence is possible. The piece lacks most of the hoop. The plate bears an incision that is perhaps a stylized plant, possibly used as a seal (fig. 1).

Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 259, Inv. VH 054 (=SAL 114412), diam. of plate 1 cm.

Finger ring 2

The other ring belongs to Henkel’s group I.3.C.II. a.2.α (i.e. metal rings, in which the metal is bronze, with a stone or glass insertion, of decidedly Roman shape, in which the hoop is round, the section is flattened inside, the stone is convex) or Beckmann’s Type 21.² Rings of this type date essentially to the second century, although once again there is some possible divergence. The ring is complete in three pieces, a major one including the insertion and two smaller ones from the lower part of the hoop. The insertion appears to be glass (fig. 2).

Sector III.12, Area 12, SU 3135, Inv. VH 213 (=SAL 114413), diam. 2 cm.

D.12.2. CLOTHING ACCESSORY

Button

Although Roman clothing involved much less tailoring than ours, buttons of various sorts are known from antiquity, including buttons with a flat loop for sewing on, as well as ones with a shank for attachment, and the stud type.³

A copper alloy button with a flat loop on the underside was found in a context of the second half of the first century (figs. 3 and 4).

Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 316, Inv. VH 077 (=SAL 114417), diam. 1.3 cm.

D.12.3. TOOLS

Knife

Knives can be satisfactorily identified typologically only when they are completely preserved. This is not the case with the example from Horace’s Villa, which has lost its tip. However, the surviving features allow some considerations to be made: the back is in a straight line with the handle tang, and the edge is approximately parallel to it. Thus, it most likely


². Henkel (as n. 1) 104-105; Beckmann (as n. 1) 38.

belong to Manning’s Types 1-4. These are essentially first-century types, passing out of use in the second century. Many were probably used as razors.

Sector III.12, Area 12, SU 3144, preserved length 7.5 cm.

**Axe or Adze**

The distinction between axes and adzes and the possible typological subdivision of the two depends on the observation of the relation of the cutting edge to the entire implement. Therefore it is impossible to classify an iron fragment preserving the cutting edge and the immediately adjacent part of the tool that was found in an early medieval context (fig. 5).

Sector I.4, Area 40, SU 607, Inv. VH 053 (=SAL 114432).

**D.12.4. Weapon**

**Slingshot missile**

Slingshots were a normal part of the Roman military armament from Republican times. Most missiles were made of lead in molds and present an oblong form coming to a point on either end. The weights are reported to range from 34 gr. to somewhat more than 47 gr.; this is the only discrepancy with the piece from Horaces’s Villa, which is significantly heavier. In the nineteenth century slingshot missiles attracted a great deal of scholarly attention because some carried inscriptions (e.g., the name of the commander, invectives, etc.). Most, however, are uninscribed, as is this one (fig. 6).

Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7026, Inv. VH 082 (= SAL 114418), length (max.) 5.2 cm, weight 79 gr.

**D.12.5. Structural Fittings**

**Nail**

Various typologies for nails have been proposed, generally with length playing an important role. Thus, they are not useful for fragmentary specimens, such as the copper alloy one found in a layer dated between the Flavian period and the early decades of the second century A.D., the only nail retained by the excavators. Given its massiveness, one could suppose that it was used for heavy carpentry, although it is normally iron nails that appear in this function (fig. 7).

Sector I.2, Area 50, SU 313, Inv. VH 075 (=SAL 114416), diam. of head 2.6 cm, thickness of stem at attachment to head 1.1 cm.

**Marble clips (?)**

Two long slender pieces from a first century A.D. context have a flat rectangular section: the first tapering to a rounded hook at each end, the other with such a hook at one end and broken at the other. It has been suggested that similar items may be clips for securing thin slabs of marble veneer. Marble cladding in Roman architecture was indeed normally fixed to the wall by means of mortar and clips of bronze or possibly copper, which, however, typically present a T-shape in order to hold two slabs at once. Even where they form a simple angle, clips are illustrated as much more substantial than these pieces. Therefore, the attribution must be considered somewhat doubtful (fig. 8).

---


5. Manning (as n. 4) 15-18.


---
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Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1279, Inv. VH 146 (=SAL 114421), length 11.5 cm (bent at about 2/3 from one end). Sector I.7, Area 35, SU 1279, Inv. VH 147 (=SAL 114422), length 9.5 cm (nearly straight).

D.12.6. Miscellaneous Objects

Ring

In the case of simple copper alloy rings made of a bent piece of wire with the two ends soldered together, it is impossible to establish whether they were worn on fingers as inexpensive jewelry or used for some more utilitarian purpose. The relatively early date, the late Republican period, for a copper alloy ring at Horace’s Villa could be an indication that it was used for the latter, as finger rings became common only during the imperial age. On the other hand, it is of a size and shape (slightly oval) suitable for a finger ring.

Sector IV.1, Area 23, SU 4030, Inv. VH 056 (=SAL 114411), width 2.0-2.2 cm.

Unidentifiable object

Some objects are difficult to recognize in spite of their relatively good state of preservation. One copper alloy piece from an early medieval context falls into this category. It is flat, tapering from a wider, rounded end to a pointed one. It is not clear whether that was the original termination. The piece is at present curled, although that may not have been its original form.

Sector I.3, Area 37, SU 448, Inv. VH 048 (=SAL 114431), length 5.8 cm.

Fragmentary objects

Other objects are impossible to identify because of their poor preservation. This is the case of three pieces from datable contexts.

The first piece, from a layer of the late first or early second century A.D., is a slightly curving shaft of lead with an approximately rectangular section. It could be part of a rivet for the repair of a large ceramic vessel.

Sector VI.2, Areas 24-25, SU 6013, Inv. VH 117 (=SAL 114420), length 4.5 cm.

Another piece, made of copper alloy, presents two parallel arms joined by a crosspiece at one end. One arm is thickened in its final portion, before a probable break. The other is shorter but appears to be folded back on itself. The piece was found in a context of the second half of the first century A.D.

Sector I.5, Area 38, SU 865, Inv. VH 090 (=SAL 114419), length (max.) 4.1 cm.

The third piece is a highly corroded small fragment of copper alloy that has disintegrated in storage. It comes from a fourth or fifth century A.D. layer.

Sector VII.1, Area 24, SU 7035, Inv. VH 094 (=SAL 114433).

Tome I: Matériaux, techniques de construction et formes du décor (Paris and Rome 1985) 144, pl. 42.5.

11. Ginouvès and Martin (as n. 10) 444.


13. Martin (as n. 7) 448.
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D.13. **INSCRIPTIONS ON LEAD Pipes**

**By Christer Bruun**

**D.13.1. EPIGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL**

**Commentary**

There have been notices of water conduits at or near the site of the villa at Licenza for over two centuries. As early as 1761, Domenico De Sanctis, a lawyer and antiquarian from nearby Tivoli, mentioned "some traces of a small conduit that carried the waters of the spring to the villa." The material of that conduit is not known, but it was quite likely of lead. There are other reports of inscribed lead pipes having been found on the site during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but they have long since disappeared and will therefore not be treated in this paper.¹

Lead pipes, to be sure, were discovered during the excavations of 1911-1914, but although they were published by Lugli in 1926,² the stamps they carry have remained practically unknown to the scholarly world. The texts are indeed valuable, as one stamp gives the name of a one-time owner of the villa, yet these sources have suffered complete neglect ever since Lugli’s publication.³ Together with more spectacular archaeological material from the excavation site, the lead pipes were carried up to the little town of Licenza and placed in the old antiquarium situated in the medieval Rocca degli Orsini.⁴

In the present museum in Licenza, a handful of well-exhibited fistulae can still be studied today. None is complete (a single unit of pipe was often ten Roman feet,⁵ about three meters, in length), and some have been reduced to fragments. Two inscriptions can nevertheless be read without difficulty: one reads C. Iulius Priscus (f)ecit; the other P. Ostili Firmini. For the technical details, see De Simone, D.1.3.2.

The pipes carrying these stamps were, according to Lugli, not found together; however, there are some inaccuracies in his description.⁶ Nevertheless, the sizes of the fistulae make it possible that the pipes belong to the same manufacturing process. If this is so, we have one name in the nominative and one in the genitive on the same conduit and we are surely dealing with a manufacturer of pipes (a plumbarius) called C. Iulius Pruscus, and with one P. (H)ostilius Firminus, who must have been the customer commissioning the work. That the latter was a sometime owner of the villa is, however, to be assumed even if the pipes did not belong together.⁷

---

1. De Sanctis, 43.

2. The stamps are Ti. Claudi Burri (CIL XV.7897a) and -[Im Burrus]- (CIL XV.7897b), also mentioned by Lugli 1926, col. 583. It is known that the inscriptions were destroyed by the priest of Licenza in the 1770s, who used them for birdshot; see Frischer and Brown, 133 n*, with 155 n38. See also Mazzoleni, 194 n2: “in Licenza presso Vincenzo Onorati si conserva ancora un frammento di tubo di piombo che fu trovato innestato a questa abitazione.”

3. For the official edition of the stamps, see Lugli 1926, cols. 581-583. See also Lugli 1930, 66, on the inscribed lead objects from the villa now in the museum.

4. There is, e.g., no reference to the fistula stamp in PIR² H 225 (Hostilius Firminus), nor in RE. The stamps are naturally absent from CIL XIV and XV (published before 1911), from Inscriptiones Italicae IV.1 Tibur (Rome 1952), and have never been cited in L’Année Epigraphique. The area of Licenza was not included in C. F. Giuliani, Tibur. Pars Altera. Forma Italicae I.3 (Rome 1966).

5. Lugli 1930, 66, on the inscribed lead objects from the villa now in the museum.


7. Lugli 1926, col. 581, writes that the stamp P. Ostili Firmini was found on a pipe emptying from the room O (=room 34) into the sewer m (=h-i), while the stamp C. Iulius Priscus f. was found on a conduit some 40 meters to the south, leading into the sewer r (=p2) from the “fishtank” T (=room 53). But both stamps were found in two exemplars, as can be seen in the museum at Licenza, and Lugli does not give information on the find-spots of the other stamps.

8. The interpretation of the genitive on fistula stamps has in the recent past caused some discussion; see Bruun 1991, 81-95, and more recently C. Bruun, “A City of Temples and Squares, Emperors, Horses, and Houses,” *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 10 (1997) 397f. and C. Bruun, “Senatorial Owners of
The name C. Iulius Priscus is of little help for dating and identification purposes. No plumbarius by that name is known from other sources. Moreover, C. Iulius Priscus is a very common name; in Rome alone, at least nine C. Iulius Prisci and two Iulii Prisci (without a praenomen, although they could in principle have been called Gaius, too) are known from inscriptions. Nothing indicates that we might be dealing with any of these persons, although it cannot be excluded.

The tria nomina C. Iulius Priscus also occurs among members of the senatorial and equestrian orders, but in these cases an identification is impossible.

The situation is rather more rewarding regarding P. Hostilius Firminus. A senator called Hostilius Firminus is known from the correspondence of Pliny the Younger. In 100 A.D., the Roman Senate gave a verdict in a case of extortion of provincials involving the proconsul of Africa, Marius Priscus. Priscus was condemned and the Senate proceeded to deal with the three senatorial assistants, the legati of the proconsul. One of these was named Hostilius Firminus, and Pliny mentions him twice in his correspondence (Epist. 2.11.23f. and 2.12.1-5). Unfortunately, the only thing we hear about Hostilius Firminus is that he was found guilty of extortion and made to forfeit his eligibility to govern a province.

The fistulae from Licenza may now shed welcome new light on the vicissitudes of Hostilius Firminus, the corrupt legatus. Until the discovery at Licenza, this man was the only known bearer of the name combination Hostilius Firminus. It is therefore very tempting to identify the onetime legatus in the province of Africa with the man from Licenza. Indeed one could claim that there is a good chance that this identification is correct, were it not for the fact that homonymy, the use of identical names, was common in the Roman aristocracy. We do not know the praenomen of the Hostilius Firminus mentioned by Pliny, and he may not have been called P(ublius).

In any case, the existence of a Roman praetor named Hostilius Firminus in 100 A.D., and the lead pipe stamped P. Ostili Firmini, establish firm ground for suggesting that at some point around 100 A.D. (perhaps roughly 75-125 A.D.), the owner of the villa at Licenza was named P. Hostilius Firminus, and that he was a member of the senatorial order.

A name is thus attested for an owner of the so-called Villa of Horace. It is not Horace’s name, but this

---

What?,” Journal of Roman Archaeology 13 (2000) 502-506. In a clear-cut case such as this, I see no reason to doubt that the genitive indicates the owner of the pipe, although I continue to think that there are instances where the genitive can have a different meaning. For other fistula stamps omitting the initial H, see, e.g., CIL XV.7467: <H>ateri Latroniani.

10. See the name index in CIL VI.6.1. In Inscriptiones Italicae IV.1 Tibur, the name Iulius Priscus does not occur.
11. See PIR² I 487 (a centurio under the emperor Vitellius); I 488 (a praefectus praetorio in 242/43 A.D.); I 489 (a senator under the emperor Decius).
12. RE VIII.2 (1913) 2506, s.v. Hostilius no. 14 (Kadlec); PIR² H 225.
15. In CIL VI there are altogether some 55 male Hostilli from Rome, but the name is not very common in the higher ranks of society. PIR² H 224-227 registers four Hostili belonging to the senatorial and equestrian orders during the first three centuries A.D., including our Firminus. No Hostili Firmini are mentioned in Epigraphia et ordine senatorio I-II (Rome 1982), which registers prominent Hostili both of the Republican and imperial period; cf. G. Alfeldy, “Städe, Eliten und Gesellschaft in der Gallia Cisalpina,” Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien 30 (1999) 301 and 340, on the impossibility of determining Hostili Firminus’ geographical origin.
16. Cf. also Rudich, E.2, who, accepting Frischer’s identification of Ti. Claudius Burrus whose name
D.13. Inscriptions on Lead Pipes

does not mean that the traditional identification is wrong. The lead pipe belongs to a period about a century after Horace’s death, and real property could change hands as frequently in the Roman world as it does today. The only thing that needs explaining, if one wants to maintain that the villa at Licenza was Horace’s, is how a farm that had passed into the emperor Augustus’ ownership had been returned to a private owner (see Rudich, E.2). There is, however, nothing strange about this, for we have information that emperors from Claudius onward did give up imperial property. The sources mention the returning of property that had been acquired from condemned persons, but conceivably property acquired in other ways could be disposed of as well. Indeed, the emperor Trajan took to selling off imperial property, some of which had fallen into disuse.\(^\text{18}\)

One might even imagine that it was under Trajan that Hostilius Firminus had acquired the villa and that one of the first actions of the new owner was to install proper plumbing.\(^\text{19}\)

A third lead pipe stamp was discovered in the early twentieth-century excavations and presented by Lugli as *Caesernius Lucernio fec.*\(^\text{20}\) Its present whereabouts are unknown. Lugli described the circumstances of the find in the following way: “A large sheet of lead that bears the inscription of a certain *Caesernius Lucernio* was discovered in a bad state of preservation near the *calidarium* and was probably used as a division of some tank or cistern.”\(^\text{21}\) The find-spot was near the sewer labelled “I”, about one meter below the level of what Lugli calls the *calidarium* (rooms S1-3= rooms 44, 47, and 48).\(^\text{22}\)

The name *Caesernius Lucernio* is not known from any other source.\(^\text{23}\) There was an aristocratic family of *Caesernii* that originated from *Aquitia*, but there is no reason to assume a connection.\(^\text{24}\) About

was inscribed on *fistulae* found on the site in the eighteenth century, also discusses the possibility that the villa had been in the possession of the family of Ti. Claudius Parthenius, Domitian’s chamberlain and assassin, in the Flavian period. See Frischer, in Frischer and Brown, 154 n39.

17. That this happened is always maintained on the basis of Suetonius’ short biography of Horace, in which it is stated that a sudden illness prevented Horace from drawing up a proper testament. He was barely able to name Augustus as his heir orally: *herede Augusto palam nuncupato, cum urgenti vi valetudinis non sufficeret ad obsignandas testamenti tabulas* (Suet. *Vita Hor*, p. 48 lines 6-8 [ed. Reiffenscheid 1860]. See also A. Rostagni, *Suetonio De Poetis* e *Biografi Minor* (Turin 1944, reprinted 1979) 123 with commentary; G. Brugnoli, *Suetonio. Vita di Orazio* (Rome 1967) 22.


19. Even if the fortunes of Hostilius Firminus had suffered decline, this does not mean that his son or other relatives would have been impoverished as well. Note that a wealthy North African named Flavius Marcianus, who was also involved the same scandal as Hostilius, was condemned to exile from Rome, from Italy, and from the province of Africa (Plin. *Epist.* 2.11.19-22). It is normally assumed that the imperial procurator Flavius Marcianus Ilius was his descendant, perhaps even his son; see *PIR*\(^2\) F 316 and Bruun 1991, 225f.

22. Lugli 1926, col. 581; for the plan of the excavations to which he refers, see his Tav. III.
23. The *cognomen* Lucernio is not completely unknown, however, for it appears six times in Kajanto’s collection of Latin *cognomina*; see I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (Helsinki 1965) 343. There is no Caesernius among these: one comes from the province of Baetica, another from *Pannonia Superior*, and four appear in Christian (i.e. late antique) inscriptions. In view of these findings, it is somewhat surprising to find someone called Lucernio in Licenza during the first or second century A.D.

24. Only two prominent Caesernii are known from from the first century A.D., namely the senator Caesernius Veiento, praetorian proconsul of Crete and Cyrene in the mid-forties A.D. (not in *PIR*\(^2\)), and the equestrian T. Caesernius Status Quinticius Macedo (*PIR*\(^2\) C 181), who had two sons. They became senators in the first half of the second century A.D. The consular sons are T. Caesernius T. f. Pal. Status Quinticius Macedo Quinticius (*PIR*\(^2\) C 182) and T. Caesernius T. f. Pal. Status Quinticius Stavianus (*PIR*\(^2\) C 183)
a hundred Caesernii of lesser status are known from inscriptions, especially in northern Italy and the northern Balkans (13 are from Rome, however), but there is no Caesernius Lucernio among them.25

D.13.2. Technical Information

D.13.2.1. Inscribed lead pipes in the museum at Licenza26

The fistulae were manufactured according to the usual method; molten lead was poured out onto an even surface to form sheets, which were then bent to form a tube, pear- or drop-shaped in circumference.27 More lead was poured over the joint where the two ends of the lead sheet met to form a seam in the form of a “bridge,” ca. 2.5 cm wide and 1.0 cm high, running along what was to be the upper part of the fistula when properly laid.28

The pipes have been squeezed by the pressure of the earth in which they were laid to the point that it is difficult to ascertain the interior diameter. The inscriptions were all applied just beneath the seam, with the text to be read from the side, i.e., the tops of the letters are next to the seam.

The fistulae in the museum at Licenza are exhibited in four rows, and are here presented in the same order, beginning from the top (fig. 1).

1. inv. no. 00403243
C IVIIVS PRISCVS F
C. Iulius Priscus f(ecit)
Length of the lead pipe, broken at both ends: 50 cm
Length of the inscription, with the letters in relief and no borders along the area carrying the inscription: 22 cm
Height of the letters: 2.2-2.3 cm
Minimum and maximum internal diameter:29 4.8 cm x 8.5 cm
Internal circumference: 22 cm

2. inv. no. 09(?)403243 (the reading is not certain)
P OSTILI FIR[-
P. <H>ostili Fir[mini]
This piece of conduit, broken at both ends, is made of two pipes that have been joined. The reinforcement of the joint, made with molten lead, covers the end of the inscription.
Overall length: 107 cm
Length of the P. Ostili part of the inscription: 11.6 cm (corresponding text in no. 3: 11.7 cm)
Height of the letters: 2.6-3.0 cm (but the letter O has been elongated due to the deformation of the pipe)
Minimum and maximum internal diameter: 6.0 cm x 7.2 cm
Internal circumference: ca. 21 cm

3. inv. no. 00403242
P OSTILI FIRMINI
P. <H>ostili Firmini
Length of the pipe, broken at both ends: 66 cm

26. As stated above, these texts were published by Lugli 1926, col. 581 nos. 2 and 3, but without any details.
In the museum at Licenza, there are also exhibited five pieces of lead pipes without inscriptions. These are of similar size as those with text, that is, 108 cm, 58 cm, 50 cm, 25 cm and 20 cm in length. Lugli 1926, col. 582, mentions six pieces without inscriptions. Some of them (but surely not all) may be those that can now be seen in the museum.
27. On the Roman technique of manufacturing lead pipes and stamping them, see, e.g., A. Cochet and J. Hansen, “Conduites et objets de plomb Gallo-Romains de Vienne (Isère), Gallia Supplément 46 (1986) 22-50 and 57-63.
28. Hansen (as n. 27) 63, observes that the seam always appears to be pointing upward.
29. It has become common to indicate the minimum and maximum internal measures for the pear-shaped (or sometimes even further compressed) fistulae, following the calculations and recommendations of L. Jacno, “La misura delle antiche fistole plumbee,” Cronache Pompeiane 1 (1934-35) 106-108.
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Length of the inscription (form as for no. 1):
23.7 cm
Height of the letters: 2.5-2.7 cm
Minimum and maximum internal diameter:
5.6 cm x 7.5 cm
Internal circumference: 22 cm

4. inv. no. 06(?)/03241 (the reading is not certain)
C IVLIIIS PRISCVS F
C. Iulius Priscus f(ecit)
Length of the inscription (form as for no. 1):
22.8 cm (taking into account that the middle part of the first letter C is missing)
Height of the letters: 2.3-2.5 cm
Minimum and maximum internal diameter:
4.5 cm x 12 cm
Internal circumference: 31 cm

D.13.2.2. Inscribed lead pipes from the 1997-2000 excavations

5. inv. VH 121, Sector I.2, Area 50 (SAL 114590)
fig. 2
C IVLIVS PRISCVS F
C. Iulius Priscus f(ecit)
Length of the pipe: 113 cm
Length of the inscription, with the letters in relief and no borders along the area carrying the inscription: 22.8 cm
Height of the letters: ca. 2.3 cm
Minimum and maximum internal diameter:
6.5 cm x 10.5 cm
Internal circumference: 27 cm
Width of the seam: 2.5-3.5 cm
Height of the seam: 1.0 cm

6. inv. VH 122, Sector I.2, Area 50 (SAL 114585)
figs. 3a and 3b
C IVLIVS PRISCVS F
C. Iulius Priscus f(ecit)
Length of the pipe: 250 cm (following the curve); 215 cm (if measured end to end)
Length of the inscription (form as for no. 5):
22.8 cm
Height of the letters: ca. 2.3 cm
Minimum and maximum internal diameter:
8 cm x 11 cm
Internal circumference: 28 cm
Width of the seam: 2.5-3.5 cm
Height of the seam: 1.0 cm

D.13.3. Commentary on the Inscribed Fistulae

A comparison of the inscriptions mentioning C. Iulius Priscus (nos. 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7) shows that they were all done with the same stamp. In each case, the first letter “C” consists of two curved parts that do not quite meet in the middle. In the name Priscus, the foot of the letter “P” is missing in all cases, while throughout the letter “I” lacks the lower half, and the letter “C” the lower half. Therefore, we can conclude that the Iulius Priscus fistulae found in 1911-1914 and those found in the excavations of 1997-2000 were manufactured at the same time and must belong to the same hydraulic project (see De Simone, D.1.3.6).
The letters in the stamp *P. Ostili Firmini* seem to be slightly larger than those in the stamp *C. Iulius Priscus f.* Yet this does by no means rule out the possibility that Hostilius Firminus’ pipes were made at the same time, and indeed by the *plumbarius* Iulius Priscus. The stamp mentioning the *plumbarius* might have been the standard one used in the workshop, while the stamp for the owner had to be cut specifically for the occasion.

Of the inscribed *fistulae* found in the 1911-1914 excavations, the nearly identical size of pipes nos. 1, 2 and 3 makes it possible that they once belonged together. This is an important question, because it links the pipes manufactured by Iulius Priscus to those carrying the name of Hostilius Firminus. In the excavations of 1997-2000, only stamps of Iulius Priscus have been found, but this time we have a stratigraphic context for the finds, which thus also might enable us to date the presence of Hostilius Firminus.

The Iulius Priscus pipe no. 4 is clearly larger in size and more like no. 6, which carries an identical stamp, while no. 5, also naming Iulius Priscus, seems to be between the smaller pipes (nos. 1-3) and the larger ones (nos. 4 and 6) in size.

**D.13.4. ANEPIGRAPHIC LEAD PIPES FROM THE EXCAVATIONS OF 1997-2000**

These pipes were reportedly moved by earlier excavators, and their original find-spots are not known (fig. 6).

**8. inv. VH 085, Sector I.2, Area 50 (SAL 114587)**

Length of the pipe: 121 cm
Minimum and maximum internal diameter: 5.5 cm x 12 cm
External circumference: 32 cm
Width of the seam: 2.2-3.0 cm
Height of the seam: 1.0 cm

**9. inv. VH 086, Sector I.2, Area 50 (SAL 114588)**

Length of the pipe: 189 cm. Near one end there is a joint, with the two pieces joined at a horizontal angle of some 135°. At a distance of 110 cm from the joint, the conduit shows a hole in the upper part, in line with the seam, having the minimum/maximum diameters of 2.8 and 2.9 cm. The hole was perhaps meant for a stopcock, or possibly for a smaller conduit branching off.

The deformity of the pipe prevented the taking of internal diameter measurements. The external circumference is 33 cm (not including the seam). The seam is 2.5-3.5 cm wide and 1.0 cm high.

**10. inv. VH 087, Sector I.2, Area 50 (SAL 114589)**

Length of the pipe: 138 cm. At one end there are traces of a joint.
Minimum and maximum internal diameter: 6.5 cm x 11.5 cm
External circumference: 29 cm
Width of the seam: 2.3-2.9 cm
Height of the seam: 1.0 cm

---

31. There is even the possibility that pipes nos. 1 and 2 actually carry the same inventory number, perhaps because the pipe was broken after its discovery. But deciphering the early excavation’s inventory numbers is much more difficult than reading the Roman stamp.
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D.13. INSCRIPTIONS ON LEAD PIPES
**D.14. THE ARCHAEOBOTANICAL REMAINS FROM THE GARDEN**

**BY JENNIFER RAMSAY**

---

**D.14.1. INTRODUCTION**

During the 1998 through 2000 excavation seasons at Horace’s Villa, several soil samples, ranging in size from one liter to ten liters, were recovered from the garden area by a team of garden archaeologists led by Prof. Kathryn Gleason of Cornell University. The material recovered was from either medieval rubble deposits or Flavian garden soil. Although preservation was thought to be poor, it was hoped that some carbonized botanical material survived and could be identified. Such material could give indications of the plants in the larger agrarian landscape and of the diet of the inhabitants of the villa.

Of the soil samples recovered, 19 were chosen for flotation during the summer of 2000. They were thought to have the best potential for yielding plant remains, as they were large enough to provide an adequate sample size and were from areas in or near artifacts with which plant material may have been associated, such as flowerpots and amphorae. It is the material that was recovered from these 19 samples, as well as one sample of charcoal, that provides the basis for this report.

---

**D.14.2. METHODOLOGY**

The 19 soil samples obtained for analysis had been stored in large, sealed plastic bags to avoid contamination until the time of processing (table 1). Once processing began, each sample was transferred to a labeled bucket, which was filled with water and hydrogen peroxide in order to facilitate the breakdown of the soil matrix. Hydrogen peroxide flotation was adopted because the soil matrix was of a mud/clay consistency, which made recovery difficult. This technique is designed to recover botanical remains by acting as a deflocculant; the oxidizing action of the hydrogen peroxide releases bubbles of gas, which fill the hollow cases of the carbonized seeds and carry them to the surface.¹

The soil samples were left in a 10% hydrogen peroxide solution for 24 hours and frequently stirred to release trapped seeds. Once a sample had been sufficiently dispersed, the suspended material (flot) was poured through stacked 1mm and 300 µm sieves. These two light fractions (coarse flot and fine flot) were then wet-sieved to remove any remaining woody material or sediment. The residues were then dried and transferred to labeled plastic bags for transportation to the laboratory at Simon Fraser University, Canada. The heavy fraction of each sample, which is the material that sank to the bottom of the bucket, was also wet-sieved through a 1mm mesh screen and sorted. The light fractions, once in the lab, were sorted under a Leica stereoscopic microscope using x15 magnification. All of the material that could be identified as plant fragments was removed for identification.

The recovered botanical material was identified using an archaeobotanical reference collection in the Department of Archaeology at Simon Fraser University, and through drawings and books from the Department of Archaeology and Prehistory at the University of Sheffield. The seeds and other types of plant remains were identified by comparing the morphological characteristics of the carbonized specimens with the modern material from the reference collection and from pictures in seed atlases.² Plant remains that did not fit the standard morphological identification criteria, or were too badly fragmented to be placed in an exact category, were assigned to an intermediate group (e.g. cf. *Pisum sativa*), placed in an indeterminate class (e.g. Gramineae

---


indet.), or were classified in a species type that was the most similar in morphological appearance (e.g. Geraninaceae type).

The sample of charcoal (sample number 20 in table 1) was examined using a Zeiss Jena POL compound microscope with magnification up to x100. The identification of the charcoal was accomplished using comparative material from the reference collection at Simon Fraser University and wood anatomy reference books.3

D.14.3. Results

All of the coarse flot material (from the 1mm sieve) was sorted, identified and recorded in table 2. There were no identifiable botanical remains in samples 5, 11 and 18; sample 10 contained only modern plant material (Rubus L. sp. and Chenopodium L. sp.). Although it is relatively certain that many other plants were grown and utilized at Horace’s Villa, most would not have come in contact with fire and consequently would only have a small chance of being preserved.

The heavy fraction remains were also sorted for all but three samples, owing to time constraints and to the fact that little botanical material was recovered in the first 16 samples. Nine of the fine flots (from the 300 µm sieve) were scanned under a stereoscopic microscope, but only minute fragments of charcoal were observed, which indicated that continued scanning would not be productive. The sample of charcoal was identified and is recorded as sample 20 in table 2. Due to the sparse quantity of material that was recovered from each sample (no more than 10 items), table 2 indicates the presence of a species (+) in each sample and not the raw count.

The preservation of botanical material is generally quite poor and consequently identification to species level; as a result they were grouped in a Triticum sp. category. Likewise, there were several grains that could be identified as cereal grains, but because of poor preservation it could not be determined if they were wheat or barley. However, domesticated barley (Hordeum vulgare), characterized by being pointed at both the apex and the embryo, and by being rounded on the ventral surface and angular on the dorsal surface, was positively identified and appears in samples 14 and 17. Other crop species that are represented are legumes, such as grass pea (Lathyrus sativus), common pea (Pisum sativum) and horse bean (Vicia faba). Legumes that could not be identified as to genus or species were grouped in the category Leguminaceae. As for fruit and nut species, only olives (Olea sp.) and grapes (Vitis sp.) were recovered.

The majority of the wild plants represent a combination of field or cultivation weeds (including vineyards and possibly olive groves), and weeds that are hydrophilic. This illustrates that most of the wild material preserved was either introduced with the crop species during harvest or deposited in areas that were used for fill. Some of the weeds identified and their ecological habitats are: Lolium temulentum (darnel), which appears mainly in fields of cereal crops; Chenopodium sp. (fat hen), a common weed in tilled and irrigated fields, which has been cultivated in the past as a bread plant;4 Ranuncules sp. (buttercup family), which is associated with cultivated, disturbed or waste grounds; Astragalus sp. (milk-vetches), found commonly on cultivated ground; Galium sp. (bedstraw), associated with grassy habitats, roadsides and olive groves; and Allium sp. (onions, garlic, leeks), which are found on cultivated and waste ground, and in vineyards and olive groves.

In addition, there are several weed and wild species that are associated with wet or moist environments, such as Scirpus sp. (bulrush), found in marshes or brackish swamps; Carex sp. (sedge), which grows in damp or marsh-like environments; Rumex sp. (dock/sorrel), which lives in swamps and other damp places; and Geraniumaceae (e.g. crane’s-bill), a herb


4. Its seeds are also used medicinally since they are both highly nutritive and possess large amounts of vitamin C.
that is often grown in gardens and is found in moist or damp soils.

**D.14. Interpretation**

The actual plant remains recovered archaeologically represent the material that was not used by the villa, since the material would not have been incorporated in the archaeological record had it been consumed. Moreover, the representation of archaeobotanical remains is biased by a variety of factors that affect the material during all phases of deposition. For example, the carbonization of seeds is not just a process of preservation but also a process of destruction. The final assemblage after charring is determined by the differential preservation rates of each species and it is therefore difficult to ascertain the original composition. Consequently, caution must be used when interpreting fossilized assemblages.\(^5\)

The botanical remains from the garden at Horace’s Villa appear to represent material that was accidentally or intentionally charred in a hearth or parching oven, cleaned out and deposited on the garden to act as a fertilizer. This is the most plausible explanation for several reasons. First, the material that is preserved is charred, which implies that it had to come in contact with fire or high temperature, which would have most likely happened in the villa setting in an oven or hearth. Likewise, the recovery of charred oak suggests that the deposit was removed from a hearth where the wood was used as fuel. Second, most of the plant remains are not reflective of the variety of plants that grew in gardens and therefore they must have come from elsewhere. Third, the incorporation of crop species in the assemblage appears to indicate that the material emanated from an area of food preparation or processing. Finally, the weed species present in the samples must have been separated from the crop species during processing and have been disposed of, possibly by burning in an oven or hearth.

This data, then, can tell us very little about the plants growing in the garden at the time of occupation, because unless the garden was intentionally burned, there would have been no way for the seeds of the garden plants to carbonize and therefore survive in the archaeological record. On the other hand it may well be possible to find out about the larger agrarian landscape through the variety of species recovered. Although the quantity of the plant remains is sparse, the remains do suggest what was going on in the natural economy of the site and its region, as well as what was being consumed in the villa. For example, wheat was used for flour to make bread, which was a dietary staple in the Mediterranean region. There are indications that the wheat was locally processed, as there are crop by-products in the samples, such as cereal size culm nodes, rachis fragments and weed species that are commonly associated with crop fields. However, without further sampling at the site and at other sites in the region, it cannot be known whether the wheat was grown locally or imported. Similarly, barley was used for flour, feed and perhaps malted for beer, but as there are no indications of the by-products of barley from the villa, it is difficult to ascertain if it was locally grown or imported. Common pea and horse bean, grown as economic crops, could have been grown locally, as they are less labor and land intensive than cereal crops and may even have been a garden crop. It does seem probable that the grapes and olives were cultivated locally, as the villa would have had to have its own supplies.

**D.14.5. Conclusions**

From the information collected during recovery and analysis of plant remains at Horace’s Villa, a flora assemblage has been established for both the cereal/crop items and weed species. The examination of these remains permits us to hypothesize what crop items were being consumed in the villa and from this, a tentative picture of the larger agrarian landscape can be drawn.

We may conclude that at Horace’s Villa the crop species present were barley, wheats, olives, grapes and legumes, as seen from the carbonized material that remains. Moreover, most of the material recovered appears to indicate waste products that had

been cleaned out of a hearth or oven and deposited on the villa’s garden to act as a fertilizer.

The information acquired from this archaeobotanical investigation is interesting in that it provides insight into the domestic and economic life of the villa and provides important clues about the larger agrarian landscape, including how the villa may have functioned in the agricultural economy. Further recovery and analysis is necessary to increase our knowledge of the economy and environment of the site.

In this regard, it must be noted that only a small part of the quadriporticus garden was excavated in the 1998-2000 campaigns. The results thus far are very promising and certainly prove that the site is productive of archaeobotanical material. Further studies are definitely warranted. Likewise, analysis of other villa sites would undoubtedly aid in our understanding of both household and regional economies during this period. Only after such studies have been undertaken will it be possible to contextualize the results reported here from Horace’s Villa, putting them into the broader picture of Roman villa life during the imperial period in central Italy.
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E.1. SOILS AND LANDSCAPES OF “HORACE’S VILLA” AND ADJACENT AREAS

BY JOHN E. FOSS, MICHAEL E. ESSINGTON, YUL ROH, DEBRA H. PHILIPS

E.1.1. INTRODUCTION

Horace’s Villa is located in the Sabine hills in central Italy near the small village of Licenza. The villa is situated in the deeply dissected limestone region with topographic changes from 360-410 meters in the valleys to over 980-1059 meters on the high peaks. The elevation of the villa is approximately 420-430 meters. The steep slopes and generally shallow upland soils limit intensive agriculture in the Licenza area. Present land use in the region is dominated by forests with the limited areas of agricultural crops on the more moderate slopes. Agricultural crops include olives, small gardens, fruit trees, and pasture in alluvial areas.

As part of an archaeological investigation Horace’s Villa, a soils study was initiated in August 1998 and continued in July and September 1999, and in July 2000. Soil descriptions and evaluations of landscapes were made throughout the villa; this included several gardens, a large bank cut that was excavated previously, and areas undergoing evaluation by archaeologists. A general reconnaissance soil-landscape survey of areas adjacent to the villa was also initiated. Several soils in the villa and in surrounding areas were sampled for laboratory analysis. The finding of lead pipes in the excavations resulted in detailed laboratory analysis of soils within and surrounding the pipes.

The objectives of the soils study were to:

1. Determine the general soil stratigraphy at Horace’s Villa and surrounding areas.
2. Describe the morphological characteristics of soils in the villa and evaluate their physical, chemical, and mineralogical properties.
3. Evaluate soils associated with the lead pipes.
4. Integrate the soils information into the history of the site and the archaeological data.

E.1.2. METHODS

E.1.2.1. FIELD METHODS

Soils associated with the archaeological excavations at Horace’s Villa were described and sampled; these evaluations were supplemented by numerous auger borings throughout the study site. A bucket-type auger with a diameter of 8.3 cm was used to determine the stratigraphy. Soils were described throughout the site, but examination at some locations was limited in depth as a result of the large amount of coarse fragments in the soil. The coarse fragments consisted mainly of artifacts; these included bricks, roof- tiles, limestone-marble fragments, and other miscellaneous materials. The most difficult unit to penetrate with the auger was the surficial 1-2 m of disturbed soils resulting from previous excavations or other man-made land modifications in the center of the Villa.

Fig. 1 shows the location of the sampling sites in the study area (for sampling in the surrounding areas see fig. 21).

The soils were described using standard Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) guidelines of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Soil horizons identified (e.g. A, Bt, C) are also commonly used in profile descriptions prepared by soil scientists. The colors recorded in the descriptions were made using the Munsell soil chart.

Samples were obtained from several of the major soils occurring in the villa. Samples, taken by horizons, were crushed with a rolling pin and then put through a 10-mesh sieve to remove particles >2 mm. All laboratory analysis was made on the <2 mm-sized particles.

E.1.2.2. LABORATORY METHODS

Samples were obtained from soil surrounding the recently excavated lead (Pb) pipes at the villa (figs. 2 and 3). The pipes are approximately 12 cm in diameter.

and 3 m in length. Soil samples were taken from inside the pipes and from the soil surrounding a lead pipe at one location in 1-3 cm increments radiating away from it. Additional soil samples were taken from off-site soil excavations to determine background Pb levels. The samples were digested using an aqua regia-HF microwave digestion procedure.² They were also subjected to weak, double acid extraction using mixed 0.61 M HCl and 0.16 M HNO₃.³ The soil extract and digest were analyzed for Al, As, Ba, Ca, Cd, Co, Cr, Cu, Fe, K, Mg, Mn, Mo, Ni, P, Pb, S, Si, Sr, Ti, Zn, and Zr by using a Thermo Jarrell-Ash Model 61 ICAP-AES. The elemental concentrations of Co, Cu, Cr, Ni, Pb, and Zn were examined in detail.

Bulk soil samples that contained greater than 10 g kg⁻¹ (1%) total Pb, as well as the crust that encased the lead pipe, were subjected to mineralogical analysis using powder mounts and a Siemens D500 x-ray diffractometer operated at 40 kV and 30 mA to produce Ni-filtered, Cu Kα radiation. Selected samples were subjected to particle size fractionation to separate the soil particles into sand (> 50 µm), silt (2-50 µm), and clay (< 2 µm) fractions. The mineralogy of the size separates was also determined using x-ray diffraction (XRD) analysis. A Hanawalt-type search was performed to identify the mineral phases, the presence of which was validated by comparing the soil XRD data to the standard powder diffraction files. In addition to XRD, minerals in the Pb-bearing soils were examined using scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and energy dispersive x-ray analysis (EDXA). The SEM produces morphological information, while EDXA generates chemical information on a particle-specific basis. The one limitation of EDXA is that lighter elements (atomic masses below sodium) are not detectable. Thus, while metals are easily detected by the technique, the common ligands that metals may associate with in the solid phase, such as carbonate, hydroxide, and oxygen, are not detected.

E.1.3. Results and Discussion

E.1.3.1. Field Results

General setting

The general landscape components of the Licenza valley are shown in fig. 4. Alluvial sediments (water-deposited) form the lower elevations of the valley, with uplands formed mainly on sedimentary rocks. The geologic materials at Horace’s Villa and surrounding areas are mainly sedimentary rocks with limestones and shales dominating. Shale is the major rock type at the villa. Outcrops west of the site are a mixture of shale, limestone, and interbedded shale and limestone (fig. 5). The geologic setting, with limestone overlying impervious shale, is responsible for the numerous springs located near the study site. Springs develop when water percolates through the limestone and then is impeded in its downward movement by the shale. This causes the water to flow out to the surface. In the dry conditions of July and August, four to six springs are still active in most years.

In one area west of Roccagiovine, strata were upturned with interbedded shale and limestone beds. In many other areas in the valley, e.g. near Licenza, limestones were the dominant rock type. In the Castagneto, just east of the villa, volcanic tufa was identified as the major geologic formation; an outcrop of this deposit was also identified near the parking lot in the northeastern portion of Horace’s Villa. Small gravel-sized gray to light brownish gray tufa (10YR 6/1-6/2) was noted in several excavations and numerous auger borings. Fig. 5 shows the generalized relationship of the major parent materials for soils occurring at Horace’s Villa and surrounding areas.

Colluvial deposits of mixed lithology and soil materials were commonly noted at the base of steep slopes throughout the valley. Extensive deposits of alluvium occur along the Licenza river south of the village along the road linking Licenza to Vicovaro. Less extensive alluvial deposits occur along the smaller tributary streams. Several profiles observed along the Licenza river had recent alluvial sediments (80 to 110 cm) overlying a buried surface with occasional artifacts. These recent alluvial sediments


were strongly calcareous, dark brown (10YR 3/2 or 7.5YR 3/2), and clayey.

**Horace’s Villa**

The soils of Horace’s Villa were developed mainly from shale parent material, but the overlying sediment resulting from erosion or human activities seems to have developed from limestone-derived soils. The occurrence of numerous limestone fragments and the general nature of soils (dark color and strongly calcareous) occurring in the overlying sediment provide evidence that limestone was a major component in the soil matrix. The shale bedrock was yellowish-brown and mainly non-calcareous, but certain profiles had calcareous shale. The shale bedrock had an uneven surface; this was quite evident in several profiles, but especially in Sector VII.1, Area 24 (soil profile S98It8). In part of this trench, the shale occurred at 1 m and in another at over 1.8 m. This uneven surface may be the result of natural erosion, but also could be the result of land modification of the garden area during construction.

Table 1 gives the morphologic features of the soils described in the villa. As noted in the descriptions in Table 1, most of the soils show numerous discontinuities (indicated by Arabic numerals); this indicates disturbance of soils with sediments being added to previous surfaces. Discontinuities are commonly associated with human-influenced or urban soils.

**Sector VII.1**

The profiles described at Sector VII.1 consist of 180 cm of calcareous overburden from limestone-derived soils; this material contained many artifacts, limestone fragments (gravel and cobble size), and had a high content of organic matter. The calcareous overburden is typical for most of the villa, especially north and south of the pool (Area 25). The thickness of the overburden is variable; in most of the central part of the villa, north and south of the pool, the general thickness ranges from 1-3 m. Near the outer walls north and south of the pool, the calcareous overburden is usually <1 m.

The exact origin of the calcareous overburden is still unknown. This material had definitely been disturbed after the various early occupations and some previous excavations. The high organic matter, calcareous nature, dark color, and presence of limestone fragments indicate that the material originated as surficial soil, possibly as alluvium or colluvium near the site. The sediment had similar characteristics to the deep alluvial soils described on the south end of the villa and also down the valley south of the site.

The garden soil at Sector VII.1 was developed from shale-derived soil. In both profiles described at this site (S98It8 and S99It8), the buried garden surfaces had dark brown to very dark grayish-brown colors, clay texture, and were non-calcareous. The garden surfaces were underlain by clayey subsoils (Bt) and relatively unweathered clayey and shaley material. This sequence of horizonation of soils developed on shale occurred in other profiles at the study site (e.g., C6, C7 and C14).

**Sector VI.1**

The soils at Sector VI.1 (Profile S98It1) consisted of 170 cm of recently deposited silty clay loam, very dark grayish-brown (10YR 3/2), calcareous materials overlying a series of horizons with different textures, and organic matter additions (Table 1). Possible buried surfaces were noted at 215-235 cm (4Ab) and at 250-260 cm (5Ab). These surfaces were of short duration based on organic additions, thickness of horizons, and lack of underlying pedogenic development. The mottling occurring below 260 cm indicates water table influence during the soil formation process. Core no. 2 (S98It7), taken about 16 m to the south of profile S98It1, had over 100 cm of recent sediment overlying the original garden soil.

**Profile C6, S00It4**

This profile had a buried surface at 240-275 cm containing artifacts and charcoal. The charcoal fragments were sent for Carbon-14 dating at the Stafford Research Laboratories in Boulder, CO. The sample number is CANS-73447; this number was given at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Center for Accelerator Mass Spectrometry. The sample was dated to 2550 +/- 40 B.P. This date is significant in that this level (240-275 cm) marks the beginning of construction and habitation of the site.
Also, the horizons above this zone have developed in the last 2500 years, and large quantities of soil were brought to or moved at the villa site, perhaps to provide a more level garden area. It appears that the drainage way on the south end of the villa extended north along the western edge of the current structures. Thus, fill was needed to provide a more satisfactory landscape for construction. The fill material was composed of shale-derived soil that was readily available on site.

**Bank cut, S98It2.**

The soils at the bank cut were derived mainly from colluvial deposits. The profile showed four major discontinuities with three major buried surfaces; these surfaces occur at 48-60 cm (2Ab), 88-118 cm (3Ab), and 143-183 cm (4Ab). The surfaces probably did not exist for very long periods of time because of the minimal development in the underlying horizons. The soils data need to be correlated with the archaeological findings to determine the age relationships of this unique profile. Artifacts were noted throughout the profile. Shale parent material was evident at the base of the slope.

**Gardens**

Soils of several gardens were studied using an auger to determine the general nature of the sediments. In several of the gardens, the content of coarse fragments limited the soils investigation with the auger. The small peristyle garden (Garden no. 1=Area 8) had about 60 cm of soil overlying shale bedrock, with shale fragments also occurring throughout the profile (table 1).

**Regional studies**

Table 2 shows the general morphological characteristics of soils observed in areas of the Licenza valley near Horace’s Villa, and figure 4 shows the relationships between landscapes and geologic materials. The upland soils near the villa are briefly described at stops 8, 9, 11, and 13. The soils are derived from shale bedrock and are generally shallow (< 1 m) except for the soil occurring in the chestnut forest (Castagneo) east of the site. The soil in the forest and exposed on the bank overlooking the parking lot (S98It5), however, was strongly developed (clayey argillic horizon and thick profile), indicating a stable geomorphologic surface for a long period (perhaps 100,000 years or more). The soils in the chestnut forest are derived from volcanic tufa and this material weathers much faster than the surrounding shale or limestone bedrock.

**E.1.3.2. Laboratory results**

**General conditions**

Table 3 gives the results of the chemical analysis of several soil profiles at Horace’s Villa. A major characteristic of soils at the villa is the amount of Ca in the upper 2 m of soil; for example, S98It8 (Sector VII.1) had over 26,000 mg/kg of Ca from 15 to 210 cm and S98It2 (Bank cut) had over 130,000 mg/kg throughout the 2.1 m profile. This characteristic indicates the domination of limestone residuum in the upper several meters of soil at Horace’s Villa. The Castagneo, on the other hand, had Ca values <290 mg/kg throughout the profile; these values indicate the change in parent material to volcanic tufa. Castagneo soils also had differences in Mg, Mn, and Sr as contrasted to soils derived from limestone or shale. The shale parent material below 210 cm in S98It8 had Ca values <7277 mg/kg. Differences in parent material drastically change the chemistry of the soils in the villa.

**Soil Pb concentrations**

Soil samples obtained at incremental distances from the lead pipe, as well as from within the pipe, indicate Pb migration (table 4). The concentration of Pb in the soil samples is a function of the distance from the pipe. Soil within the ~12 cm inside diameter pipe contains 25.4 g kg⁻¹ Pb. Lead concentrations in the soil surrounding the pipe are 30.8 g kg⁻¹ (0-1 cm from pipe), 4.02 g kg⁻¹ (1-3 cm), 3.34 g kg⁻¹ (3-6 cm), and 1.40 g kg⁻¹ (6-9 cm). The Pb content of a soil sample collected 0.5 m from the pipe (at the same elevation) is 157 mg kg⁻¹ (0.157 g kg⁻³). The Pb content of a soil sample collected from the buried A-horizon of a profile in the vicinity of the villa (‘Background’ in table 4) is 50 mg kg⁻¹ (0.05 g kg⁻³). The higher Pb concentrations in the villa control sample, relative to that of the off-site background sample, is a finding consistent with those from other Roman archaeological sites; most
notably, soil Pb levels are elevated relative to adjacent and uninhabited areas. The data further indicate that, aside from Pb, no trace element was present at levels above the background. However, concentrations of Cu, Ni, and Zn are clearly elevated in soil samples collected within the pipe relative to concentrations in samples collected 6 to 9 cm from the pipe. Copper and Ni concentrations are also elevated in the 0 to 1 cm sample relative to concentrations in the 6 to 9 cm sample.

**Total versus double acid-extractable metals**

Lewis et al. promoted the double acid extraction technique as a cost-effective mechanism for assessing the trace element content of soils at archaeological sites. With the exception of Cr, the double acid-extractable and total metal content of soils from Italian archaeological sites are highly correlated (fig. 6). Correlation coefficients (r) are: 0.698 (Co), 0.235 (Cr), 0.829 (Cu), 0.520 (Ni), 0.915 (Pb), and 0.977 (Zn). All r values are significant at the 0.001 level (except for Cr). In addition, the double acid extraction exhibits a high level of efficiency, particularly for Co, Cu, and Pb, and to a lesser extent for Zn. Regression equations relating total metal content (denoted by T) to double acid extractable metals (denoted by DA) are: \( T_{Co} = 3.72 + 0.78\ D_{Co} \) \((r^2 = 0.49***)\), \( T_{Cu} = 41.86 + 1.32\ D_{Cu} \) \((r^2 = 0.68***)\), \( T_{Ni} = 15.58 + 7.69\ D_{Ni} \) \((r^2 = 0.27***)\), \( T_{Pb} = 86.2 + 0.66\ D_{Pb} \) \((r^2 = 0.66***)\), and \( T_{Zn} = 51.3 + 1.53\ D_{Zn} \) \((r^2 = 0.51***)\). As is evidenced by these regression equations, the acid extraction is nearly as effective as total dissolution in assessing the total content of Co, Cu, Pb, and Zn in these soils. Although total and double acid-extractable Ni concentrations are significantly correlated, the relationship between these two elemental Ni concentration parameters is somewhat tenuous. Further, the concentrations of both Ni and Cr in the double acid extracts are not in proportion to their total concentrations. Maximum acid-extractable Cr and Ni are approximately 4 mg kg\(^{-1}\) and 10 mg kg\(^{-1}\), respectively, while total concentrations range up to approximately 80 mg kg\(^{-1}\) and 180 mg kg\(^{-1}\), respectively. The lack of significance in the correlations of total and acid-extractable Cr and Ni may be associated with the mineralogical environment in which these elements reside. With the exception of Pb, the trace elements in the Horace's Villa soils originate as minor inclusions in silicate mineral phases. When released through weathering processes, these elements will form mineral phases that are stable under the prevailing environmental conditions. For the soil conditions at Horace's Villa (alkaline and free calcium carbonate), Co, Cu, and Zn may precipitate in carbonate and hydroxycarbonate phases. These phases are easily dissolved by the double-acid extractant. On the other hand, Cr and Ni do not appear to weather to acid-soluble phases, either preferring to remain in the silicate framework or to form acid-stable oxide and hydroxide phases when released through weathering.

**Mineralogy of Pb**

The crust on the lead pipe is primarily composed of litharge [PbO], with smaller amounts of cerrusite [PbCO\(_3\)] and quartz (fig. 7). Metallic Pb was also identified in the crust. Scanning electron microscopy and EDXA of the Pb pipe-soil contact clearly illustrates the presence of Pb-bearing particles that are fibrous (needle-like) and platy (figs. 8 and 9), reflecting the crystal habits of cerrusite and litharge. The occurrence of litharge (a weathering product of metallic Pb) and metallic Pb, coupled with the finding that whole sections of the pipe could be completely dissolved in a pH 5 buffered CH\(_3\)COONa (sodium acetate) solution, indicate that the crust was originally the lead pipe. Energy dispersive x-ray data also indicate the presence of Cu in the Pb-bearing particles found in the pipe crust (figs. 10-13). This observation that Cu occurs in detectable concentrations in Pb precipitates is consistent with the chemical data, which shows elevated Cu levels in soil proximate to the lead pipe.

The soil within the pipe is predominantly composed of cerrusite and calcite, with a small amount of quartz (fig. 14). X-ray diffraction of the particle-size separates of the soil inside the pipe suggests that cerrusite is concentrated in the smaller-size separates (fig. 15). This conclusion is evidenced by the stronger cerrusite diffraction lines in the silt-size fraction, relative to the cerrusite diffraction lines in the sand-sized fraction. SEM and EDX analysis of silt and sand fractions also showed that calcite is a dominant
The stability diagram indicates that the other local rocks because of its porous nature and usually results in more rapid soil development than the other local rocks because of its porous nature and mixed mineralogy. Alluvial deposits make up the bulk of sediments in valley. Such deposits are common on the southern portion of the villa and also existed on the western side prior to construction activities. The overburden in the central portion of the study site is also probably limestone-derived alluvium.

Most of the soils described at Horace’s Villa show a great deal of disturbance in the upper meter or more and probably represent past excavation activities and recent land modification. Below this 1-2 m layer, however, the garden soils developed primarily from shale and show dark colors, mostly leached of carbonates, and have clayey textures. Chemical characteristics also indicate wide differences in elemental composition of soils developed on shale, limestone, and volcanic tufa.

Soil samples were collected from the excavation of Horace’s Villa to examine trace element content, relative to the surrounding environs, and to document the movement of Pb from lead pipes that were emplaced more than 2000 years ago. Of the trace elements examined (Co, Cr, Cu, Ni, Pb, and Zn), only Pb concentrations in soil at the villa were found to exceed background levels, although Cu, Ni, and Zn concentrations were elevated in soil proximate to the lead pipe. Lead concentrations in the pipe and up to 9 cm away from it were highly elevated relative to control levels. The metals content of the soils, as determined using a double acid extraction procedure, was found to mimic the total metals content for Co, Cu, Pb, and Zn. The extraction procedure was less efficient than total dissolution for determining Ni and Cr, although the results from these two procedures were significantly correlated for Ni determinations. The lead pipe was encased by a crust that was composed primarily of litharge, with smaller amounts of cerrusite. This observation, coupled with ancillary information, indicated that the crust embodies the skeletal remains of the pipe, rather than representing an authigenic coating. Soil within the pipe and in close proximity to the pipe contained cerrusite. The direct observation of this mineral was consistent with the predicted stability of Pb-bearing minerals in this environment.
E.1. SOILS AND LANDSCAPES OF “HORACE’S VILLA” AND ADJACENT AREAS
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In his recent study of Roman villas, Pappalardo observes: “Over 3,000 Roman villas are known in the West, but hardly any owners’ names.” Horace’s Villa at Licenza proves a remarkable exception. It is true that at the present stage of its excavation, it is not possible to establish with any certainty whether that villa could have indeed been the one that was owned by Horace and celebrated in his poems. Still, one cannot and should not discard this possibility, supported as it is both by local tradition and considerations of topography. At the same time the findings, including the most recent, offer inscriptions indicating by name several individuals who must have owned this property in the period between the mid-first century B.C. and the early second century A.D. As will be seen, some of those names have important implications for the political history of the early Roman Empire.

In order to elucidate the issue, however, and before any attempt at identifying the villa’s owners is made, it seems imperative to inquire into the economy of the fiscus, since we know that in his testament Horace left his estate to Augustus (Suet. Vita Hor. 8). Especially important is the movement of properties, in terms of sales and resales, in and out of the imperial domain, during the period under consideration. It goes without saying that at this stage of our knowledge any effort at a plausible reconstruction can be made only in the most tentative sense, and must be based on disparate evidence filled with gaps.

Modern scholarship has long ago established with certainty that the imperial domain could not only increase through inheritance, confiscation and gift, but could also be diminished “by various forms of alienation” on the part of the emperors. Egypt is often cited as the standard example to illustrate the practice of the emperors, beginning with Augustus, of bestowing gifts of land on their relatives and associates. Scholars have debated whether the owners of all formerly imperial estates in Egypt held these lands as doreai (donations), or as ousiai, that is, property acquired on the open market. Given the emperors’ vested interest in Egypt as the main source of grain, and their control of the senatorial movements in that province, the former view seems more plausible. It is also supported by the evidence of P. Ryl. 171 (56-57 A.D.), which concerns the plot of twenty seven arouras donated by Nero to his favorite freedman, Doryphorus. The document also states that the land had previously belonged to Claudius’ powerful freedman secretary, Narcissus. No doubt similar practices existed elsewhere other than Egypt. Moreover, one must also agree with the contention that such and similar gifts of land “often returned to the emperor through inheritance and could be redistributed as he wished amongst a fairly limited circle of associates.” As we will see, all of this might have had a direct implication on the fortunes of “Horace’s Villa” after the poet’s death.

We know that, for various reasons and in various periods, the emperors were willing to dispose of their land for profit. Thus, after his accession to power, Galba put Nero’s estates on auction and there was no lack of prospective buyers (Plut. Gal. 5.5). Nerva was not averse to selling land for quick cash (Dio 68.2.2) and Pliny the Younger commends Trajan for

4. For the estate sizes in Italy, see Duncan-Jones, 323ff.
5. Crawford, 42. Extrapolated to the Augustan period, this argument might support, albeit indirectly, the notion of Horatian ownership of the villa.
doing the same (Paneg. 50).\textsuperscript{6} At least two episodes of considerable fiscal crisis during the Julio-Claudian period are reported, when some portions of the imperial estate might have been sold into private hands on a scale larger than usual, with the object of financial recovery: one in 38 A.D., after Caligula’s first year in power (Suet. Cal. 37; Dio 59.2) and another, apparently, much more serious, in 64 A.D. under Nero, in the aftermath of the Great Fire (Tac. Ann. 15.45; cf. 16.3; Dio Epit. 62.18.5; Suet. Nero 31f, 38). Last but not least, one assumes that the throes of Civil War in 68-69 A.D. and the devastation of the Italian countryside would have compelled any of Nero’s successors to allow further sales of their land or properties, perhaps for even lower prices.\textsuperscript{7} Consequently, we may propose that, under the above circumstances, or for that matter at any other point in the history of the first century A.D., the Licenza villa, if willed by Horace to Augustus, might have passed from the imperial domain back to private ownership.

Most of the names appearing in the stamps on bricks and roof-tiles belong to the persons responsible for producing such items: the \textit{domini} of the \textit{figlinae}, the \textit{officinatores}, etc. (see Filippi, D.4). Of seven names that seem to indicate the Licenza villa’s owners,\textsuperscript{8} three cannot be placed in time with any degree of confidence;\textsuperscript{9} one \textit{gentilicum} is extremely rare, and another entirely unknown.\textsuperscript{10} To these must be added two further inscriptions discovered on the lead water pipes (see below, and see Bruun, D.13).

In what follows I will concentrate only on those individuals whose names allow a possibility of identification, or at least are datable, however tentatively.

Thus qualified, the earliest brick stamps bear the name of MANIUS NAEVIUS and are presumably late Republican.\textsuperscript{11} Under the Republic, the Naevii (this \textit{gentilicum} was apparently common to both senatorial and equestrian clans) had never reached true prominence.\textsuperscript{12} Apart from the poet Cn. Naevius (certainly not a senator), one can mention perhaps only M. Naevius, \textit{tribunus plebis} of 184 B.C., who might have had a hand in the attempted impeachment

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{6} See Crawford, 43f; for some further evidence on the sales of imperial estates, \textit{ibid.}, 177 n52.

\textsuperscript{7} In the \textit{Digest} (D. 49.14.50.3 \textit{decret.}) one finds a detailed discussion by Paul of a case pertaining to the sale of an estate by the imperial \textit{fiscus} to a private individual. The legal question, however, concerned only “the ownership of the crops harvested during the time intervening between the purchaser’s original bid and his subsequent, successful bid;” See also D. P. Kehoe, \textit{Investment, Profit and Tenancy. The Jurists and the Roman Agrarian Economy} (Ann Arbor 2000) 187.

\textsuperscript{8} In distinguishing the names which pertain to the \textit{figlinae} from the villa’s owners, I follow the procedure articulated by Filippi (D.4.4): the brick stamps of private producers (i.e. the villa’s owners) consist of “a simple onomastic formula in the genitive,” while the brick stamps from the local workshops “bear a more complex and evolved text...with the generic denomination of the brick product (\textit{opus doliare}), of the \textit{officinator}, of the proprietor (\textit{dominus}), of the place of production (\textit{figlinae}), and the consular date.”

\textsuperscript{9} L(uci) Pomp (Filippi, D.4.2.2, no. 13); Favoniae C(au)\textit{(ii)} f(iliae) and Q(uenti) Fabrici F\textit{el((icis)} (\textit{ibid.}, no. 27). \textbf{The last two might or might not have been} a married couple and shared the villa’s ownership.

\textsuperscript{10} a. L(uci) Braeti (Filippi, D.4.2.2, nos. 5 and 6). The \textit{gentilicum} is absent in \textit{RE} and \textit{PIR}, \textit{Der neue Pauly} (vol. 2, 760) lists only Q. Braetius Sura, \textit{legatus pro quaestore} to C. Sentius Saturninus in 87 B.C.; b. L(uci) Ope\textit{jilli} (Filippi, D.4.2.2, no. 12). The \textit{gentilicum} is absent in \textit{RE}, \textit{PIR} and \textit{Der neue Pauly}.

\textsuperscript{11} M(ani) Naevi (Filippi, D.4.2.2, nos. 14-26; D.4.2.3., no. 28; D.4.2.4., no. 29). On these, Filippi comments (D.4.4), “Among the older stamps, that of Naevius has distinctive palaeographic characters, such as obliqueness, variations in height, irregular appearance of the lines and the divericulate form of some of the letters (M, N, V). The circular dividing sign can be felt by touch, on account of the way in which the inscription was prepared on the matrix, i. e., ‘in negative’.” See also Filippi’s comments at D.4.7: “The one-name onomastic formula goes back to the late Republican period; the form of the \textit{gentilicum} Opellius, the \textit{praenomen} Manius, and in particular some of the characters of the writing provide clues.”

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{RE} XV1.2.1557-1571 lists 27 entries on the male Naevii (some of them only tentatively identified); it seems telling that no Naevii are mentioned in I. Schatzman, \textit{Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics} (Brussels 1975), which deals with the period of the Republic.
of the elder Scipio Africanus (Livy 38.56; 39.52; cf. Val. Max. 3.7.1e)\textsuperscript{13} and Q. Naevius Matho, praetor of the same year, charged with the investigation of poisonings within and without the city (cf. Livy 38.41; 39.32).\textsuperscript{14} There was indeed a Sex. Naevius who proceeded in court against Cicero’s first client, P. Quinctius, but his social standing (a praeco) was insignificant.\textsuperscript{15} It appears that under the Republic none of the Naevii had ever attained the consulate. If our Manius Naevius owned the villa before Horace, the status of his family or clan (nowadays we might call it middle-middle class) accords well with the poet’s description of the place as a relatively modest call it middle-middle class) accords well with the status of this family or clan (nowadays we might mention of a Naevius in Horace’s Satires (1.1.101 and 2.2.68)—a stock name for a spendthrift figure borrowed from Lucilius—would acquire for those in the poet’s immediate circle an additional spice.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{13} cf. RE XVI.2.1558f. Livy is uncertain whether it was M. Naevius or the Petilii who in fact acted as Scipio’s accusers.
\item \textsuperscript{14} cf. RE XVI.2.1564; one may mention C. Naev(ius) Balb(us) who was in charge of coinage in 81 B.C. He may or may not have been the Balbus who a year earlier led an attack of Sulla’s forces in the battle of the Colline Gates (Plut. Sulla 29.3). On him, see RE XVI.2.1562.
\item \textsuperscript{15} cf. RE XVI.2.1559f (Münzer).
\item \textsuperscript{16} \textit{Manius} is among the least frequent of Roman praenomina, its most famous bearer being the third century dictator Curius Dentatus, who defeated Pyrrhus and became a stock example of the ancient virtus Romana that was often cited by the champions of the mos maiorum. The choice of name suggests a somewhat conservative family tradition, perhaps exhibiting antiquarian tastes. It seems by no means implausible to imagine that the man thus named could have joined the supporters of the Republic against the triumvirs, with the eventual loss of his estate. Conversely, one might speculate, even though in a more fanciful vein, that Manius Naevius was compelled at some point in life to sell his villa because of bankruptcy, in which case the mention of a Naevius in Horace’s Satires (1.1.101 and 2.2.68)—a stock name for a spendthrift figure borrowed from Lucilius—would acquire for those in the poet’s immediate circle an additional spice.
\item \textsuperscript{17} For C. Naevius Capella, see RE XVI.2.1563; PIR\textsuperscript{2} N9; for L. Naevius Surdinus (senior), see RE XVI.2.1567f; PIR\textsuperscript{2} N16.
\item \textsuperscript{18} After he served as praetor inter cives et peregrinos (CIL VI.1468; cf. 31662); on him see RE XVI.2.1569f (Fluss); PIR\textsuperscript{2} N17.
\item \textsuperscript{19} This is how he is listed in PIR\textsuperscript{2} N12, on the basis of epigraphic evidence. Dio (58.9.2) gives his name as Naevius Sertorius Macro. On him, see RE XVI.2.1565ff (Stein).
\item \textsuperscript{20} Filippi, D.4.2.2, nos. 5-7. Filippi extends the dating of these inscriptions to the early second century (Nero-Trajan) on the grounds of onomastics rather than paleography, pointing out the apparent scarcity of the Greek cognomen under consideration in later periods (see D.4.7 and below, note 25).
\item \textsuperscript{21} PIR\textsuperscript{2} E72; RE VI.1.34 (Stein).
\item \textsuperscript{22} See Rudich, 100, 104ff, 288.
\end{enumerate}

Of the villa’s owners whose names are found on the brick stamps and who are datable to the early imperial period, one name catches our immediate attention. It borders on the sensational and may directly relate to the political history of imperial Rome. The name is CLAUDIA EPICCHARIS.\textsuperscript{20} As I will argue, there are strong reasons to believe that this refers to the very remarkable freedwoman whom Tacitus describes (Ann. 15.51, 57; cf. Dip–Xiph. 62.27.3) as one of the central participants in the Pisonian conspiracy against Nero (65 A.D.).\textsuperscript{21} I have already had an opportunity to discuss her activities in some detail elsewhere, Tacitus’ account is dramatic and well known. According to it, quaedam Epicharis (51), mulier libertina (57), belonged to the intransigent core of the plot aimed at tyrannicide, even though she had never hitherto shown “any concern for what is honorable” (neque illi ante ulla rerum honestarum cura fuerat – 51). She is said to have become involved on her own
initiative, enlisting the cooperation of the commander of the imperial fleet at Misenum, Volusius Procules, who, however, denounced her to Nero. When arrested and confronted with her accuser, she resolutely denied all his allegations, but was still left in prison (ibid.). It was only after the conspiracy began to unravel, owing to a series of treacheries and breakdowns, that the emperor ordered her to be tortured, although in vain. We learn that even on the rack she refused to implicate any other person, but finally managed to commit suicide by strangling herself with her breastband (57). Tacitus, whose work is otherwise fraught with manifestations of deep-rooted social prejudices, chose to honor her with an exceptional epitaph, which proclaims the moral superiority of “a mere freedwoman” over the despicable conduct on the part of Rome’s freeborn senators and knights (ibid.).

Tacitus does not mention his heroine’s nomen gentilicum, but an assumption that she was indeed an imperial liberta allows us to resolve several vexing problems related to her record and behavior, including her connections in the senatorial, military and court milieus. I will return to this topic later.

23. clarior exemplo libertina mulier in tanta necessitate aliens ac prope ignotos protegendo, cum ingenii et viri et equites Romani senatoresque intacti tormentis carissima suorum quisque pignorum proderent.

24. In my previous treatment of Epicharis (Rudich 100f, 288), I assumed that her role in the conspiracy reflected the interests of her patron, who preferred to stay behind the scenes, and found puzzling Tacitus’ silence about the latter’s identity. But in the case of an imperial freedperson, any such argument is superfluous, a consideration which makes us revise that earlier position. She apparently acted on her own. Epicharis’ membership in the familia Caesaris must have been a matter of common knowledge, and it is well known that under the Julio–Claudians many individuals of similar extraction acted as independent agents in political and court intrigues (one female example is Nero’s mistress Claudia Acte; see, e.g., Boulvert 1970, 440; and on the influence of Vespasian’s concubine Antonia Caenis, see Dio 67.15). On the other hand, as Boulvert observes elsewhere, “le caractère public du lien rendra difficile la copropriété de l’empereur et d’un particulier sur un esclave ou un affranchi: In the extant epigraphic corpus, the appearance of the name Epicharis is relatively infrequent. Out of 25 known cases in Rome, only two funeral inscriptions erected to their respective husbands by different women, each called CLAUDIA EPICHRARIS, might bear on the identity of the villa’s female owner. I will start with CIL VI.8411, which seems to be of major importance for the present study (fig.1). It runs:

\[
\text{DIS MANIBUS} \\
\text{TI CLAUDI} \\
\text{AUG LABASCANTI} \\
\text{ARA TIONIBUS} \\
\text{VIX ANN XLV} \\
\text{CLAUDIA EPICHRARIS} \\
\text{UXOR CONIUGI} \\
\text{BENE MERENTI} \\
\text{F}
\]

One immediately observes two features of interest. First is the status of the deceased husband, employed in the department a rationibus. This was one of the three major officia, created by Claudius in an effort to centralize the government of the empire, that were for a period of time controlled by the imperial liberti. Second is the Greek cognomen, Abascantus. This was a popular name, perhaps because of its apotropaic meaning. There are 216 Abascanti epigraphically attested in Rome, datable to the first and second


26. CIL VI.8411 and VI.29081. There also exists yet another inscription with the name CLAUDIA EPICHRARIS (CIL VI.29062), but it provides no clue as regards its date or any other relevant circumstance and therefore may refer to any of the persons so called. It runs: D M VITALIONIS CLAUDIA EPICHRARIS VERNE SUO VIXIT AN V MEN VIII DIE VII.

27. The department a rationibus was responsible for the imperial finances, including taxation; the two other major officia were ab epistulis and a libellis. Under Claudius and Nero they were all headed by the imperial freedmen. For the office a rationibus see, e.g., RE 1a.1.263ff (Liebenam); O. Hirschfeld, Die Kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis Diocletian (Berlin 1905) 29ff; Boulvert 1970, 383ff; Weaver 1972, 259ff and passim; see also Millar, 73ff.
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centuries A.D. (including 17 with the gentilicium Claudius). The most well-known of them all seems to be T. Flavius Abascantus, Domitian’s rich and powerful freedman secretary ab epistulis, who was the addressee of Statius’ poetic consolatio written in 95 A.D. on the death of his wife Priscilla (Silv. 5.1). It is, however, obvious that he could not have been the husband of the Claudia Epicharis from CIL VI.8411; the name and the office are different, as well as the name of the wife. Nor does the dating conform; it appears highly probable that our Ti. Claudius Abascantus belonged to the late Julio-Claudian period, which must rule out all the other Abascanti from the time of Domitian and the Antonines.

CIL VI.8411 states that Ti. Claudius Abascantus, the late husband of a Claudia Epicharis, was the imperial freedman a rationibus. From this one cannot ascertain, however, whether he was in charge of that department or merely a member of its staff. It is known that during Claudius’ entire reign this officium was presided over by the notorious M. Antonius Pallas, fired by Nero shortly after the latter’s accession to power (Tac. Ann. 13.14). We do not know the names of those who succeeded him, until the emergence under the Flavians of the man known as the ‘father of Claudius Etruscus’ (from Stat. Silv. 1.5; 3.3; cf. Mart. 6.83; 7.40) who, like Pallas, held that same office for more than a decade. The candidacy of Ti. Claudius Abascantus would have easily filled at least the part of the Neronian gap. Given Pallas’ reputation for arrogance and greed, one would expect that his Claudius included), who are described as a rationibus in the inscriptions. See also Boulvert 1970, 97 n37. It seems obvious, however, that all of them could not have been the heads of that department. In other words, the problem is, as Weaver states it (259), “how to distinguish between, e.g., an a rationibus and the a rationibus.”


29. PIR² F194 + add.; RE VI.2.2529f (Stein); cf. Millar, 79. His praenomen and gentilicium are attested in CIL VI.2214; on his status, see CIL VI.8598f. There existed yet another imperial freedman of the same name, who served under Domitian a cognationibus (PIR² F195), although it cannot be determined whether he was that department’s head or merely a member of the staff; he was the husband of one Flavia Hesperis (CIL VI.8628). An attempt to argue that the two were one and the same is demolished by P. R. C. Weaver, “Confusing Names: Abascantus and Statius, Silvae 5.1,” Echos du Monde Classique 38 (1994) 333-364.

30. Ti. Claudius Abascantus from CIL VI.8411 is dated by Solin (846) to the reigns of Claudius and Nero. In a private communication, Brian Jones also supported the dating earlier than the time of Domitian.

31. Such as, e.g., Domitian’s freedman Abascantus Atimelianus (CIL VI.656; 30806; XIV.2657= XV.7818) or the Claudius Abascantus from Ostia who was still a slave in 177 A.D. On the latter’s career see P. Herz, “Claudius Abascantus aus Ostia. Die Nomenklatur eines libertus und sein sozialer Aufstieg,” Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphic 76 (1989) 167-173.

32. Weaver 1972, 259f lists for the first century A.D., apart from Pallas and the ‘father of Claudius Etruscus’, at least 10 individuals (our Ti. Claudius Abascantus and five others with the gentilicium
immediate successor would have felt compelled to keep as low a profile as possible, which explains the absence of any information about him in the literary sources. This description fits the inconspicuous man commemorated in CIL VI.8411, and would also account for his modest funerary monument. One is almost tempted to say that if the figure of someone like Ti. Claudius Abascantus were not available, it should be invented.

The average age of manumission for an imperial libertus was around 30, and this meant that those who continued to hold offices must have acquired the relevant administrative experience while still slaves. If our man was manumitted by Claudius, say, in 50 A.D. or even earlier, he could have conceivably qualified for a major post within the officia five years later and still have a span of up to ten years of service until his death at the age of 45. In fact, the present argument does not depend on whether he served as the head of the a rationibus department or in some subordinate capacity. In the latter event, the scale of his importance and influence would of course have been diminished, but in both cases the post must have been lucrative enough to allow him to acquire a villa from the imperial estate and to leave it to his widow upon his death.

As for the latter, her name—Claudia Epicharis—strongly suggests that she was also an imperial liberta, manumitted within the same period of time as her husband Claudius Abascantus. It is true that, since her status indication is absent from the inscription (thus relegating her to the category known as incertae), she could have been, theoretically speaking, a freeborn person, an ingenua. On the other hand,

37. This seems to be implied by M. Griffin, Nero: The End of a Dynasty (London, 1984) 54: “It is significant that we do not know for certain the name of his [Pallas’] immediate successor as a rationibus, the Imperial financial post from which Nero dismissed him.” It must be also remembered that at the outset of his reign Nero solemnly declared that he would keep apart his household and the state (Tac. Ann. 14. 4: discretam domum et rem publicam). This would have also diminished the public visibility of the imperial freedmen, at least for the duration of the quinquennium Neronis, with Burrus and Seneca in charge of affairs; cf. Boulvert 1970, 191.

38. Especially in comparison, e.g., with the funeral and tomb of his wife Priscilla, on which T. Flavius Abascantus, as portrayed by Statusius (Silv. 5.1.209ff), spared no expense. In particular, note Pliny’s anger (Epist. 7.29; cf. 8.6) at the inscription on Pallas’ funeral monument located intra primum lapidem at Via Tiburtina: Huic senatus ob fidem pietatemque erga patronas ornamenta praetoria decrevit et sestertium centes quinquages, cuius honore contentus fuit; cf. B. Frischer, “Monumenta et Arae Honoris Virtutisque Causa: Evidence of Memorials for Roman Civic Heroes,”Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica di Roma 88 (1982-83) 51-86, at 75. For the Sepulcrum Pallantis, see also L. Richardson Jr., New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome (Baltimore and London 1992) 358.

39. Weaver 1972, 225. It was also the minimum age prescribed by the lex Aelia Sentia; see also Boulvert 1974, 96f.
epigraphical studies have made it clear that a great number of women who were in fact imperial libertae chose not to indicate their legal status.\textsuperscript{44} It has also been established that within the imperial household “[a]mong the liberti the commonest marriage pattern is with wives bearing the same nomen.” \textsuperscript{45}

Statistically, 31% of freedmen who possessed the gentilicium Claudius married women who also had that nomen.\textsuperscript{46} It would seem preposterous to argue against the view that most, if not all, of them must have belonged to the same social group as their husbands.\textsuperscript{47}

Given the hazards of survival, there is not much evidence for the age of marriage among the imperial freedpersons (many of them must have entered contubernium or concubinatum while still in slavery).\textsuperscript{48} It appears that for men the average age was around 22, and for women around 19 (although it could range from 12 to 32).\textsuperscript{49} This implies that by the time of Ti. Claudius Abascantus’ death, his wife Claudia Epicharis must have been roughly of the same age (mid-40s) or younger, and presumably, she was a woman not without means. If, as it seems reasonable to assume, their union was proper and recognized as legally valid under the iustum matrimonium, with the concomitant ius conubii,\textsuperscript{50} she would have been endowed with the right of inheritance. For a Claudia Epicharis to have owned the villa, inheriting it would have been the easiest way to obtain the property; alternatively, she could have purchased it on her own, or have received it from some benefactor, perhaps even imperial, as a donum.

It seems now imperative to evaluate the balance of probabilities as to whether Claudia Epicharis, the villa’s owner (E1), Claudia Epicharis from CIL VI.8411, the wife of Ti. Claudius Abascantus (E2), and Epicharis, the Pisonian conspirator and Tacitus’ heroine (E3) could indeed have been one and the same person. It seems apparent from what so far has been said that, unless valid objections are raised, of which I am at present unaware, there is nothing to contradict this conclusion.

All three women share the same Greek cognomen, and two of them (E1 and E2) have the same nomen gentilicium. All three belonged roughly to the same historical period: E1, according to the evidence from archaeology;\textsuperscript{51} E2, since this is the likeliest dating of her husband, Abascantus; and E3 for the obvious reasons found in Tacitus. The chances are very high that all three were freedwomen in the familia

\begin{enumerate}
\item See Weaver 1972, 177: “… many women who had the legal status of Aug. libertae did not bear the Imperial status indication. This is obvious from the abnormally low proportion who do have the indication…” Cf. \textit{ibid.} 174: “… a far lower proportion of wives use the status indication than would seem entitled to do so.” The alternatives to considering Claudia Epicharis of \textit{CIL} VI.8411 an imperial freedwoman would be to state she had descended from either an enfranchised provincial, or from another Claudian member of the familia Caesaris; the former supposition is unlikely for this period, and both violate the principle of Occam’s razor.
\item Levinson 1980, 208-212.
\item Boulvert 1974, 264: “Il est donc probable que la plupart des femmes formant une couple avec un affranchi imperial et dont le nom derive de celui d’un emperore sont des affranchies imperiales.” In this context, the Abascantus-Epicharis inscription \textit{CIL} VI.8411 is referred to, among others; see Boulvert 1974, 265 n47. Note also Chantraine (as n. 43) 117.
\item On the patterns of marrying age within the familia Caesaris, see Weaver 1972, part II, chapter 6.
\item Weaver 1972, 106.
\item If they had entered contubernium while still slaves, their marital relationship could have been legitimizied upon their manumission. See, e.g., S. Treggiari, \textit{Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian} (Oxford 1991) 53: “The change in the legal nature of their [i.e. slaves’] union depended on the acquisition of legal capacity—they had been freed and became Roman citizens—and also on their attitude (affectio maritalis).” Cf. also S. Treggiari, “Contubernales in \textit{CIL} 6,” \textit{Phoenix} 35 (1981) 42-69.
\item The ‘Nero-Trajan period’, according to Filippi, see above, note 20.
\end{enumerate}
Caesaris: E1 and E2 carry the imperial name; E2 was the wife of an imperial freedman, and E3 is called explicitly mulier libertina. Finally, all three must have been persons of certain means and standing: E1, since she owned a comfortable country villa in her own name (an exceptional case for a woman of her origin and social status⁵³); E2, by virtue of the fact that she was married to an imperial functionary of some importance (even if he was a mere staff member, and not necessarily the head of the a rationibus department; one knows that in a corrupt administration every junior clerk matters⁵⁴); E3, as is clear from her network of connections within the imperial establishment, described by Tacitus, and her ability to move and maneuver among its various groups.

To claim that all this is merely an accumulation of coincidences and the evidence discussed pertains to three (or two) separate individuals would require, in my judgment, stretching the notion of the coincidental altogether too far, as well as defying the principle of Occam’s razor. It appears most unlikely that within one relatively short period of time there existed three, or even two, women of the same name, prominent enough, and sharing a whole plethora of identical characteristics. On the other hand, if the proposed identification is accepted, it might help to elucidate a few aspects of the Epicharis narrative in Tacitus, which have hitherto remained obscure.

Although there are no grounds to believe that Tacitus had ever deliberately invented a single fact, it is known that he sometimes tended to omit some facts, even when they were pertinent to the narrative, for dramatic, rhetorical or any other purpose he deemed appropriate. In his portrayal of Epicharis, as is made clear by his eulogy of her, the historian intended to present a person of exceptional virtue, a woman who was of low origin but was morally superior to the whole group of Roman noblemen. By those standards, any further material on her (such as her identity as an imperial freedwoman, her financial circumstances, or her marital status) that did not directly enhance that particular vision was, at best, superfluous and, at worst, undesirable; such information could divert the reader’s interest from the point the author was making and even raise the suspicion that she might have been motivated by some ulterior motive, other than rerum honestarum cura—“concern for what is honorable.” In fact, Tacitus’ comment that before entering the plot she had shown no political interests at all may imply that, in his view, her pursuits until that time were less than honorable. Given the mores of the Julio-Claudian court milieu, it would have been nothing unusual if, upon the death of her freedman husband (or perhaps even during his lifetime), Epicharis began to dispense her favors to men of standing or wealth and embarked upon the path of a high class

52. Tac. Ann. 15.57.

53. The one other known example of a freedwoman property owner is that of Domitian’s nurse (nutrix) Phyllis, who owned a suburban villa where she buried him after his murder (Suet. Dom. 17); cf. Millar, 79ff., and note also Favonia C(aii) filia (Filippi, D.4.2.2, no. 27) as possibly another owner of the Licenza villa, see above, note 9.

54. On the influence enjoyed by the members of the imperial household, see Millar, 73: “Such were the pressures of existence in the orbit of the emperor that even mere slaves could confer favours on important men which might lead to a lifetime of benefits for themselves.”

55. One major example is Tacitus’ account of Cn. Piso’s trial (Ann. 3.10-18) as contrasted with the recently discovered text of an official document—senatus consultum de Pisone patre—relating to the trial. Placing an emphasis on the murder accusation, which the decree mentions only in passing (l. 28: the official indictment was laesa maiestas), the historian, for some reason of his own, omits such charges against Piso listed therein as arbitrary executions (cf. l. 50: crudelitate unica), including the crucifixion of a centurion who was a Roman citizen (ll. 50ff). On Tacitus’ omissions see H. Flower’s thoughtful review in Bryn Mawr Classical Review 7 (1997) 22, of the document’s critical edition: W. Eck, A. Caballos and F. Fernandez, eds., Das senatus consultum de Pisone patre (Munich 1996). Note also the issue of American Journal of Philology (1999.1) wholly devoted to the studies of this senatus consultum and containing both its Latin text and English translation (14-41).

56. See above, note 23.

57. Predictably, Tacitus never mentions the nomina gentilicia of the imperial freedpersons; these we know largely from the inscriptions. Furthermore, he tends not to refer to any such individuals by name unless it is made imperative by the context.
courtesan. The late source Polyaeus reports—and I find it by no means implausible—that she became the mistress of the fabulously rich M. Annaeus Mela (Strat. 8.62), Seneca’s brother and the father of Lucan. Mela might have known about the conspiracy, and Lucan was certainly a part of it. He could have easily been the one who recruited her to join the cause.\(^{58}\) As for her deeper motives (other than those postulated by Tacitus\(^{59}\)), one can only speculate. Elsewhere I proposed\(^{60}\) that she might have fallen victim of some sexual outrage perpetrated by Nero or the members of his inner circle—a guess that seems as good as any. It would have certainly been in accord with such a woman’s proud and independent nature to issue brick stamps with her name as the owner of the villa, irrespective of whether she had purchased it on the market, inherited from her husband, or received it as gift from an admirer.

If one wished to indulge in the play of imagination, one could easily visualize the Pisonian conspirators gathered on those premises (conveniently located at some, but not too long, distance from the capital) debating the methods to get rid of the tyrant, with the hostess Claudia Epicharis prominently present, and in their midst Lucan, drawn into a reverie about the rustic joys sung in the verses by (possibly) one of the villa’s earlier owners, Horace—but this, of course, is the stuff of historical fiction rather than historical scholarship, and we will leave it at that.

Some comment is now in order regarding CIL VI.29081, which is also an inscription containing the name CLAUDIA EPICHARIS. It runs: D M P VITELLIO DIADUMENO CLAUDIA EPICHARIS CO[N]IUGI BENE MERENTI. It was found surrounded by numerous other funeral stelae with gentilicia such as Ulpia and Aelia,\(^{61}\) which indicate the early Antonine period. Although formally still within the acceptable chronological bounds, this inscription could not possibly be related to the owner of the Licenza villa. The individual whom this text commemorates was clearly undistinguished. There is no reference to the husband’s employment or profession, and the person of the name Vitellius Diadumenus seems otherwise unknown.\(^{62}\) His funeral monument is of the simplest kind; in contrast to some of its neighbors,\(^{63}\) it lacks any decoration whatsoever, suggesting a family without even a pretence of wealth.\(^{64}\)

The Licenza villa, on the other hand, had become by this time an establishment on a grand scale, with a luxurious bath complex built at some point under the Flavians or a decade later (see Frischer, F). It must have commanded an exorbitant price, and I will show that among its owners in this period were a senator and a member of one of the richest and most influential freedman families. I find it implausible that humble persons, as Vitellius Diadumenus and his

---

\(^{58}\) Cf. Rudich, 288.

\(^{59}\) Epicharis’ harangue to Volusius Proculus—plura et omnia scelerata principis orditur, neque senatui <neque populo> quidquam manere (Tac. Ann. 15.51)—must have almost certainly reflected the attitudes of Tacitus and the multi bonique, rather than her own political philosophy. Cf. Rudich, 101.

\(^{60}\) Rudich, 101.

\(^{61}\) See no. 1116 in Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma (Rome 1886) 87.

\(^{62}\) He is absent in RE, Der Kleine Pauly and PIR. It is not clear whether he could have belonged to the family of some freedman emancipated by Vitellius, in which case, as a son of a libertas, he would have by this time received Roman citizenship. Weaver 1972, 25, however, states that no freedmen of Vitellius are represented in the extant epigraphical corpus. Alternatively, and less likely, his family might have been Greek, given (at any point in time) Roman citizenship under the patronage of the Vitellian clan.

\(^{63}\) See, e.g., the image of a crown on Aelia Tryphena’s funeral stele, no. 1101 in in Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma (as n. 61) 82 (see also no. 1107, 84, with corona lemniscata).

\(^{64}\) Note also the careless execution of the letters and the spelling error in the word CONIUGE. In contrast to Ti. Claudius Abascantus under Nero, in subsequent periods the imperial liberti stood in no need of downplaying their wealth; cf., e.g., Statius’ description (Silv. 15.208ff) of the luxurious funeral and tomb built for his wife Priscilla by T. Flavius Abascantus, as noted above.
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wife Claudia Epicharis must have been, could have ever afforded a property that splendid.

With regard to the names of the villa’s subsequent owners, the state of the evidence, once again, allows an attempt at certain cautious reconstructions. We know that an inscription had been found on one of the lead pipes, later destroyed, bearing the name CLAUDIUS BURRUS (see Bruun, D.13). It seems that he is best identified with the child of Domitian’s powerful freedman chamberlain (cubicularius) Ti. Claudius Parthenius.65 Burrus’ fifth birthday had been celebrated by Martial in an epigram of 88 A.D. (4.45; cf. 5.6.6). It is plausible to assume that, in the aftermath of the Pisonian debacle and Epicharis’ suicide, her property was confiscated and the villa taken back by the emperor. In that case, Parthenius could have purchased it from the fiscus (or received it as a donum) before or after Nero’s downfall, or at any point in the course of the next two decades. This would confirm the scholarly argument I have earlier referred to, i.e., that certain estates originally belonging to the imperial domain often circulated, at the discretion of the ruling prince, within the narrow circle of his associates.66

It is known that, under Domitian, Parthenius reached the heights of influence and, presumably, amassed considerable wealth.67 We know that he played patron to Martial and was not himself devoid of literary pursuits, but could not indulge in them for lack of time (cf. Mart. 4.45; 78; 5.6; 8.28; 9.49; 11.1; 12.11). The villa would have provided him with an opportunity for a few and rare moments of leisure.

The dramatic irony in the story of the villa’s ownership lies, of course, in the fact that Ti. Claudius Parthenius, in his turn, conspired against the emperor and played a major role in the plot that led to Domitian’s murder on September 18, 96 A.D. (cf. Suet. Dom. 16f). So it seems that the Licenza villa, besides its other possible designations, merits carrying the name of the Villa degli assassini imperiali. Parthenius could have bestowed it as a gift on his teenage son Burrus during his own lifetime, or the latter could have inherited it after his father’s terrible death in 97 A.D. by lynching; Nerva was forced by the praetorian prefect Casperius Aelianus to deliver Domitian’s assassins into the hands of the vengeful soldiers (Dio Epit. 67.15.1; 17.1f; Epit. de Caes. 12.7.8; cf. Plin. Paneg. 6). It should not surprise us if, shattered by that catastrophe and, presumably, the collapse of the family fortunes, Burrus (or, rather, his guardians68) would have chosen to dispose of that property by sale.

This brings us to last identifiable owner of the villa, whose name is preserved on a lead water pipe from the bath complex, HOSTILIUS FIRMINUS. This combination of gentilicium and cognomen is rare, and almost certainly refers to P. Hostilius Firminus.69 He was yet another dubious individual, who was a senator and former legate in Africa, disgraced under Trajan (Plin. Epist. 2.1.23f; 2.12.1-5). He ran into trouble as an associate of Marius Priscus, the corrupt ex-proconsul of Africa. Priscus was indicted before the Senate de repetundis by Tacitus and Pliny the Younger and convicted in January 100 A.D. He was subsequently expelled from the Senate and from Italy, but maintained his property and civic status (Plin. Epist. 2.11). Priscus’ legate Firminus, however, suffered only a minor penalty; he was debarred from admission to the lottery designed to distribute appointments among the candidates for provincial offices (sortitio provinciae: Plin. Epist. 12.2). Firminus’ guilt seemed to Pliny quite shameful

66. From Mart. 4.45.3, it follows that Burrus was born in 83 A.D.: he turned five years old (qui prima novo signat quinquennia lustro) in 88 A.D., the year of the epigram’s composition. This means that at the time of his father’s death in 97 A.D., he was still a minor.

67. See Duncan-Jones, 343f for the list of the available evidence on the size of substantial private fortunes under the principate. Incidentally, Virgil’s wealth is reported as having been 10 million sesterces.

68. See above, note 5.

69. RE VIII.2.2506; PIR² H225. Cf. A. N. Sherwin-White, The Letters of Pliny. A Historical and Social Commentary (Oxford 1966) 171. Sherwin-White specifies that Hostilius Firminus must have been a legate of praetorian rank. He notes only one other person of the same nomen during the period, a certain T. Mustius Hostilius...Augurinus, a praetorius from Patavium.
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(turpissimum); it concerned negotiations for a bribe of 200,000 sesterces of which 10,000 were to be paid under the heading “cosmetics” (unguentarii: Plin. Epist. 11.23). The lightness of this sentence prompted our author to embark upon a lengthy disquisition on the pros and cons of this or that senatorial punishment and their effects (Plin. Epist. 12.3ff).70

Firminus could have acquired the villa before or after his trial.71 One infers ex silentio that he was not even made to pay back the bribes he had received in Africa, in contrast to Priscus, who was deprived of his gains of 700,000 sesterces by the senatorial verdict: Plin. Epist. 11.19. The appearance of his name on the lead pipe suggests that he might have undertaken some of the villa’s reconstruction, at least, by later adding to the luxurious bath complex.72 This would have been in accord with Pliny’s comment that the man showed a penchant for an elegant lifestyle (hominis compti semper et pumicati: Plin. Epist. 11. 23). Since at this stage of the project it is not possible to ascertain the villa’s layout in the time of Horace, it seems by no means implausible that through the course of more than a century, one or several efforts at its renovation and amplification by different owners could have ultimately transformed the modest establishment portrayed by the poet into the remarkable affair that is at present coming to light.

70. Sherwin-White (as n. 69) 72, in his commentary ad Plin. Epist. 2.12.2, points out that Hostilius Firminus, as it appears, had not been formally accused by the provincials.

71. The terminus post quem would likely be the lynching of Parthenius in 97 A.D.

72. Naturally, the work on the villa’s renovation or reconstruction could have been started earlier under Burrus, Parthenius, or Epicharis, or at any other point of time. For a review of various construction costs in that period, see Duncan-Jones, 124f.
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E.3. THE ORSINI IN THE TIBURTINE REGION AND IN THE LICENZA VALLEY (XII-XV CENTURIES)

By Franca Allegrezza

On 7 April 1215, Giangaetano and Matteo di Orso di Bobone acquired half of the castle of Civitella from a deputy of their uncle, Giovanni Boveschi, for 300 provisini of the Roman Senate. The acquisition of the castle, which is situated as the crow flies at less than 1 km to the north-west of the castle of Licenza, represents the first evidence of the establishment of the sons of Orso in the valley of the Licenza river. It was not the first time, however, that the filii Ursi acquired property and rights in the area; at the close of the twelfth century, Pope Celestine III (1192-1198), Giacinto di Pietro Boveschi, had granted to his nephew Orso and to the sons of Orso nomine pignoris ab Ecclesia Romana the castles of Vicovaro, Cantalupo and Burdella, the last two of which were situated near modern Mandela, where the rivers Anio and Licenza join.

That concession was probably made in order to place a firm papal hold on a zone characterized in the preceding decades by the persistence of monastic domination. It also probably occurred together with the assignation of property to other Boveschi relatives and was very much part of the territorial policies pursued by the popes, even if not systematically, by the middle of the twelfth century. These policies aimed to allot the territory to secular seigneurs of proven trustworthiness, by way of granting them castles.

At the beginning of the tenth century, the Roman church constituted the ruling force in the Tivoli-Subiaco area, owning almost the whole region, organized into vast holdings, of which the massa Giovenzana was the most notable.

The origins of this institution are unknown because of the lack of documentary sources, but it did undergo radical changes in the middle of the tenth century as result of the policies of the Roman princeps Albericus. He inserted the two monasteries positioned at its edges, SS. Cosma e Damiano at Vicovaro and S. Benedetto at Subiaco, into a girdle of monastic bodies, including those of Farfa and S. Andrea del Sorelto, which were supposed to protect the territory of Rome. Both these monasteries, therefore, saw their power in the region grow at the expense of the papal holdings.

At the insistence of Albericus, the popes themselves dismembered the enormous massa Giovenzana, granting all the territory between the loop of the Anio and the estates in the basin of the Anio at Subiaco to the monastery of SS. Cosma e Damiano, and to the monastery of Subiaco the remaining southern part of the two valleys and all the part of the Empolitana area belonging to the massa. Farfa was allowed to expand along the delimiting valley of the Licenza.

The monastery of Subiaco, which during the second half of the tenth century had made determined efforts to return to the ideological and devotional roots of the Benedictine tradition, played a fundamental role in an attempt to reunify the once-divided area to its own advantage. This reunification was effected at the expense of the monastery of SS. Cosma e Damiano of Vicovaro, which was compelled to renounce part of its patrimony, but did not succeed in preventing the expansion of the Abbey of Farfa into the Licenza valley.

In fact, the Abbey of Farfa, supported by the policies of Albericus, also promoted its interests in the northern and eastern parts of the region, in particular in the zone close to the diocesan boundary between Tivoli and the Sabine area, in the part which crosses the Licenza valley. In the middle of the tenth century the boundary between the dioceses passed from Monte Gennaro just to the north of the castle of Percile, and then continued, by way of the Cimata delle Serre, to

2. The concession is recorded in the Gesta Innocentii III Papae, in J. P. Migne, Patrologia Latina vol. 214 (Paris 1855) cols. 183-190; for background on the donation, see Allegrezza 1998, 4-6.
4. See Delogu, 25-54. I have relied heavily on this article for my reconstruction of the history of the area.
5. Delogu, 31-33.
the boundary stones of the campum sacrum along the river Turano.6

In the following decades, under the protection of Albericus, the Sabine abbey managed to obtain strips of territory in the valley, on the mountains to the right of which the powerful faction of the Crescenzi from Rome was establishing itself. The first indirect record of the beginning of the process of the fortification of the valley dates from the early years of the eleventh century. A century later, the Abbey of Farfa counted among its possessions castra situated in the hills to the right of the river (Macla, Petra Demone) and to the left (Percile, Castel del Lago), and had itself built the podium Burdella, in the lower Licenza valley.

The revival of papal activity in the Tivoli-Subiaco area halted the expansion of Farfa and Subiaco towards the end of the century and brought new protagonists into the zone. There were the more easily controlled monastic entities—the Roman monasteries of S. Paolo fuori le mura and S. Sebastiano alle catacombe—and secular seigneurs. One of the fundamental objectives of this reforming papacy was that of imposing its political control on the territory of Lazio.

Halfway through the twelfth century, and particularly during the pontificate of Hadrian IV (1154-1159), the Church had a certain success in imposing its authority on part of Lazio in this way. At the death of this energetic pope, however, the confrontation with the empire and the anti-papal policies of the Comune of Rome resulted in a complete inability to rule on the part of the papacy, even in the areas closest to Rome.7

Only in the last twenty years of the century, and particularly after the peace signed between Clement III (1188-1191) and the Comune of Rome in May 1188, did the popes succeed in restoring, partially, their authority over Rome and Lazio. For much of the thirteenth century the Comune maintained some remnants of autonomy in the face of papal meddling, to the point of being able to make choices unfavorable to the popes. But the ascension to the papal throne of Clement III, Celestine III and Innocent III (1198-1216), all of Roman origin, resulted in Comune policy being much influenced. Particular favor was shown to the families that were linked to those popes by blood, by matrimonial alliances with their families or with the families of the members of the college of cardinals, and by financial interests.

Against this backdrop—the growth of the influence of the pope and cardinals over Rome and Lazio, as well as the growth of the revenues of the Church on account of the powerful push towards centralization between the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the following century—the families of the new urban aristocracy found exactly their role, as had the Boveschi, although they were to be suddenly and utterly replaced in the course of a few decades by their Orsini descendants.

The Roman families such as the Orsini, with the support of the Curia, began occasionally to take over the rights and possessions belonging to ancient monastic holdings from the middle of the twelfth century onwards. They were strongly motivated towards the exploitation, for economic and strategic reasons, of the castra of Lazio, which produced excellent agricultural yields and revenues. This was accomplished through the control exercised over the inhabitants, who were bound to the dominus by an oath of vassalage and obliged to provide labor for all sorts of works. The merum et mixtum imperium also belonged to the lord, together with all the revenues deriving from the exaction of fines and the control of the ecclesiastical structures within the castle, by way of the exercise of the right of patronage and the income from levies and tributes.

The castrensian properties of the new Roman aristocracy, while involving all the provinces of the Patrimony of St. Peter, did not develop uniformly into all the surrounding territory, that is, from the city outwards. Rather, for a long time they were confined

6. Amore, 220. The Licenza river, in a privilege granted by Nicolò I to the monastery of Subiaco in 867, features as the boundary of the properties conferred on the monks. See Il Regesto Sublacense dell’undecimo secolo, eds. L. Allodi and G. Levi (Rome 1885) 51.
7. For papal policy in Lazio, see Toubert. For the city élites in Rome in the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries, see M. Vendittelli, “Mercanti romani del primo Duecento ‘in Urbe Potentes’,” in Roma nei secoli XIII e XIV, ed. E. Hubert (Rome 1993) 87-135.
to restricted areas, conditioned by the pre-existing arrangement of local power and landed estates.\(^8\)

In brief, therefore, such development in a given zone was initially occasional and subject to factors such as the ability of a pope or an important prelate to exploit the temporary crisis of some monastic institution for the benefit of his own family members, and, indirectly, of the interests of the Holy See. This was the case with the arrival of the Boveschi in the mid-Anio valley from the mid-twelfth century onwards; with the passage of decades, this arrangement evolved into a plan systematically followed and shrewdly managed by the family, now created seigneurs. These are the characteristics of the settlement of the Orsini in the Tivoli area.

Having achieved autonomy from the original stock, the Orsini began a long phase of expansion in the area, both by taking over properties once belonging to the Boveschi and by acquiring new properties in the region, by purchase or by force.

A summary of the possessions that constituted the patrimony accumulated by the family between the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century will better display the great extent of it.

Following the via Tiburtina-Valeria beyond Tivoli, where the Orsini possessed houses and estates, the first dominating castle of the family we come upon was the castrum Sancti Angeli, the present Castel Madama, set up on the northern ridge of the Monti Tiburtini and purchased in 1252 by Napoleone di Giangaetano. Behind this and outside the nucleus of the properties, situated in the narrow part of the valley formed where the chains of the Monti Tiburtini and Prenestini join, and guarding the road that climbed from the valley of the Anio towards the gentle Passo della Fortuna, is the castrum Apolloni, granted to the Boveschi in 1159 by the abbot of Subiaco, and now belonging to the Orsini.\(^9\) Immediately to the left of the consular road there is another castle, the castrum Saccomuri, which in 1288 was designated castellare, but a few years later was in the process of being re-inhabited. A few miles to the east can be seen the most important of the Orsini properties, the fortress castle of Vicovaro, the fulcrum of their settlement along the valley of the Anio. Finally, still on the right side of the river, are the castles of Cantalupo and Burdella, which had been granted to the filii Ursi by Celestine III. Along with this compact body, the enlargement of their dominions in the Licenza valley, where they owned the castle of Licenza, half of that of Civitella, Percile and the villa de Opico, spearheaded their potential expansionist interest in the direction of Sabine territory. In the last two decades of the thirteenth century, the Orsini also had a lien on the castle of Poggio Ronci and purchased that of Arsoli from the Boveschi.

The lengthy and complex operations undertaken to get possession of castles situated so as to control the most important communication paths, or those with large numbers of inhabitants and therefore productive and rich, demonstrate clearly the economic importance of castrensian revenues for the Orsini family, as well as for other baronial dynasties.\(^10\)

Behind this systematic accrual of power over the territory around Rome on the part of these families, and particularly of the Orsini, there always lay the privileged relationship with the Curia. This relationship continued even during the Avignon papacy, and thanks to the particular development of power politics in Rome, made possible the maintenance of control of the territory even after the return of the Popes and the transformations of the papacy in the fifteenth century.

Despite the tenacity with which new parcels of property were patiently added over several generations to those already owned by the Orsini—in 1338 Civitella passed entirely into their hands, by way of misappropriation, and in 1351 they bought half of the castle of Roccaiovine from the abbot of the monastery of S. Sebastiano in Rome\(^11\)—the borders of their territory had not greatly expanded, and the

---


10. See the numerous examples noted by Carocci (as n. 8) 106ff.

11. Archivio di Stato di Roma, Pergamene, box 61, nos. 101 and 115; AO, II.A.V, 12 (p).
area controlled by the descendants of Napoleone di Giangaetano remained circumscribed.

Around the middle of the thirteenth century, however, the family seized the opportunity to spread its influence over wider territory, expanding into the kingdom of Sicily to the east of the watershed of the Monti Carseolani by way of the marriage of Giacomo with the daughter and heir of the owner of half the castle of Tagliacozzo.12 Tagliacozzo was the first important fortress on the via Tiburtina-Valeria beyond the border with the kingdom of Sicily.

The crossing of the frontier achieved through this union was ratified by Pope Innocent IV (1243-1254), who exploited the sort of interregnum that followed the death of Frederick II to advance concessions in the frontier royal territories; the province of the Abruzzo itself was filched from Manfredi in September 1254, when he was nominated deputy of the kingdom. Endorsing the establishment of the Orsini at the outpost of Tagliacozzo would have represented a guarantee for the Church. The development of the struggle that was immediately rekindled between the popes and the last of the Swabians showed how false these hopes were.

The established territory of the Orsini was therefore circumscribed, but by no means insignificant from the economic and strategic point of view, since it guaranteed an established presence—Vicovaro, Cantalupo, Burdella, Tagliacozzo—on the axis road that joined Lazio with the Abruzzo. Flocks and goods moved along that road right next to the border with the kingdom, and, in the thirteenth century, in the years of the rivalry between the Swabians and the Angevins, the control of it was militarily significant. As confirmation of the care devoted by the family to this property nucleus between the end of the twelfth and the middle of the fourteenth century, five or six generations of Orsini had succeeded one another in the Tiburtine estates; there had thus occurred various divisions of property among the sons, with a consequent breaking-up of the common inheritance. Several times, however, the family put into play strategies to keep part of the patrimony intact, by dispatching the majority of the males into ecclesiastical life or by maintaining as indivisible the most important and prestigious properties, Vicovaro in particular. They maintained control of the area in the second part of the fourteenth century by means of marriages with the families of the local minor nobility, which strengthened their ties over other castles and led to a more solid attachment to the territory.13

This strategy continued even when the family, which had grown in size, began to see natural social and economic inequalities grow up between its various constituent branches. Up to the end of the fourteenth century, in fact, in spite of the considerable divergence between the Orsini who were lords of Vicovaro and feudatories of the Abruzzo, and their cousins, who were domini of the castle of Licenza or Pescorocchiano, there was substantial unity in the objectives followed by both. During the wars that troubled the Tiburtine area as result of the papal schism (1376-1417), the small castles of the lateral valleys of the Anio spontaneously sent the forces of Rinaldo Orsini, lord of Vicovaro and Tagliacozzo, as armed help against the troops of the Comune of Rome.14

This strip of territory remained in the hands of the Orsini until well into the fifteenth century, being merged with their domains in the Marsica.

The community of the castle of Licenza has not handed down any medieval statutes, unlike other castles under Orsini domination. In Vicovaro, for example, a statute was drawn up in 1273, and Saccomuro had its statutory charter in 1311.15 The first statutory charter of Licenza was probably that drafted in 1590.


It has been observed that the number of dwellings subject to seigneurial dominion for which we have statutory charters and statutes prior to the first decades of the fourteenth century is so limited, especially in proportion to the global one for the castles that made up the population framework of Lazio in the thirteenth century, that it cannot be attributed simply to the dispersal of the pertinent documentation. Only in those communities that had enjoyed a significant level of socio-economic growth, or in cases of repopulation and relaunching of a site to attract new inhabitants, were the consuetudines castri hand-transcribed by a notary. In very many cases such transcription was never done.

We do not know how many inhabitants there were in the castle of Licenza in the period under consideration, but it was probably always a castle of modest proportions. In the Salt Registers of the first half of the fifteenth century, the community was taxed for three rubbia of salt, while Burdella had to pay five and Vicovaro 20.

Because it is not possible to draw on direct sources, such as a statute, for the characteristics of life in the community of Licenza in the centuries of domination by the Orsini, we must content ourselves with more generalized observations put forward for other castles in Lazio.

In the twelfth century, when the Orsini were first settling in the region, important changes were occurring in the Anio valley, and in the Tivoli-Subiaco area in general, to which the Licenza valley naturally belongs. The great transformative fortifying of the tenth and eleventh centuries, which had redrawn the countryside by enclosing the people in villages on the peaks and locating the fields in the vicinity of the individual castles, had not left the countryside completely depopulated. Fortified and turreted villages, isolated towers, and cliff top strongholds with the purely military function of guarding the castra, alternated with the ancient churches, casalia, fundi and villae that punctuated the territory dependent on the castles. In spite of the varied countryside, the castle remained the central and dominating element, both geographically and economically, at that time and for a long time to come.

These changes had redefined the environment, creating an agricultural space in concentric rings of land which became progressively less productive further from the inhabited center. Outside the walls, the land was subjected to intensive cultivation. First were vegetable plots and orchards, or, rather, vegetable plots with orchards pressed in around the walls of the castrum. There followed the more specialized, intensive planting areas, ferraginalia, destined for the cultivation of barley, spelt and legumes, as well as hemp, which needed systematic irrigation rather than frequent manuring. In the flatter and more recently ploughed-up land, there was extensive cultivation of cereal crops. Areas of natural meadow, alternating with vineyards, both self-supporting and trained onto trees for support, occupied a place between the cultum and the incultum. The woods were used for the raising of pigs in a semi-wild state, and obviously supplied wood for heating, building and for the making of utensils. The woodlands, the pastures, and, during the winter, even parts of the cultivated area itself, served as a huge and varied terrain for hunting, with game both large and small.

The demographic growth in the thirteenth century and the first decades of the fourteenth altered the internal equilibria of the small economies of Lazio; more energy was directed towards the cultivation of vegetables and viticulture, while new fields began to be exploited for cultivation. These fields were created


18. For the phenomenon of fortification, the obvious reference is Toubert, for the territory around Tivoli in the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, see Delogu.

essentially by the appropriation of common lands that had been uncultivated in previous centuries. In Lazio, the cultivation of new land did not definitively transform the characteristics of the uncultivated areas, “thanks to the traditional diffidence of the Mediterranean peasant when faced with integral ploughing up.”

The countryside, which had remained more or less unchanged for three centuries, entered a long phase of transformation after the demographic crisis of the middle of the fourteenth century. The sharp demographic decline of that century, which was associated in the Tivoli region with the wars that accompanied and followed the eastern schism (1378-1417), depopulated many centers in the area, particularly those that were far from the principal road axes or at very high altitudes.

The most evident and long-lasting consequences of this phenomenon were two: the substitution of wide areas of tilled fields with fields for the rearing of stock, and the systematic planting of trees (primarily chestnuts), which created the first signs of the boundary between cultivated and uncultivated. The first met with much support as result of the recovery of the great lay and ecclesiastical estates. The second was linked to the slow abandonment of centers at higher altitudes and the designation of part of the ancient tenimentum castri as controlled uncultivated land.

The Licenza valley also would have experienced abandonment and transformation of the countryside between the fifteenth and sixteenth century, with an increase in the uncultivated land and the transformation of tilled land into pasture. When the valley centers came into the patrimony of the Borghese family in the seventeenth century, this process, already under way, was accelerated.


21. See Passigli (as n. 20) 134-135; on the spread of sale contracts for grass in the Campagna Romana from the middle of the fourteenth century, see J. Cl. Maire Vigueur, Les grands domaines de la Campagne Romaine dans la deuxième moitié du XIVe siècle. Thèse du 3ème cycle, University of Paris I (Paris 1974).

22. See Amore, 236-238.
E.3. THE ORSINI IN THE TIBURTINE REGION AND IN THE LICENZA VALLEY (XII-XV CENTURIES)
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E.4. Owners of “Horace’s Villa” at the Time of Pasqui’s Excavation (1911-1914)

By Bernard Frischer

With the passing away of the feudal system in central Italy in the nineteenth century, the former peasants who had rented the land from the Orsini and Borghese families became the property owners in the area that was to be excavated by Angelo Pasqui from 1911-1914.

A study of the five owners and their land parcels is of more than academic interest because unpublished catalogues survive in the archive of the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio that record where the following classes of objects were found during Pasqui’s excavations: A. marble sculpture; B. marble wall revetment; C. wall paintings; D. pavements; E. marble architectonic elements; F. construction materials; G. lead objects; H. terracotta decorative plaques; I. terracottaapottery; K. instrumenta domestica and jewelry; L. lead and marble weights, inscriptions; M. marble basins and vases; N. fragments of funerary monuments [from the surrounding area, not from the villa itself]; O. glass; P. medieval marbles; Q. ancient coins (see Frischer, G.1.12, for a selection of the catalogues). In addition to these catalogues, there are also catalogues of all the finds on each property, so that a “double-entry” bookkeeping system was used. This is valuable because, along with Nicola De Rossi’s sporadic and partially preserved excavation journal, it allows for some cross-checking.

In 1926, Lugli published essentially the same catalogues of objects, not only introducing occasional mistakes (cf., e.g., Buttrey, D.11 and Werner, D.8) but also omitting all information about provenance. This fact has led scholars to be understandably pessimistic about the possibility of contextualizing Pasqui’s finds. In fact, as we will see, some evidence does survive from the unpublished Pasqui catalogues that permits us to assign some of the finds, at least in a general way, to specific parts of the villa.

The owners of the properties in question can be traced back to the first cadaster of the Papal States, which dates from 1777, and from the second, dating to 1859.1 In 1911, when Pasqui started work, the properties and owners were as in Table 1.

The cadastral map from the time of Pasqui’s excavations survives (see figs. 3 and 17 in Frischer, B). If we superimpose this map over the plan of the villa as it appears today (see fig. 4 in Frischer, B) we can see that the properties correspond fairly nicely to the different parts of the villa (the residence, garden, quadriporticus, and baths). Table 2 shows these correspondences.

The division of parcel 1215 into 1215a (Maria Assunta Foschi) and 1215b (Rocco Foschi) is not shown in the cadastral map of the period. It can, however, be determined on the basis of the entry for April 25, 1912 in the Giornale di Scavo (see Frischer, G.1.12), which speaks of the discovery of “pilastrini di mattoni” on both properties. These correspond to the small columns of bricks holding up the suspensurae in room 20. Hence, the line dividing 1215a from 1215b must have run through this room, the approximate center of the entire parcel 1215. That 1215a was the section on the right (i.e., east) is clear from the entry in the Giornale for May 9, 1912, which speaks about how the existing road was excavated and on the property of Foschi Mariassunta a mosaic 5 x 3.0 meters was discovered. This is the mosaic in room 1.

The study of the Pasqui catalogues is a fertile field for students of “Horace’s Villa.” Here are some examples of the kinds of discoveries that can still be made from these archival documents (in G.1.12):

1. The sculpture was found distributed in a schematic way. Large statues were found almost exclusively on Caponetti property (see Categoria A, nos. 2, 3, 5, 9, 11, 12, 13, 23, 26); small statues on the Angeletti and Foschi-Ricciotti properties. Since the bulk of Caponetti land falls into the garden and western branch of the quadriporticus, this may

---

1. The shelfmark of the second cadaster of 1858 is Archivio di Stato, Roma, Catasti dello Stato Pontificio, Licenza, AR 3714.
tell us that the life-size and colossal statues on the property once were located in these parts of the villa. Contrariwise, the smaller statues all come from the areas of the baths (Angeletti, Foschi-Ricciotti: cf. nos. 6, 8, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 25 [Angeletti]; 18, 21, 27, 30 [Foschi-Ricciotti]; cf. no. 28 [a statuette from under the public road in the area of the residence]). The exceptions are: no. 1 (colossal statue from Angeletti land); no. 29 (female statue, slightly larger than life-size, from Foschi-Ricciotti land).²

2. The fragment of a male statue in the Licenza Museum (inv. 62370) does not come from the site of “Horace’s Villa.”

3. The satyr’s mask (see Lugli 1926, fig. 59) came from Angeletti property, i.e., from the western wing of the quadriporticus, as De Rossi’s Giornale entry of March 30, 1912 shows: “[terreno Angeletti Antonio:] Nel seguito del lavoro del gripo portico alla profondità di circa due metri si è trovato un mascherone per ornamento di Fontana in marmo greco, vuoto dalla parte di dietro, misurante centimetri 14 di altezza…”

4. All the parietal marbles (Categoria B) come from Angeletti land. This might appear consistent with the parietal marbles from in the 1997-1999 excavations in the same area of the baths (see Angelelli, D.6.1). But one should compare De Rossi’s Giornale entries for March 26, 1912; April 3, 1912; April 6, 1912, and May 1, 1913, where there are reports of the discovery of marbles on Angeletti property including the drains i and m as well as the eastern branch of the quadriporticus (23) and the front side of the “veranda” (13): “[26 marzo 1912:] oggi si è incominciato il lavoro di scavo nel terreno di Angeletti Antonio e precisamente nel griptoportico sinistro; attiguo alla fognola principale; ove sono venuti in luce molti frammenti di marmo di varie qualità;” “[3 aprile 1912:] nella fine della scala il muro reticolato della parte sinistra seguita; ed il muro della parte destra svolta; ancora a destra viene scoperta una forma di chiusino, quadrato, entro il quale si rivengono gran quantità di marmi fino alla profondità di circa metri 2;” “[6 aprile 1912:] si lavora sempre nel terreno di Foschi Rocco, dove vengono in luce molti frammenti di marmo di varie qualità e grandezze;” “[1 maggio 1913:] si incomincia il lavoro di espurgo della piccola fognola che dava l’acqua alla piccola vasca da bagno dove vengono in luce molti frammenti di marmo, e musaici diversi.” The context makes it clear that the work in this period was in the general area of the northern end of the western branch of the quadriporticus (23), the drain behind (i), and along the front facing of the “veranda” (13).

5. All the fresco fragments (Categoria C) come from “il grande Calidario della prima costruzione delle Terme,” i.e., from room 33. It is true that, under provenance, the catalogue gives “prov. diverse,” so that one might think that the attribution of the fragments to the “Grande Calidario” is simply a conjecture and that they really come from various places on the site. But Pasqui’s published report removes this ambiguity, since in it he clearly states that the provenance of the fragments was the “Grande Calidario” (cf. Pasqui 1916, 12: “da questa grande sala provennero esempi bellissimi d’intonachi dipinti con ornati e figure.” Pasqui’s words are consistent with the finding of additional fresco fragments, with the same or comparable colors and designs, in the 1997-1999 excavations of areas 35 (adjacent to 33) and 38 (see Mols, D.9.3.2-3). One should also compare De Rossi’s entry for May 4, 1912, in which he writes of the discovery of finding, at a depth of ca. 1.80 meters, “vari frammenti di intonaco” on the land of Rocco Foschi (=1215b, which includes room 33).

6. Unfortunately, no provenance is given in Categoria E (no. 26: the last item listed in this category) for the large, ornate coffer, now in the Licenza Museum (inv. 62969). Given the fact that finds from elsewhere in the Licenza valley are twice put last in these catalogues, we might even wonder whether the coffer is from “Horace’s Villa” (Categoria A, no. 34, “non prov. dalla villa;” Categoria I, no. 9, from Percile). At any rate, the lack of a provenance for this piece is a troubling enigma.

². For several statues, it is not possible to tell the size from Pasqui’s catalogue (cf. Categoria A, nos. 4, 33, etc.).
7. A terracotta plaque such as those found in 1997-1999 (see Strazzulla, D.5) was found on Angeletti land, i.e., in the central area of the baths (see Categoria H, no. 1). This is the same area where the fragments of plaques were found in 1997-1999. Other fragments were found on Caponetti land in the southern part of the bath complex (Categoria H, nos. 2-7).

Because of some discrepancies between the De Rossi Giornale di Scavo and the Pasqui category catalogues, and between the category and property catalogues, there is reason to doubt that the category catalogues are completely accurate. For example, whereas the catalogue for Category B attributes all the parietal marbles to Angeletti’s parcel 1214, De Rossi’s Giornale for April 11, 1912 records the find of marbles in the drain, \( i \), on parcel 1215a owned by Rocco Foschi. It is not clear where the error is—in De Rossi’s Giornale or in Pasqui’s catalogue. One might suspect the former, since De Rossi writes on July 17, 1912 about more cleaning of drain \( i \), which yielded more marbles. But this time he gives the property as that of Angeletti Antonio.
E.5. GRAPHIC DOCUMENTATION OF “HORACE’S VILLA”: ANALYSIS AND REVISION OF THE DATA USING MODERN SURVEYING PROCEDURES

BY FRANCESCA COLOSI, ROBERTO GABRIELLI, BERNARD FRISCHER

E.5.1. INTRODUCTION

Over the years “Horace’s Villa” at Licenza has been the object of archaeological study by scholars of various nations. The graphic and photographic documentation regarding the surviving structures and the excavations is abundant, but not always trustworthy. In fact, the earliest surveys of the structures were carried out with rudimentary instruments that could not guarantee the absolute precision of the results. Moreover, the methods and even the very objectives of archaeological research have evolved considerably over the last century. Currently, there are new requirements for exactitude in the gathering of data in the field.

For these reasons it was necessary to analyze in detail the existing plans of the villa, in order to assess their accuracy and their possible usefulness for our investigation. Such checking was also important in preparation for the creation of a three-dimensional model of the building and for the gathering and managing of data within a Territorial Information System.

In order to perform this assessment, the plans were geo-referenced in a system of absolute coordinates and were superimposed on each other within a GIS. The work was carried out using a survey method on the ground that involves the integrated use of DGPS (Differential Global Positioning System) and of a Total Station.

The process of revising the plans, on the one hand, supplied definite numerical data on which to perform the successive phases of treatment and processing, and on the other hand, allowed us to test the validity of the methodology we adopted. Furthermore, the availability of abundant documentation, which covered a long span of time, made it possible to assess the accuracy of the various plans of the villa in relation to the topographical techniques available at the time when they were made.

E.5.2. GATHERING AND ANALYSIS OF THE EXISTING DOCUMENTATION

The first excavations carried out in the locality of the Vigne di S. Pietro near Licenza date to 1760, when a structure in opus reticulatum was discovered on the site of the villa.1 The presence of this building technique was taken as a clear indication for dating the site to the Augustan age and therefore for interpreting it as Horace’s Sabine property. In the 1770s, the Scottish painter Allan Ramsay uncovered some mosaic floors in the same area; these too were dated to the Augustan age.2

The first systematic excavations of the monument were begun in 1911 under the direction of Angelo Pasqui, who worked on the Vigne di S. Pietro site until 1914. Pasqui unearthed most of the remains that are visible today over an area of ca. 110 x 60 m. He also undertook extensive restoration works in order to preserve the ruins. The first survey of the structures above ground was carried out by his draughtsman Edoardo Gatti (fig. 1). Pasqui died in 1915 before being able to publish the results of his research; these were presented in a detailed report published in 1926 by Giuseppe Lugli, who had not taken part in the excavations. Gatti’s plan was published at the same time, and this can be considered the first available survey of the area.

Excavation was again undertaken in the years 1930-31 by the landscape architect Thomas Price, a Fellow of the American Academy in Rome, and by Giuseppe Lugli, by then a functionary of the Soprintendenza, in an area not previously explored by Pasqui. At the conclusion of the work, Price published not only


2. Frischer and Brown 2001, 146-147.
the excavation report, but also a detailed survey of the structures, along with the first hypothetical reconstruction of the villa (fig. 2).³

Excavation and research on the villa were then totally suspended, except for a few restoration efforts that were carried out on the site by the Soprintendenza Archeologica per il Lazio between 1960 and 1980. In this period, probably, the planimetric survey of the building that was presented by Coarelli in the Guida Archeologica del Lazio was commissioned.⁴ The authors of this survey are unknown.

Even though there were no systematic excavation campaigns, the interpretation and the dating of the structure urgently needed revision. The villa was surveyed in detail in the early 1990s by M. De Simone for her Tesi di Laurea.⁵ The plan was made using traditional methods, namely with an optical level and tape measure.

At the same time, the Soprintendenza Archeologica del Lazio carried out a survey of the building directly, due to requirements of documentation and conservation. This survey was done using a diastimeter and was published in 1993.⁶

From 1997 to 2001, the American Academy in Rome, the University of California at Los Angeles and the Soprintendenza Archeologica del Lazio carried out a new and systematic investigation of the site, under the direction of Prof. Bernard Frischer (UCLA).⁷ The project included the realization of a new plan of the villa by M. Cola using digital equipment (fig. 3); at the same time the present study of the preceding surveys was undertaken, in collaboration with the National Center for Research (CNR)–Istituto per le Tecnologie Applicate ai Beni Culturali (ITABC) of Rome.

To sum up, therefore, the plans of the villa at present available are:

1. Gatti, ca. 1914 (published by Lugli in 1926), fig. 1.
5. Plan executed by the Soprintendenza Archeologica del Lazio, using a diastimeter (published in In Sabinis 1993).
6. Plan realized by M. Cola with an electronic Total Station for the Horace’s Villa Project in 1999 (fig. 3).

E.5.3. Survey of the Control Points

Visual analysis of these plans quickly made it clear that the various surveys of the villa during the twentieth century contained considerable discrepancies. In order to establish which of these plans might be correct, or which parts of them were rendered with accuracy, it was necessary to survey certain cardinal points on the ground, corresponding to precise parts of the structures, and to relate such points to an absolute system of coordinates. In this way a new map was created, highly schematic and geo-referenced, which served as a basis for the combination and comparison of the historic plans (fig. 4).

The survey was carried out using an electronic Total Station and a single-frequency DGPS (Differential Global Positioning System) calibrated in centimeters.

E.5.3.1. Topographical positioning with the DGPS

GPS is a system of satellite positioning, which consists of three principal elements: the space sector, namely a constellation of 24 satellites; the control sector, namely the stations on earth with the task of maintaining the space section; and the utilizer section, namely the receivers for the GPS signals. A

3. Price, plans.
5. The student was given the thesis by Prof. Giuliani, holder of the chair of “Rilievo e Analisi Tecnica dei Monumenti Antichi” of the University of Rome “La Sapienza”; the survey was worked on by M. De Simone and C. De Persis between 1991 and 1993.
6. In Sabinis, unbound plans.
receiver, in any part of the planet and at any moment, can capture the signals of at least four satellites (fig. 5).

In general, the ultra-compact receivers, called PDAs (Personal Digital Assistants), are used for navigation, while the antennae that require the use of stands or backpacks are intended for topographical applications, which demand precision to the centimeter.

The survey is carried out by measuring the time taken by signals transmitted by several satellites to reach the receiver; this is known as the measure of the pseudo-distance. Even more accurate is phase measurement, performed with the most sophisticated equipment, which consists of determining the number of cycles necessary for the wave carrying the signal to reach the antenna on earth.

The principal advantage of the GPS method of receiving is that it immediately determines the position of a point on earth, thereby facilitating topographical operations to a great degree.

Certain errors inherent in the GPS system, due, for instance, to problems of propagating the signal in the atmosphere, to refraction, or to defects of the equipment, can be eliminated by using the DGPS method, by which the coordinates of a point are determined with respect to a reference station. In this way, the imprecision of the data gathered in the territory with a mobile antenna (known as a ‘rover’) are correlated with those of the data registered by a base antenna (known as a ‘reference’).

DGPS can work in various ways, according to the actual needs of the operator. The static method, which must be used when measurements are taken at a great distance, takes between 30 and 90 minutes to register the point. The static method for short base lines (known also as ‘rapid static’) can be used only when the receivers are at a maximum distance of 5 kilometers, and it works more quickly. Finally, the cinematic method and ‘Stop and Go’ are the most innovative aspect of DGPS; these are used when rapid reception of large quantities of data is required. The cinematic system permits rapid movement over the territory while continuously registering the spatial coordinates of the route being taken; ‘Stop and Go’, although following the same procedures, does not register the actual route covered, but only the stationing points. Both methods are particularly recommended for GIS-type applications, because they allow the rapid surveying of the altimetric development of the terrain over a very wide extent, an indispensable procedure for the 3D reconstruction of the territory.

At the Vigne di S. Pietro, DGPS was used in static modality to obtain the absolute coordinates of a series of points on the outside of the structures of the villa over the whole extension of the site (fig. 6). By linking the various parts of the survey of the building to these reference points, a geo-referenced plan of the complex could be made without constructing a traverse on the ground (fig. 7). This operation, given the impermeable vegetation of the site, would have involved topographical procedures of complex and lengthy preparation.

E.5.3.2. Integrated procedures for the execution of the survey

The site of the Vigne di S. Pietro is largely covered with a thick canopy of trees, which hampers the view from the sky and makes the registration of the data by way of the DGPS satellite antenna impossible. Although DGPS, therefore, was very useful for establishing absolute reference points on the outsides of the buildings and far from the vegetation canopy, it was inadequate for the direct survey of the masonry structures. For this reason, numerous control points on the walls of the villa were established with an electronic Total Station. Various topographical positionings were made (in fig. 7 defined as ‘Oi’, in which ‘i’ indicates the number of the bases, or reference points, established). These

8. Preference was given to working statically on account of the need to pick a limited number of points with the maximum precision possible.

were not necessarily within sight of one another; they coincided with the origin of a system of Cartesian axes ‘xy’, in which ‘y’ is not necessarily oriented to the north. By connecting every positioning to two DGPS points (in fig. 7 called P1 and P2) outside of the vegetation, and by using a roto-transactional matrix, it was possible to iso-orientate the local systems and thereby obtain the absolute geographical coordinates of every element surveyed. The method, simple and very precise, provides in a short time a perfectly geo-referenced survey.

E.5.4. Determining the Accuracy of the Existing Plans: The Methods and the Results.

In order to verify the accuracy of the earlier surveys, the data were handled within a GIS. The plans, available in raster format (nos. 1-5) or vectorial format (no. 6), were geo-referenced on the basis of the feedback from the cardinal points, and then compared one with another. The plan executed by M. Cola in 1999 using the total station (no. 6) proved to be very accurate, as is shown by the almost perfect coincidence of the survey with the control points. It therefore served as a most useful comparison for the analysis of all the earlier plans (fig. 8).

The following observations were made:

- Gatti’s plan (no. 1) is substantially correct in the representation of the north part of the villa, while it has a notable error of orientation in the south part, where the south-east corner diverges from the cardinal point by 40 cm to the south (fig. 9b). This inaccuracy demonstrates the difficulty the surveyor had in sighting points that were very far from each other and in correlating the north and south parts in the drawing. In spite of this, the accuracy of Gatti’s plan is exceptional, given the instruments available at that time. Moreover, errors in the rendering of some rooms could be due to the fact that not all the structures had been uncovered when the survey was carried out (fig. 9a).

- The plan of the architect Thomas Price (no. 2) is not as accurate, even though it was made twenty years later. All of the northern part of the villa is out of line by about 20 cm towards the north-west in relation to the true position, and the area of the baths is rendered very sketchily. But the most notable discrepancy relates to the south-east side of the quadriporticus, where the measurement is off by half a meter (fig. 10).

- There are considerable inexactitudes in the survey published by Coarelli (no. 3). First, there is a decided problem in the orientation of the map, whose north corner is considerably shifted in relation to the cardinal point. There are also numerous and evident inaccuracies in the representation of the residential quarters. For example, the recorded dimension of some rooms is greater than in fact they are, and the fountain on the inside of the atrium is misplaced by many centimetres. Such errors in the representation of details do not seem due to procedural or technological shortcomings, but rather are evidence of inadequate precision in the performance of the work (fig. 11).

- The plan of De Simone (no. 4), although drawn with very simple equipment, is substantially correct, both with regard to the orientation and the general dimensions of the building, and with regard to the rendering of the spaces. This goes to show that the availability of sophisticated instruments does not always produce the best results; on the contrary, careful and accurate work on the field can make up for the lack of sophisticated gadgetry (fig. 12).

- The survey carried out by the Soprintendenza Archeologica del Lazio (no. 5) is rather untrustworthy. There is, in fact an erroneous measurement on the north front, which is shown as being 30 cm shorter than it really is. This in turn generates an error that is repeated over the entire bath complex to the west of the monument (fig. 13a). The orientation of the plan is out of line by several degrees towards the south-west, as is clear when the long sides of the quadriporticus and of the south front are checked (fig. 13b)

E.5.5. The Creation of the Three-Dimensional Model of the Terrain

The efficacy of using DGPS for carrying out the morphological survey of areas of small dimensions

10. GIS TN Shark software was used for the geo-referencing and the comparison of the designs.
has been amply demonstrated. As noted above, for this type of work cinematic modality DGPS is used, which requires the use of a ‘rover’ antenna on a backpack; this permits the registration of space coordinates while on the move, and with extreme rapidity (ca. 1800 points/h).

By following the cinematic method, a series of points of determined altitude on the terrain of “Horace’s Villa” were established using DGPS. These points were used to create the first digital three-dimensional model of the site (fig. 14). The DTM (Digital Terrain Model), on which was “spread” the plan of the villa, requires the gathering of further data on the morphology of the zone; above all, it must be enhanced with the three-dimensional rendering of the masonry structures. It is evident that the structures adapt perfectly to the lie of the land. The residence is at a higher level, where the north side of the quadriporticus is also situated. From this there is access to the long sides of the quadriporticus by way of two lateral ramps, while a central staircase leads to the uncovered area, kept as garden. The garden and the two long sides of the quadriporticus follow the natural slope from north to south. The east side deviates slightly westwards to adapt to the morphology of the site, coming as far as the limit of the level area, beyond which the terrain rises eastwards. The structure that was created in the east wing of the quadriporticus, a fountain or some ornamental structure, must have also served the purpose of holding up the slope.

E.5.6. CONCLUSIONS

The difficulty in making different plans of the same site coincide is a problem that scholars often find when reworking excavation data. In the case of “Horace’s Villa,” all the graphic documentation has now been linked to a single topographical grid and analyzed with the help of computers.

The grid was made using equipment with various functions. DGPS, receiving the data from satellites, requires good visibility in order to function; it cannot be used, for instance, in the midst of heavy vegetation. These characteristics make DGPS ideal for the resolution of specifically topographical problems, such as fixing the points and geo-referencing the elements, while it has certain limitations in the surveying of masonry structures. Conversely, Total Station is characterized by the highest precision, but cannot operate quickly if there are obstacles between the various points.

On the site of “Horace’s Villa,” the integrated use of these two pieces of equipment greatly simplified the gathering of spatial data and led to the rapid production of a geo-referenced survey, with little expenditure of energy.

Analysis of the pre-existing plans leads to several observations. It is clear that the survey, carried out at very different times and with very different techniques, produced varying results. The orientation of the map is often not correct, which shows the difficulties the topographers had in linking the parts of the survey; with a smaller number of operations, any errors, of course, had greater consequences. For instance, on some plans there are imprecision in the measurement of the north front of the building; the bulk of these, particularly the older ones, do not resolve the problem of the linkage between the north and south parts of the villa. Only the survey of 1999, carried out with the electronic Total Station, gives a correct representation of the building and positions it precisely in the space.

In addition to the discrepancies resulting from the limitations of the instruments used, in some surveys inaccuracies are found in the rendering of the particulars. Presumably they depend on errors of measurement made by the operators, who were not always very sensitive to the problems of architectural surveying.


12. The analysis of the model, however, already provides inspiration for reflection (fig. 14).
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E.6.1. ABSTRACT

This paper explores the historic and theoretical intersections of archaeology and folklore and how their disciplinary perspectives diverge and converge around the site of the Villa of Horace today. Treasure serves as a metaphorical tool to explore the various meanings, contexts, and discourses on Horace’s Villa. The contested interpretations of treasure emerge from an analysis of the various types of oral narratives collected in Licenza: treasure tales, meta-archaeological narratives, and finally, stories about Horace and the Villa. An ethnographic sketch of Licenza serves to contextualize these narratives, where issues of peasant worldview, archaeological project, and future economic development and land management emerge. Finally, the paper focuses on former custodian and folk poet of the villa, Giuseppe Rinaldi, a “living treasure,” and considers how he embodies the intersection of oral tradition and archaeological site.

2. The term “folklore” introduced by W. J. Thoms in *The Atheneaum*, August 12, 1846, replaced “popular antiquities,” which largely referred to traditions, legends, tales, sayings, proverbs, and songs; today, these are frequently referred to as “oral tradition.”

3. Connections, however, are still evident to some, as they relate to material culture and areas of ancient vs. recent technologies; the folklore of prehistoric stone tools; and more recently, to a new area of enquiry which might deal with, e.g., the role of megaliths in popular beliefs, or the effects on monument and site preservation on the contemporary tourism industry.
of unbroken, ancient traditions, “untainted” by urban civilization. Here the “authentic” folk’s utterances (songs, tales) might represent purer “survivals” unchanged since ancient times (fig. 1). This view was shared by archaeologists, antiquarians, folklorists (and landscape painters, see below and Frischer, G.2.2). The mischief that fallacy of a-historicity played in the lack of civil progress accorded the actual “folk” was significant.4

Recent trends in archaeology indicate a rapprochement of the disciplines, as archaeologists are called to explore “complementary landscape histories,” to consider “cultural value” in their discourse, and to weigh folklore’s potential contributions to interpretive archaeology (i.e., the search for meanings of the past in the past and in the present). The effort to more fully understand monuments in history, as well as in the societies where they survive, creates fertile ground for interdisciplinary discourse around questions of history, historical accuracy and meaning. Folklore indeed provides alternative images of people’s histories, different systems of meaning and may help us “in understanding not only what happened and when, but how events were experienced by people participating in them and remembered by their descendants.”7

This contribution offers a folklorist’s perspective on an archaeological site. It focuses on the cultural meanings and symbolic value of Horace’s Villa in the oral tradition of Licenza. Its aim is to contribute, not quaint “curiosities,” but rather a fuller understanding of the physical and human landscapes contextualizing the archaeological site today. I suspect, however, that folklore’s disciplinary position vis-à-vis archaeology may still be largely viewed as somewhat analogous to the peasant vignettes found in many a Hackert landscape engraving, that is as: personaggi di contorno, decidedly marginal to the canvas. Next to the sweeping, authoritative, Romantic landscape with monument appears the quaint peasant, shepherd, or even brigand; these figures grace the corners, offering a sense of scale and “local color,” as they generally behave in an idealized pastoral mode (riding donkeys, making music, etc.).8 I propose bringing such figures in from the margins by interrogating them directly and soliciting their personal narratives about the landscape of which they form an integral part.

Hackert indeed integrated monuments into their natural milieux, where men, monuments, and the physical setting seemed to create a seamless and picturesque harmony.9 Significantly though, he studiously avoided

4. “When population movements were not evident, ethnologists and archaeologists believed that the activities, material culture and social organization observed in the nineteenth century were identical with those that existed in the past” (Gazin-Schwartz and Holtorf 1999b, 9). This fallacy was fully operative among ethnologists of Amerindians (i.e., “people who do not change don’t have a history”). In Italy and Europe, peasants were dubbed la gente senza storia (‘people without history’: cf. E. Wolf, Europe and the People Without History [Berkeley 1992]). See also Antonio Gramsci’s numerous writings on history, culture and folklore, a scholar who worked to restore historical depth to the discourse around the “subaltern classes,” and to elucidate socio-cultural distinctness among these classes.


6. “Cultural value [which] accrues from the study of the changing meanings of monuments through the ages” (Burström, Winberg and Zachrisson 1996, quoted in Gazin-Schwartz and Holtorf 1999b, 10). “Today [however], there is gradual recognition that all meanings that have been ascribed to ancient monuments contribute to their cultural value. This realization motivates a renewed archaeological interest in folklore” (M. Burström, “Focussing on Time: Disciplining Archaeology in Sweden,” in Gazin-Schwartz and Holtorf 1999a, 35-47, at 35).

7. And folklore may also help explain “how these memories influenced the creation, preservation and destruction of monuments in landscapes” (Gazin-Schwartz and Holtorf 1999b, 3).

8. In François Morel’s later engravings (based upon Dunker’s drawings, ca. 1800), while he remained faithful to the Hackert landscapes, he nonetheless substituted the peasant vignettes with neo-classical figures drawn by Luigi Sabatelli, in an attempt to give the settings historic depth by placing humanity and monument on the same chronologic plane (Margozzi, 10).

9. […] piuttosto egli è attento al loro rapporto con l’ambiente naturale, a coglierne l’armonia nel contesto del paesaggio di cui fanno parte. La sua
cultivated fields (evidence of peasant work) in favor of wild and natural landscapes (quanto meno un luogo è coltivato, tanto più è pittoresco). According to Hackert, it is not the specific tree, but its idealized form, which is esthetically pleasing, and the painterly eye must select the most beautiful element of each specimen. So, too, must the pastoral human element in such tableaux, represented by quaint, costumed peasants, add an aesthetic contribution to the whole. Peasants appear as part of the natural landscape, as though ancient as the hills, unchanged in time (or at least contemporaneous with the historic monument). The topos is repeated in the archaeological literature by Ramsay:

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.

and echoed by contemporary local observers:

[...] curvi sotto le fatiche, rudi nel volto, abbronzati dal sole, questi buoni popolani rammentano Orazio come se fosse vissuto ieri in questi luoghi; sognano il colle Meneghella, posta al di là del Licenza [il fiume] sopra alla Piana di Otto, rammenti il nome di una diletta di Orazio e la raccontano come se lo vedessero su per la strada Oratini...

These assertions assume a continuity that may not be borne out by the historic record, and they take little note of the peasant’s actual, and expressed—were one to listen—hardships. Contented and idealized humanity, reassuringly unchanged, was surely one of the attractions for Hackert’s clients (subscribers to his engravings) on the Grand Tour, a tour which was to have included Licenza. Here begins our discourse on the divide which historically separates the learned from the unlearned response, the scholar’s from the folk’s meaning, and the esthete’s from the insider’s perspective on Horace’s Villa.

E.6.3. Landscape

Since Horace’s day, landscape has been central to any discourse on Licenza, and it remains so today,
to archaeologists, to the remaining peasants, and to ecologists and those involved in heritage management, as the villa comes to find itself within the nature conservancy of the Parco Regionale Naturale dei Monti Lucretili. If folklore can indeed be called upon to create a “complementary landscape histor[y]” it seems particularly appropriate to note that it was the very landscape itself—assuming this in fact to be the true site of Horace’s Villa—which gave birth to Horace’s country Villa, inspired much of his poetry, and delighted the poet. His love of the bucolic is a source of local pride, and peaceful rustication has attracted more recent Ausländer as well. Any future proposal to manage the site might best keep this historic function of the villa in full view.

Landscape, of course, is central to archaeology, playing its role as a means of site identification according to historic, literary, and pictorial sources. Further, direct observation of the landscape may help in the assessment of how nature, time, and humanity have altered the site’s physical setting. But land is also the very stuff of peasant life. Peasants shape and give human contour to the land by clearing, shoring up, terracing, grazing, plowing, pruning, inheriting, dividing, contesting, and sometimes damaging the historic site through agricultural work. Archaeologists and peasants are here bound by the very soil in which they dig. And in this instance at least, the archaeological site was in fact an agricultural site as well, a country villa; Horace himself, to the amusement of his laborers, attempted to dig this very soil.

What binds and divides a folk from an archaeological perspective on land and its uses, and how might they be mutually informing? At times, it may be precisely the peasant’s intimate knowledge of seasonality, topography, local history, and specificity of fauna and flora that informs the archaeologist’s project. And in the ordinary work of tilling the soil, peasants have frequently uncovered artifacts directly useful to archaeologists. They may generally be expected to have a keen topographic memory with regard to the land and its boundaries.

Landscape is also important to current economic development strategies, i.e., ecologic conservation. Archaeologists and folklorists stand to make significant contributions to issues of land and heritage management, since archaeologists offer a historic perspective on sites, and folklorists a contemporary human perspective, one which puts people back in the picture. Might it not be wise, for example, with regard to Horace’s Villa, to insist that agriculture form a significant part of its future development as a heritage site? The villa, that is, could conceivably become something of a living museum of ancient and contemporary pastoral-agricultural life and its technologies—not incompatible with present-day ecologic and commercial concerns.

17. “Ingunn Holm argues that Norwegian farmers can recognize evidence of past agricultural activity better than archaeologists who have grown up in towns. Local folklore, recorded in the 1930s, provided a more accurate explanation for abandoned fields than archaeologists had provided in the 1980s” (Gazin-Schwartz and Holtorf 1999a, 26-34 at 29).

18. But local memory may also be inaccurate. According to the visual evidence Mary Fort gathered, for instance, and contrary to common belief, the landscape around Licenza was barren and treeless earlier in the last century, due to over-foraging of wood for fuel. Reforestation was pushed forward by Mussolini.

19. The cultivation of farro or spelt (an ancient grain traditional to the area until the post-war period), and its manufacture into spelt-based products, is currently being successfully promoted by a local grocer, Pietro Pascucci, for the organic markets now booming in Italy. Other sustainability projects might be devised. For further perspectives on tourism, the heritage industry, and popular responses vis-à-vis “display” see B. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums and Heritage (Berkeley 1999). On these issues as they relate to Italy more specifically, see S. Magliocco, “Coordinates of Power and Performance: Festivals as Sites of (Re)Presentation and Reclamation in Sardinia,” Ethnologies 23 (2001) 167-188.

15. E.g., John Rae, a former British naval captain (and naval attaché to Rome from 1956-59), retired to Licenza for similar reasons, for its simple and unspoiled nature: “I came in search of peace, [for] I had had an extremely unpeaceful life.”

Classical sites and *beni culturali* abound in Italy, how
to manage these cultural treasures is frequently also
a controversial subject—as is the very interpretation
of “treasure.”

E.6.4. **Treasure as Metaphor**

The hunt for treasure is not only a common folk
narrative motif but it is also found in the discourse
and practice of early folklorists and archaeologists.
Folktales and song collections often made reference
to “treasure” and “gems” as diamonds in the rough,
ruder forms of folk “poetry” (note the hegemonic
literary nomenclature), which, when polished
through editorial tinkering (standardizing dialect
forms and /or regulating metrics) could be made
presentable to civilized society (cf. the “cleaned up”
peasants in Hackert’s paintings). Treasures brought
to light by archaeologists may have proved more
lucrative. Nonetheless, semantics as well as some
methodological affinities wedded the disciplines, as
does the agricultural metaphor of “fieldwork,” which
implies spadework in the great outdoors and not
from an armchair. Indeed, this metaphor conceals a
shared border between archaeology and the work
of peasants, which I propose to explore.

This paper also attempts to interpret the polysemous
motif of “treasure” and its various meanings as they
merge in the current discourse around Horace’s
Villa. “Treasure” has proven surprisingly versatile.
Treasure, for instance, may be viewed as ill-gotten booty (e.g., a pirate’s or a brigand’s treasure chest);
as archaeological artifact (e.g., the “Treasures of
Tutankhamen”); as the folk hero’s reward in classic
talestales (e.g., buried gold, or magical objects such
as tablecloths, pasta pots, etc.); as a living human
resource (e.g., “living cultural treasure”=specific,
traditional, cultural knowledge, as is it known to
folklorists); or a “national treasure,” as known to
literate culture (e.g., Horace himself). Finally, treasure
may be viewed as public finance and economic
development (i.e., the Treasury). Yet many of these
discrete categories may merge in consciousness and
practice. How many museum artifacts from earlier
archaeological expeditions are now considered pirated
booty, such as Native American burial artifacts or
the Elgin Marbles? How many early archaeological
expeditions were thinly-disguised treasure hunts?
How often have folktales motifs of dreamed gold
promoted contemporary treasure hunters to “seek
their fortune” with metal detectors and treasure
maps? Lotteries fund public treasuries, as they exploit
widespread aspirations to sudden wealth. Given the
wealth of interpretive possibilities, treasure talk in
this paper will be metaphorical and literal, for it weaves
together history and oral memory as well as folk and
archaeological narrative.

Such contested meanings of treasure come to the
fore in Licenza, exemplifying how “one man’s
treasure is another man’s trash.”

One archaeologist noted the fundamental disparity between popular
expectations of *il tesoro della villa*—precious metal
gold), or at least a single object of great value—
and the archaeologist’s: “for us it’s the opposite,
[it is] the object that allows us to understand the
site.”

Tangible versus intangible treasures concern
Licenza’s mayor Romanzi, too, as he cautions
against interpreting treasure too literally. Horace’s
Villa cannot alone create employment opportunities
and thereby solve Licenza’s economic problems, but
should be understood as a cultural treasure (*un bene
culturale*) to be “internalized” by the population (see
E.6.8). Opposing ideas of treasure may especially divide folk from literate worldview. A peasant may
willingly hand over *cubilia*, since he has little use for
stones in his field; to the archaeologist these might
provide a crucial piece of the puzzle. A treasure hunter

20. **L. Del Giudice**, “Paesi di Cuccagna and other
Gastronomic Utopias,” in *Imagined States: National
Identity, Utopia, and Longing in Oral Cultures*, eds. L.

21. **A. van Dongen**, ed., *One Man’s Trash is Another
Man’s Treasure: The Metamorphosis of the European
Utensil in the New World* (Rotterdam 1996).

22. **Stefano Camaiani** (a member of the excavation
team at Horace’s Villa 1997-2001) notes that such
objects can reverse the history of research on a site,
turn chronology on its head, and have profound
ramifications for the study of larger geographic areas.
It is precisely this possibility which gives artifacts
their real value, and which makes archaeology so
exciting (personal communication).

23. **Ramsay, in Frischer and Brown**, 140 (=Ramsay,
*Enquiry*, 46).
might sell them for hard cash, while an antiquities collector instead might display them in his garden or home as objets d’art (see E.6.13).

E.6.5. ArCHAeoloGy And orAl TrAdItion

Oral tradition may be relevant to archaeologists in a variety of ways, yet when archaeologists try to use folk materials as clues they find that folklore and archaeological remains rarely match, and that such leads usually prove disappointing, as noted by Gazin-Schwartz and Holtorf. As archaeologists, Gazin-Schwartz and Holtorf encourage colleagues to move beyond the question of the historic accuracy of folkloric materials, and they assert that “neither field can be relied upon to tell us about the actual past.” It appears to me that it may be the actual assessment of the quality and nature of such “information” (historically accurate or not), which requires a folklorist’s assistance. We ask these critical questions of oral narratives: why are they told; how do they continue to be relevant narratives; and what (and whose) underlying concerns do they express? That is not ‘are they or are they not true?’, but rather, ‘how are they true?’ These are not likely to be the sorts of questions archaeologists are accustomed to ask. Folklore materials follow their own internal, traditional logic, style, and genre-specific language, and must be interpreted “from within.”

Origin myths are told in mythological language, which is symbolic and interpretive. They reveal not so much facts about the past as the significance of the past. It is thus more appropriate to look to the stories for meaning than for facts. It is this meaningfulness of the story that ensures its transmission, not its historical accuracy.

This does not exclude the possibility that these narratives may be embedded with “useful” (actual) cultural and historical information. Furthermore, “what people believe happened is often as important as what actually happened, for people think, act and react in accordance with what they believe to be true.” It is therefore “preferable not to dismantle the narratives of folklore, in order to sift vestiges of truth from various kinds of fantasy” but, as Emma Blak argues in her work on ancient towers in Sardinia, to “treat oral traditions holistically.”

My goal was precisely to treat this enquiry holistically, combining traditional bibliographic research and oral interviews with as wide a range of interviewees as possible, who might shed light on Horace and his villa in living oral tradition. This would include, e.g., nomenclature, songs, personal and traditional narrative, oral poetry, etc., their historic functions and their symbolic value in the economy and history of the area. I sought therefore, to explore the various intersections of folk culture, oral tradition and archaeology through Horace’s Villa.

E.6.6. Land And Landscapes: Peasants And ArCHAeoloGists

Peasants and archaeologists dig dirt, handle stone, build walls. But what makes fieldstone conceptually distinct from artifacts? What place does stone have in the peasant’s worldview? Do ancient, Renaissance, and modern stones differ substantially? Historic lines are in fact frequently blurred when ancient stone is recycled. In folk material culture, furthermore, design and construction methods (e.g., terracing) may not actually have changed in centuries (fig. 2). Peasants seem to periodize history in distinct ways (e.g., the generic ai tempi di Nerone to indicate great

---

24. In my native Terracina (southern Lazio), I learned that when a family friend found an urn still containing ashes on the road to the cemetery (a funeral site from ancient times forward), he merely gave it to a doctor, a casual acquaintance, who had mentioned his interest in such things.


antiquity, *ai tempi dei nonni* for the recent past), and frequently display an a-historical and non-philologic approach to objects in their domestic spaces. While archaeologists deal in linear chronology, folk culture tends to re-visit, re-mold, and re-embody cultural forms from the past, and while the former tends to move the origins of customs further into the past, folklore draws those customs forward in a continuous updating of tradition.\(^30\)

And yet, part of antiquarian Ramsay’s novelty may have been his willingness to directly consult the local “country people,” showing a certain faith in their “native capacity for comprehension and appreciation.”\(^31\) This openness indeed yielded many positive results. It may perhaps be an attitude learned from the elder Ramsay, a member of the Scottish enlightenment, who wrote *The Gentle Shepherd*, a work in Scots vernacular credited with a “directness of impression and [an] appreciation of country life [which] anticipate the attitude of the school which broke with neo-classical tradition.”\(^32\)

### E.6.7. LICENZA AND HORACE’S VILLA: WORLDS DIVIDED

Fieldwork in Licenza led to the disappointing realization that Horace and the Villa have actually had little impact on the people of Licenza,\(^33\) save for the few who have had direct dealings with the villa, either as laborers or custodians. Of course, there is a greater acquaintance with Horace among the local intelligentsia. As lamented by archaeologists, noted by civic authorities, and admitted by the Licentini themselves, few are curious about or have visited the site, despite its proximity to the village. We might speculate on the reasons for this neglect: general lack of formal education of the population (due to socio-economic factors or the inadequacy of the educational system), or perhaps it is attributable to the assumption that “those who will benefit from economic development [of the site] lie outside the village.”\(^34\)

The villa has historically been associated with “outsiders.” German and English tourists (from the era of the Grand Tour) have been its major enthusiasts. At least one peasant woman remembers that about 70 years ago, groups of young children (*branchi di ragazzi*) would flock to the “strada romana” when the English tourists arrived by buses. The children sold them bunches of large violets for a penny (*un soldo*). Furthermore, the villa as an archaeological site is associated with foreign academics (e.g., those from the American Academy in Rome working in conjunction with the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio, fig. 3). The land in its vicinity is inhabited

\(^30\) R. Layton, “Folklore and Worldview,” in Gazin-Schwartz and Holtorf 1999a, 26-27.

\(^31\) On Ramsay’s defense of the native intelligence and ability of even the illiterate and lowest to appreciate “the leading principle in poetry and painting,” cf. Smart (as n.14) 143.

\(^32\) Allan Ramsay (the elder), wig-maker turned poet, publisher, and book seller, engaged in local, vernacular poetic forms such as songs (among which is *The Ever Green, being a Collection of Scots Poems wrote by the Ingenious before 1600*), with the purpose of reawakening an interest in the older national literature. The dramatic pastoral, *The Gentle Shepherd*, written in Scots vernacular, was a remarkable success and directly inspired his greater successors, Fergusson and Burns. Cf. “Allan Ramsay,” in *The Encyclopedia Britannica*, vol. 22, 878.

\(^33\) Indeed, as noted by Chiavarone, not one of his students had named Horace’s Villa as an “affective site” (that is, a site “of the heart,” one to which one was emotionally attached), in their research projects on *Le vie di Orazio*. Foschi (personal communication) maintains that there was a greater consciousness of Horace in earlier days and among those peasants who actually stayed in Licenza.

\(^34\) Cf. D. Shankland, “Integrating the Past: Folklore, Mounds and People at Çatalhöyük,” in Gazin-Schwartz and Holtorf 1999a, 139-157, at 142-143, on the relationship of a Turkish archaeological site and its adjacent village, its similar perception of separateness, the site’s small impact on village life, and the lack of understanding of where the locals might fit into its development. Similar disinterest on the part of peasants seemed to be present in Licenza vis-à-vis annual Oraziana cultural events (“we don’t have imagination anymore, we are old,” stated one woman, suggesting that a life of relentless physical labor had worn her down and had left little cultural energy). Her reaction to reports of an actress completely disrobing during a performance at the villa suggested too that such representations might not be in tune with local sensibilities.
by the few literal “foreigners” (English, Romans) of Licenza who have purchased land there. When an Englishman, John Rae, built his home just beneath the Ninfeo in the 1960s, locals were both amazed and alarmed that he should consider inhabiting this dangerous wilderness. Much of the land beyond the town may have been considered wild, that is, space beyond civilization; traditionally, even the cultivated lands that were worked during the day were never inhabited by peasants. Instead, the peasants returned each evening to their homes within the town walls, a pattern typical of towns and villages throughout central Italy. Historically, those extra-mural spaces were feared, as being full of dangers both human (bandits) and animal (wolves and snakes). Today, of course, “country villas” or villini have sprouted up in many places once deemed uninhabitable, including the vicinity of Horace’s Villa (fig. 4).

The specific history of Licenza, a history made of penury and emigration, goes a long way to explaining why few working in such harsh subsistence reality had the time, resources, or inclination for matters of archaeology. It is considered un paese arretrato (“a backward town”) by more than one. Yet this disinterest does not seem limited to peasants alone and may be even more marked among the younger adult population, who smaniano di andarsene (“are restless to leave”) and have little interest a sporcarsi le mani (“in dirtying their hands”) in any local agricultural labor or the more physical sorts of archaeological work. Class bias against dirtying one’s hands may arise from the little regard with which agricultural work is viewed, and carry over to archaeology (see E.6.13).

The economic history of the Licentini as migrant workers in the fields of the valley (the hinterland around Rome) and in Tivoli goes back to the late nineteenth century and is remembered by elders now in their late 70s and 80s. Historically, men, women, and even children (unmarried girls and boys) were hired out, while married women normally remained in the town. The migrants returned to Licenza only for Christmas, Easter, and Ferragosto, and so a peasant’s oral history of Licenza must take note of these long absences from the village. The steep, inhospitable landscape meant that arable land was scratched out at great cost (figs. 5 and 6). Only olive trees, hardy spelt (farro), and a few vineyards seemed to survive, and enough of a plot for kitchen gardens and an animal or two. “Non è una bella campagna” (“it is not great farming land”), from a peasant’s point of view, for it lacks open fields and can be tilled only by hand. The land therefore could not sustain the population, leaving the Licentini little choice but to migrate. Local migration was common, while emigration to overseas destinations generally was not.36

Remembering the seasonal farmwork of those days as a young girl, a woman in her late 70s stressed that “c’hanno fatto scoppià” (“they made us bust a gut”).37 In the post-World War II era, Licenza experienced another mass emigration, for Licentini left for jobs as stone masons, factory workers, doormen, bidelli (janitors), and other areas of unskilled labor requested by the various government ministries and institutes of Rome. Farming as an economically viable activity was largely abandoned by the 1970s and the wilderness (la macchia) slowly reclaimed the

35. Foschi, 39 and 79, notes that local bandits (he names one Marcellino) were usually good to local peasants; they were Robin Hood figures who gave to the poor, rewarding them for their help. For tales of violence as they relate to “jayhawkers” and buried treasure in an American outlaw context, see G. E. Lankford, “Jayhawker Narratives as Treasure Legends,” Kentucky Folklore Record 32 (1986) 110-117.


37. Santina Orati Muzi (b. May 5, 1924) remembers that from the age of 10 many girls were hired out to work in the fields in the Roman hinterland. She herself was not sent to school because her family had need of her earning capacity. She went to the “campagna”, the Orti of Rome, the Gianicolo. She typically worked 15 hour days, digging and loading carts to take to market, and returned to Licenza only at Easter, Christmas and Ferragosto. She banded together with other female companions and did not feel any danger, even traveling at midnight without worry.
valley. Today there are a few old peasants\textsuperscript{38} who tend
their lands, a few “weekend-farmers,” and a high
unemployment rate among young adults. There is
a general sense of feeling economically cut off and
that the youth must flee Licenza to create their future.
There is little tourism (despite the Parco), and the few
regular tourists who visit this area have family ties
here, returning on weekends or as retirees. A social
center for the elderly, recently built, gathers in many
returning emigrants as pensioners.

How have Horace and the villa impacted the culture
and economy of Licenza, and what part do local,
historic and ethnographic realities play in proposals
for, or resistance to, current plans for “marketing
Horace”?  

E.6.8. CULTURAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:
MARKETING HORACE

Municipal authorities and the local intelligentsia
have been consciously developing Horace as a public
symbol of Licenza for about 50 years, according to
mayor Romanzi, and most assiduously since 1993,
the year marking the second millennium of Horace’s
death. The earliest efforts appear to have come on
the heels of Lugli’s publication (in the wake of early
excavations of the villa, begun by Pasqui).\textsuperscript{39}
Cultural promotion and public education took various forms
in the post-war period. Augusto Onorati, president
of the Pro Loco (an organization promoting local
tourism and culture) from 1967 to 1975, was directly
responsible for having a medallion struck of Horace’s
image. He apparently also arranged declamations of
Horatian poetry with instrumental accompaniment.
Mafalda Corsi Gorini, a teacher at the Middle School
remembered with fondness,\textsuperscript{40} created a school festival
on the piazza of Licenza, in which children performed
pageants and other “folkloric” events, performing as
tarantella dancers in costume, and giving recitations
in dialect. She consciously wove references to Horace
into the Stornellata licentina, her song on Licenza.\textsuperscript{41}

Since the 1990s, and in conjunction with the creation
of the Parco Regionale Naturale dei Monti Lucretili,
there has been a flurry of publications aimed at
general audiences: a guide to the park for youth
(Camminando per i monti); a park map with some
interpretive materials (fig. 7); a tourist guide to the
Museo Oraziano. New interpretive panels at the site
itself (July, 2001) provide an updated orientation to
Horace’s Villa, and new benches encourage more
casual enjoyment of the site’s beauty and serenity.
Most recently, the administration has placed the villa
at the center of ambitious cultural activity, going
beyond enlarging the museum and supporting the
archaeological project to sustain annual festivals
of art, theater, and culture entitled Oraziana. These
largely contemporary reinterpretations, inspired by
the work of Horace, in turn have spawned exhibits,
conferences, and publications. Such public events
presumably encourage the local population to
“internalize Horace” (as mayor Romanzi puts it).

Perhaps the most promising efforts are being
conducted through the Middle School. Systematic
curriculum enhancement integrating Horace’s Villa,
the Park, and projects on sustainability stress the role
of youth in the future economic development of the
area. The interdisciplinary teaching team has guided
the students in the creation of multimedia projects.\textsuperscript{42}  

---

\textsuperscript{38} Yet it must be noted that the culture of the vast
majority of Licentini, those who have remained and
those who have returned, is clearly peasant-based.

\textsuperscript{39} Lugli, 1926.

\textsuperscript{40} Foschi, 137-139.

\textsuperscript{41} Mafalda Corsi was an enthusiast of local culture.
In that role, which is typical of local intelligentsia,
she became a mediator of learned culture for local
peasants, while attempting to instill a sense of
patriotism and local pride. She wrote the town song
(Stornellata licentina, see Foschi, 138), reminiscent
of so many others written for towns like Licenza.
While I am unaware of her politics, she may have
imbibed this cultural conviction from a Fascist
milieu, for Fascists were particularly fond of folk
pageants and processions, preferably in colorful
costume—a visual extension of the happy peasant
(see E.6.2).

\textsuperscript{42} The Middle School has produced two digital student
projects on the area. The first is on sustainable
development (Progetto sviluppo sostenibile: Parco
Regionale Naturale dei Monti Lucretili, Scuola
Media Statale Sabellico, Vicovaro [Rome], Sede
Competitions focusing on Horace’s poetry and on the wider geographic context of the Valle Ustica have also been devised for children throughout the school district.

Many of these activities are meant to bring government subsidies, tourist lire (now Euros), and employment opportunities to the area, and to broaden cultural discourse and activity around Horace. They also seek to make this historic figure and the villa relevant to contemporary life, hence titles such as *Il Mecenatismo Oggi: un Dibattito nella Villa di Orazio* (Oraziana 1999), and the presence of contemporary artists called to update Horatian themes. Unifying efforts have been devised to overcome *campanilismo* (local pride) and prevent the various municipalities who contest “ownership” of Horace from sundering the fragile regional unity of the “Comunità Montana” that has focused on regional park management since 1989.

New plans focus on the development of tourism and further integration of the villa into the regional park (fig. 8), as well as on ways of linking the villa to a broader “antiquities trail.” Plans for cultural tourism that would entice visitors to explore the valley more fully seem urgent, as does tourism which goes beyond the harvest festivals, which have also been invented recently to promote local products (e.g., Percile’s *sagra della ramiccia*, Licenza’s *sagne di farro*, for spelt).

Issues of “control over the use, presentation and management of ancient sites” become thorny concerns of any “heritage industry,” particularly as it manages “collective identity.” In this context, archaeologists do well to understand local traditions and concerns and to attempt their mediation where possible. But how the local population figures in that grander plan is far from clear to locals. While the new activities at the villa are viewed favorably (although the cultural events sometimes appear esoteric), the Parco has proved a vast disappointment. Despite all these laudable cultural and ecologic plans, it is generally perceived that little economic advantage actually accrues to the local community. The complaints regarding the Park do not come from peasants alone, however. Some see it as a drain on resources: the cost of rescuing trekkers in the wilderness (since the paths are so poorly marked), as well as the loss of livestock, is not negligible. It has also been noted that since 1990, residential construction has been halted; hunters, who apparently brought some seasonal income to local establishments, have been officially banned (although hunting seems to continue undisturbed); wild fauna (e.g., boars) has made even modest agriculture untenable; and the forest has returned to the town’s gates. Furthermore, employment opportunities have been negligible, and employment—not cultural activity—remains foremost among the concerns of the Licentini. To the locals, it seems counterproductive, for example, to restructure and pave the road to the villa with European Economic Union, rather than local, labor.

43. *It is felt, however, that these plans require a concerted,* supra-regional effort if they are to overcome traditional cultural and political fragmentation. Licenza and other mountain destinations, whose isolation was only relatively recently overcome through the construction of a road, rarely benefit from tourists, who seem to require more reasons than currently exist to lure them up the valley.

44. *One curious suggestion for cultural tourism touched* on an archaeological site within the town of Licenza. While working on the building next to the old church, a wall broken into unexpectedly revealed the upright body of a prelate who was promptly re-immured and nothing more said about it. Couldn’t he be exposed in a glassed viewing case so tourists might be further attracted to Licenza? Such an idea might certainly bring an off-beat (and macabre) tourist to Licenza! Foschi, however, contends that the prelate should be left in peace (Foschi, 51, 54).

---


46. Several pointed out the irony of this construction project employing Romanian labor—used, I might add, throughout this area. But the villa has always provided only limited economic opportunity, at best. The villa’s economic potential has a minor history of its own. Hackert’s prints, early on, were marketed, along with travel maps and itineraries, for tourists on the Grand Tour (Margozzi, 28-29). A local presence at the villa’s margins took various forms: we recall the hoards of children selling...
The conception and management of the nature conservancy also has certain basic flaws, according to a segment of local opinion. A look at traditional peasant worldview will help us understand why.

E.6.9. WILDERNESS VS. FARMLAND

There are particular binary oppositions that seem to operate in local consciousness as they relate to land: wild (unproductive, ecologic) vs. domesticated (productive, peasant), which roughly overlay idealized rustication and pastoralism vs. actual rustics (peasants and shepherds). A strong (and traditional) insider/outsider dichotomy also exists in Licenza, and considers all non-Licentini (those from neighboring Percile, as well as foreigners such as English expatriots) to be outsiders. Little experience with actual foreigners, as has been noted, may have compounded this attitude. With rare exception, not even Romans have made Licenza a weekend escape destination. Issues of insider/outside may play out even among professional archaeologists, as Italians encounter foreign équipes.

The few remaining peasants, however, cling to a traditional worldview, lament the state of the landscape, and consider the regional park to have been a disaster (fig. 7). How could they appreciate a nature conservation area where wild beasts and rapacious birds (l'aquila reale) are privileged over fields and domesticated animals? In fact, laments for various losses go beyond the physical and tend toward the ethical, as traditional values such as honesty, respect, and so forth are also being swept away. This sentiment is echoed in various quarters and seems to equate the oldest peasant generation (the good generation) with such values, while the younger, restless generation (uprooted from the land and with little sense of place), is eager to leave Licenza behind. Such are the moral and economic dilemmas of this area. Public projects seek to keep this reality in the forefront. Yet, while in local opinion, the assessment of the Park has been generally negative—environmentally as well as economically—the place of Horace’s Villa in popular consciousness is more complex. As stories of buried treasure, villa narratives, and meta-archaeological tales will show, however, economic issues are also intertwined there and offer another way of speaking of similar and overlapping concerns such as land management.

E.6.10. HORACE IN ORAL TRADITION

Oral tradition often embroiders around and symbolically completes the historic record (i.e., the “Apocrypha” phenomenon), especially as it relates to great historic figures. Unlike Ovid in Sulmona’s oral tradition, however, where a blend of fact and legend has focused on Ovid’s misuse of the magical arts for lustful purposes, Horace is a less articulated figure in local Licenza tradition. He does emerge in a few anecdotes, which primarily focus on his legendary lovemaking but which also have implications for folk interpretations of the archaeological site. The legendary hedonism of such ancient figures in oral culture may reflect the Church’s historic attempts to suppress pagan ideals and lifestyles.

Let us begin to explore the various areas of local oral tradition affected by Horace. Typically, proper names and toponyms can evidence the popularity of a historic or cultural figure in the local imagination (e.g., saints’

47. Although John Fort, John Rae’s nephew, has spent decades living in Licenza and Rome, he feels he will never be considered an insider by locals. According to him, Licentini are fond of noting dialect differentiation between residents of Licenza and Percile, only a few kilometers away, rather than obvious similarities.

48. It seems to be the consensus locally that Bernard Frischer has accomplished what few others could ever have, providing true leadership while maintaining a humorous, democratic, accessible style, balanced with savvy—essentially to all excellent effect—on the villa’s behalf. His name has become a passpartout (‘lasciapassare’, ‘parola d’ordine’), and his love for the place is a source of local pride.

names, figures from opera, sports, and film, etc.), but after consulting the telephone directory, visiting various local cemeteries, enquiring in the communal census office, and asking during interviews, it was clear that “Horace” has left barely a trace. There are a few specific exceptions: commercial establishments such as Orazio Garden Bar (Horace’s garden café, fig. 9); Farmacia Orazio (Horace’s pharmacy); and Albergo Fonte Bandusia (Bandusia Fountain Hotel/restaurant), as well as the names or nicknames of those in direct contact with Horace or the villa, including Orazio De Rossi, the son of the villa’s first custodian, Rocco; and Augusto Onorati, nicknamed “Orazio” among his Roman friends. Horace’s Villa, as an archaeological site, however, may be intertwined with other parts of the local oral tradition, as we shall see, but it is an oral tradition on whose behalf few claims of chronological depth are made.

E.6.11. Oral Narrative, Buried Treasure and “Horace’s Villa”

It might be argued that oral tradition is more critical to some archaeological sites than others. Shankland, for instance, maintains that anthropology, folklore, and archaeology are crucial for the study of Anatolia, and that folktales are a key way by which villagers link the mounds which surround their territory into their mental representation of the area’s past. In Licenza, where the visible remains of the past are only twentieth-century deep (but talk of the villa may be longer), can this symbiosis be seen as significant? I would contend that how traditional treasure narratives inform the local understanding of landscape and the villa’s place in that landscape is in fact telling.

It is worth noting that various genres of Italian traditional narrative may touch upon archaeology:

50. According to Foschi (admittedly not a philologist), traces of Horace’s descendants (local heirs of this erotically active man?) can be found in surnames common to the area, such as Orati and Oratini (=little Orazi). But according to philologist E. Tuttle, the surname Orati likely derives from HONORATO > Orrato > Or(r)ati > Orati (cf. Dante: orare, or(r)evolve, etc.), and conversely, HORATIO > (O)razzo > Razzi, Razzulo, etc. (unpublished ms. and personal communication).

51. Shankland (as n. 34), 139

foundations, legends (and legends of lost civilizations); classic fairy tales wherein treasure appears hidden or guarded, and then bestowed upon a worthy hero; local character cycles, such as those of the Sicilian fool, Giufà; or hero cycles (e.g., brigand’s tales). The latter are especially common in those areas of pre-Unification Italy, such as southern Lazio, where banditry was rampant, and Licenza’s treasure tales do, in fact, record the memory of banditry in the area. By far the most significant body of oral traditions merging with archaeology regards buried treasure; these are particularly abundant where civilizations have left their mark on the landscape via ancient ruin, monument, and artifact, as in central Italy. In European oral tradition indeed, buried treasure narratives figure prominently. Gold is often found

52. In one instance, Giufà is sent by his mother to find a buyer for a piece of cloth (cf. Jack and the Beanstalk). He eventually argues with a statue, strikes the insolent and silent buyer, and finds hundreds of gold coins within—apparently hidden there by thieves (I. Calvino, “Giufà and the Plaster Statue,” Italian Folktales [New York 1980] tale 190). A tale with historic resonances forLicenza is to be found in Ramsay, where he recounts how peasants had smashed a marble chariot and Ionic pillars with the hope of finding money in them (Frischer and Brown, 134).

53. S. Thompson, Motif-Index of Folk Literature, 6 vols. (Bloomington, IN 1932-1936).

54. In my Terracina experience, for instance, where classical antiquities are abundant and where people have lived among the ruins for centuries, fictive and personal narratives from field and sea are common. Fisherman, peasants, and tombaroli narrate endless tales of found artifacts and lost treasure. Something of a foundation legend, moreover, states that Terracina is built on seven previous cities, each in turn swallowed by the sea.

55. For a rich survey of this motif and the ongoing practice of buried treasure in the folk tradition of Quebec, Canada, see J-C. Dupont, Les Trésors Cachés: Québec et Arcadie (Sainte Foy 1999). See also A. E. Uysal, “Turkish Treasure Lore: Tradition and Practices,” in International Folklore Review: Folklore Studies from Overseas, v. 2, ed. V. Newhall (London 1982) 135-142 for contemporary treasure-hunting practices as they relate to Turkish archaeological sites and how they employ motifs from Turkish oral tradition. On current treasure seekers, the interplay between fact and fiction
at the base of venerable trees or in caves (sometimes revealed by the deceased in dreams). It dots the imaginary landscape as an object of desire—just as far-away utopias, where mountains were made of cheese and rivers flowed with wine, beckoned for centuries in topoi such as il paese di Cuccagna. Treasure abounds but is rarely retrieved. Silence or secrecy betrayed, mismanaged spells or instructions, and the control of supernatural guardians often puts the gold just beyond reach.

Of course, pre-banking practices, banditry, or other historic motives might be invoked to account for such treasure tales. Aspirations to gold may even be grounded in socio-economic reality: little hard currency in peasant economies meant that only a fortuitous encounter with gold could hope to alter lives of penury and subsistence. But folklorists know how treasure tales, evergreen vehicles of psychological escape, express desire, even as the objects of desire are continuously updated (e.g., jobs, land). Just as history furnishes new reasons for burying or concealing treasure (beyond the bandits, pirates, and miners of old), the media provides a new vehicle for the transmission of these narratives. Today, it is Nazi-era hoards (paintings, bank accounts) which may be recovered and fact and fiction continue to blend, yet in new oral genres such as urban legends.

In urban settings, such as those of former Eastern-bloc countries described by Karanović:

> [M]edia reporting on treasure is situated in the [current] economic and social crisis of the moment [in Yugoslavia]…interpolated with the favourite rumour that some popular personality…has promised a part of his/her wealth to pay off the national debt…. In this instance, it is the fear of national economic collapse which substitutes the traditional fears of hunger and poverty.

Great treasures however, are found from time to time (e.g., Spanish galleons off Caribbean shores) and miners do strike the Motherlode. Indeed, laws regarding found treasure exist because treasure is recovered. On the whole, though, treasure rarely materializes; job creation schemes always seem to vaporize, and the lottery ticket is always one number shy of a win. But this fact does not deter treasure seekers from wielding metal detectors and taking to the beaches on any given day, or panning for gold in the Sierran foothills. And were it not for the inassatable dream of finding treasure, lotteries and gambling of all sorts—both Tuesday-night church bingo, and the Las Vegas variety—would not be half as popular as they are.

Oral narrative scholarship agrees that traditional treasure tales have much to do with the concept of “limited good” or the “moral economy of the peasant.”

---

56. *Or in Licenza tale 3, by the imprisoned, who communicate the whereabouts of treasure to the free man. Guardians of treasure are frequently those who have met an untimely death, sometimes the very person who buried the treasure and was unable to return to it.*

57. Del Giudice (as n. 20).

58. *An example of updated objects of desire in treasure tales is reported in Karanović, 410, where a great grandfather dreamed not of gold but of the location of four underground sources of water in Cuca (Montenegro). Cf., of course, Pagnol’s Manon des Sources.*


60. Karanović, 412-413.


62. A kinder term, as Layton (as nn. 29 and 30) sees it, preferable to the former, coined by E. C. Banfield, *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society* (Chicago 1958). On limited good in treasure tales, see also S. L. Arora, “Memorate as Metaphor: Some Mexican Treasure Narratives and Their Narrators,” in *Perspectives on Contemporary Legend*, v. 2, eds. G. Bennett, P. Smith and J. D. A. Widderson (Sheffield 1987) 79-92; Briggs (as n. 27); G. M. Foster, “Treasure Tales and the Image of the Static Economy in a Mexican Peasant Community,” *Journal of American Folklore* 77 (1964) 39-44; Hand (as n. 60); J. Mechling, “Patois and Paradox in
Economic issues are relevant to Licenza treasure tales as well. The oral tradition, as it relates to the circulation of treasure tales, may itself be viewed as a “limited good.” Indeed, the “low return” on such tales (i.e., I did not recover many of them) may be due, not to their current irrelevancy, but conversely, attributable to the fact that they are still operative and valuable. A veil of secrecy and reluctance accompanied each telling. It is with respect to that injunction that tales are here given anonymously, and that references which might identify their teller are suppressed. But the narratives which follow are not limited to treasure tales, for it is in considering all possibly relevant genres of narrative together that we can hope to create a coherent discourse, both on the interpretation of treasure, and on the archaeological site qua site. The narratives are paraphrased from orally-recorded accounts and are followed by some

63. A. Dundes, “Folk Ideas as Units of World View,” Journal of American Folklore 84 (1971) 93-103;

64. These narratives do not take into account those found in earlier, written sources. Ramsay, for example, in his conclusion to An Enquiry, advises that if any man be interested in excavating locally, he ought to employ the country people in locations they recommend, but cautions that the work begin either early in Spring, or after the harvest, for the country people, “who know nothing about odes or epistles, believe that all who dig do it from the expectation of finding hidden treasure; and that the demon who watches over the treasure would raise a wind which might destroy their little crop of corn, wine, and oil” (Ramsay in Frischer and Brown, 152).
it still there? I don’t know, maybe, but I never really looked.

4. The treasure tale denied

Peasant X first told of the molten gold tale, of the brigand’s hidden treasure, but when questioned at a later date, denied knowing anything about such tales.

E.6.11.2. Meta-archaeological narratives or exercises in oral archaeology (B)

Evidence of the written sources of some orally-circulating information regarding the site (e.g., Lugli’s aquarium hypothesis for the villa’s oval structure)\(^6\)\(^5\) may be attributable to persons such as Rinaldi, who somewhat mediated the boundary of oral/written sources (cf. E.6.15). But there are other, clearly oral narratives, which either directly relate to the villa as an archaeological site, or secondarily reflect on it. These may be considered “meta-archaeological” narratives, oral, or “fireside” archaeology, and may be the most immediately interesting to archaeologists. Here follow the meager “oral artifacts,” the nuggets of treasure sifted from hours of taped interviews.

5. The villa under the chestnut grove

The mountain just behind the villa is called i Campanili (“the belltowers”) and in a landslide came down over the centuries ago. The area just below the villa, known as the Castagneto (“chestnut grove”), represents the mountain which has slid. The remains of Horace’s villa are to be found under the Castagneto.

6. Licenza parish priest destroys the villa

The invasions, time, space, as well as limited intelligence and culture did the rest.] After the place was abandoned by the brothers, according to one oral account, it is told that the parish priest of Licenza had wood gathered from the woods nearby, dug out a deep hole in the clay-like earth, gathered the stones and the marble statues and, in the brick-baking oven, had the stones and statues baked in order to retrieve from them lime for the construction of the rectory. [And on the villa fell a long night of darkness.]

7. Artifacts in the wilderness

In the macchia (“wilderness”) there is a stone tablet inscribed in Latin and known as la véna scritta (“the protruding rock with writing on it”). The area is so overgrown that one could hardly find it anymore. There probably isn’t even a path there any longer. We used to gather wood at la véna. That’s where carbonai (“charcoal makers”) used to be and we could gather their leftovers.

E.6.11.3. Horace/Villa narratives (C)

Horace narratives regard the local perception of Horace as poet and his life vis-à-vis the villa, as well as the recent history of the site, and hence this narrative type continues to evolve and accrue. For extensive narratives regarding the villa, as well as the villa-inspired poetry of Giuseppe Rinaldi, an ex-custodian of the villa, see below, E.6.15. Here instead follow only the best known of these tales in Licenza oral tradition.

---

\(^{65}\) What makes the aquarium thesis “valid” as articulated by Lugli but apparent nonsense when reiterated by the unlearned? “Archaeological interpretation can grow from the same roots as folklore, but […] it gains a different status because of the reiteration of archaeological interpretation over folklore” (J. Murphy, “Archaeology as Folklore: The Literacy Construction of the Megalith Pentre Ifan in West Wales,” in Gazin-Schwartz and Holorf 1999a 240-254, at 240).

\(^{66}\) Foschi, 31. Translation mine.
8. Meneghetta, Horace’s peasant lover

Meneghetta (in dialect) or Meneghella (in more “standard” Italian, a diminutive of “Domenica”) gives her name to Colle Meneghetta, across from the villa and the Castagneto. She was a particularly beautiful local peasant woman and Horace’s lover. They enjoyed hidden encounters via a tunnel beneath the villa. He would signal to her with a horn and she would come to him (without having to cross the river).

E.6.12. INTERPRETING NARRATIVE

First and foremost, it is important to note the proximity of many of these tales’ settings to Horace’s Villa (Ninfeo, Castagneto, Vigna La Corte), an area presumably perceived to be of great antiquity and clearly outside the town’s confines (i.e., wilderness), where the supernatural, the hidden, the illicit, the dangerous, and the buried treasure are located. The most archaic of the treasure tales appears to be the molten gold narrative (tale 2). In Italian oral tradition, such gold is frequently fashioned in the shape of a small domestic animal and associated with evil, as treasure in general is as well.

But by far the most intriguing treasure tale encountered in Licenza was the tale mangé, the tale not told by peasant X. Its significance went far beyond tales actually told, for its denial seemed to underscore the perception that oral patrimony itself was a limited good which must be hoarded. Indeed, there are many examples in folklore research that underscore this practice of protecting traditional knowledge.

A subtext of tales 3 and 4 appears to relate to land ownership (e.g., as desirable land containing hidden treasure not purchased, or as the fear of potential treasure seekers on one’s land). In a third narrative interview, an actual landowner in the Castagneto area stated (a little too emphatically) that there were no such treasure stories in Licenza at all! It may be important to note here that land (and water) is itself perceived as treasure in the peasant worldview, and more specifically among the Licentini perhaps, that land in the Castagneto area may be particularly valuable. The molten gold (or “treasure in the tree”) narrative also offers an interesting interpretive possibility in this regard, if we consider one of its subtexts to be land. Could the intimate association of treasure and tree indicate that it is the very tree—nature’s bounty—which is itself the peasant’s primary treasure (literally and figuratively)? This is an appealing reading, since for centuries the greatest treasure on the agricultural landscape was “liquid gold,” i.e., olive oil, for which Licenza was renowned.

Second, at least one of these tales (tale 5, The villa under the chestnut grove) seems to result from a peasant’s keen observation of the landscape and represents an attempt to account for discrepancies. In this case the question is: “why are chestnuts growing

67. In buried treasure tales of southern Italy, treasure (strictly gold) frequently takes the shape of animals, including dogs, chicken and chicks, or roosters. These are often found in caverns and caves, hollow trees, or buried in chests at the foot of a tree. The rooster may have a negative connotation as it is associated with the infernal and hence was often used in witchcraft and necromancy. See Benvenuti Papi (as n. 49), 61-65 on “I tesori nascosti.”

68. Examples of protected knowledge in folk culture might include: cooking secrets not shared between older and younger women in order that the older may retain power over the younger; artisans who “steal” training during apprenticeships because masters do not willingly share it (to avoid creating
here at this low altitude, since the chestnut trees in this area are predominantly found along the mountain ridge?” The presence of chestnut trees near the villa suggests that part of the mountain may have slid down over the villa long ago. Consequently, this somewhat plausible explanation also addresses a third concern, namely that these tales deal with the mystery of the villa’s disappearance.

How could an entire villa have been reduced to mere foundations? Indeed, in Licenza, the yield of recovered artifacts has not been great—not even in the area adjacent to the villa.⁶⁹ The search for clues and artifacts is the focus of archaeological enquiry. Oral tradition offers its own hypotheses: the villa and its artifacts may yet be unearthed under the chestnut grove; or perhaps the loss is attributable to ecclesiastic depredations of pagan sites (in part historically true, yet not confirmed for this particular site; but see tale 6). It is unclear whether this explanation is attributable to traditional anti-clericalism, to leftist political ideology, or to historic truth. [Editors’ note: cf. Frischer, G.1.8.27.] And the tradition also speculates on other locations to be explored: Rocca Gione, Mandela, Percile, Le Marmore. Note this last toponym, which suggests marble artifacts to be found in the overgrown wilderness (e.g., la vena scritta). Indeed the symbolic value of tale 7 seems clear: the wilderness is swallowing traces of man’s work, ancient and more recent, so that both the memory of ancient civilization (in the form of mysterious writings) as well as the peasant’s careful agricultural work on the landscape (fields, paths), are being slowly obliterated by a common enemy—the encroaching macchia.⁷⁰ It is not surprising, therefore, that the peasants lament the intentional reversion of the land to wilderness, in the form of a regional park.

As for narratives dealing directly with Horace, the best known tales involve his amorous exploits, although Horace himself never mentioned Meneghetta among them! According to one cynical observer, Horace hardly required a hidden tunnel for this tryst. Nonetheless, this tale attempts to account for the toponym, Colle Meneghetta; seeks a more immediate and intimate link between the local population and Horace; or merely tries to account for physical remains of the villa (its sewer system), whose function was not understood. Tunnel narratives are in fact common to many archaeological sites.⁷¹ The tale also seems to apply a Christian ethic (anachronistically) to Horace’s encounter with a local woman (sexuality as illicit, shameful). Evidence of the superimposition of Christian culture on a pagan site may be indicated even today by the recent placing of a niche honoring the Trinity (figs. 10-12) at the beginning of the road leading to the villa—perhaps lending credibility to tale 6 and the parish priest who destroyed villa artifacts.

E.6.13. Treasure Hunt: Treasure Found and Treasure Stolen

While the Church may have historically been hostile to pagan sites, it is generally acknowledged that Licenza peasants have been cooperative in conserving and turning over recovered artifacts to the authorities. In one such incident a peasant working with his tractor near Rocca Gione found a small head and turned it in to the museum (from which it was later stolen).⁷² According to mayor Romanzi, there was no traditional caccia al tesoro (treasure hunt) here, and no illicit saccheggio del monumento (vandalism).

⁶⁹. According to his wife, Mary, John Fort, although an avid gardener at their home in Vigna della Corte, has never turned up anything.

⁷⁰. In the opinion of Mary Fort, however, the paradox is that the wilderness was created by humans who used the local resources to the point of deforestation. It may also be due to inheritance practices of dividing plots equally among children in large families, so that plots become smaller and smaller in time, resulting in marginal economic interest in cultivating a few trees.


⁷². According to Rinaldi’s telling, the compensation offered to the finder was to have been a mere 2,000 lire. Seeing that the peasant would have needed 3,000 to have the paperwork alone completed, it was argued by an inspector of the Belle Arti that this would be no incentive for anyone to turn objects in, but rather to break, hide, or sell them on the black market. The sum given instead was at least 20 times as great, to the peasant’s delight. Rinaldi’s sensitivity to issues of compensation is here obvious.
Yet the tombarolo (tomb robber) spirit of greed and theft, despite such statements, is evident in the very fact that the Museo d’Orazio in Licenza was robbed two times during the 1970s. In any case, certainly there is more to be gained in artifact-rich areas such as the Castelli, the via Appia, and Tarquinia than in Licenza. Between these two extremes of disinterested peasant and predatory thief (working perhaps for art dealers) stand those who enjoy historical objects and are driven by this passion, sometimes risking legal inconveniences, to pursue their course.

Anyone traveling the road up behind the villa and around by the Ninfeo will notice a curious garden by a villino studded with antiquities, some apparently real and others pastiche. Its owner explains his visceral passion for ancient stone wherever it is to be found, and for collecting it (il malato della storia sono io - “the history-sick guy here is me”), which apparently created a personal dilemma for him. Coming from a landowning family, class bias precluded his ever actually working with stone, as he explains:

Ci parlo dentro di me con le scalpellature; mi esprime qualcosa dentro…

[sono] appassionato degli scavi, [starei] ore e ore li a guardare […]

Mi sono sempre vergognato per il fatto [di] com’era fatta la nostra famiglia…

Inside myself I speak with the cuttings; they express something inside me…[I am] passionate about digs, [and could stay] hours and hours there watching […] I have always been embarrassed by the fact [off] how our family was [about these matters]

Suspected of illegal activity, he was secretly reported to the Belle Arti but subsequently cleared. Here again we note a perceived affinity between the activity of archaeological digs and agricultural digging (i.e., as somehow not dignified), or at least their blurred boundary. This attitude may also confirm the potential for misjudging stone. Indeed, a word of caution was offered by the proprietor’s wife, who learned from direct experience: never allow a non-expert (a carabiniere, for instance) to inspect your property, because the possibility for even non-malicious accusation (or worse) is great. It might be added, however, that the possibility for error in assessing the real from the fake is not limited to non-experts. And the need to keep objects, knowledge, or narratives buried is known to archaeologists and folklorists as well. The threat of state surveillance, popular gossip and censure are kinds of exposure that can render even a scholar vulnerable to theft, envy, accusation, or ridicule.


I first saw Horace’s Villa at about 6:30 p.m. on April 29, 2001, at the very start of a week-long fieldwork trip. Struck by its natural beauty, I stayed a while longer but not quite until sunset. Wildflowers were abundant among a lush green woods filled with chirping birds, and surrounded by reassuringly regular gray stone walls. Richly blooming, nature did indeed provide a harmonious setting for the villa remains, creating an island of calm, beauty, and solitude. I determined to read the Odes to better imbibe this place! I imagined this to be a favored lovers’ spot (but was told that such activity was reserved for the waterfall). The villa also offered an ideal view of the village and the surrounding fields.

Some monuments have an historic, as well as a present life, and sometimes maintain a continuity of function in time.73 Others, instead, evolve in quite unique ways. Horace’s Villa and the adjacent Fonte Bandusia (or Ninfeo degli Orsini, fig. 13) have seen varied uses: originally as a country refuge for a world-weary man of letters; more recently as a pleasant goal

---

73. Cairns, for instance, may be burial grounds to archaeologists, but they are also entrances to the Otherworld in folk narrative. Hence they arguably display a continuing local knowledge of their original function; see Gazin-Schwartz and Holtorf 1999b, 16. Ancient monuments have in many cases led to the emergence of folktales and legends, which in turn explain why they existed (i.e., by creating a narrative context in which they had meaning). The enduring monuments themselves are then viewed as the physical proof of such aetiological stories. This phenomenon is described as “feedback” (of a monument to the local body of folklore) by Vansina in 1985, cited in Gazin-Schwartz and Holtorf 1999b, 17.
for a country walk from Licenza; as an ideal backdrop for wedding photos; and even as a picnic spot (i.e., on Ferragosto, or the first Sunday of October)—to the chagrin of the ex-custodian, Rinaldi, who battled litter at the site for years. In some respects, therefore, the site’s setting has fostered continued “bucolic” activity. It is indeed an excellent setting for meditating on the passing of “deep time” and perhaps appropriate for lifecycle rituals as a result. According to several reports, the Castagneto’s ritual possibilities were further explored recently by hooded New Agers (“outsiders,” of course) who apparently held a “sabbath” in the grove two or three years ago. They were promptly removed by the carabinieri.

The villa has seen other more agro-pastoral uses as well. Its lands may have been farmed (there are rumors of earlier custodians growing hay to sell at market), and livestock has roamed freely in this pasture. Rinaldi considered the installation of a fence to be an early imperative to exclude such animals. The waterfall, on the other hand, much to John Rae’s dismay, was used as a weekend carwash for years, killing as many as 14,000 trout, in his trout farm downstream, at one time.

The area has recently been put to cultural use, as well. Reginald Foster (Latin secretary to the Pope and lecturer at the Gregorian University) regularly brings students to read Horace by the waterfall (as part of the “living Latin” movement). And it is, along with the Museo d’Orazio, the logical setting for the annual Oraziana festival of art and culture.


Every treasure must have its guardian. In the case of Horace’s Villa, the most notable of these in recent memory has been Giuseppe Rinaldi. Largely beloved, but by some criticized for his passions (esagera, “he exaggerates”; è fanatico, “he’s a fanatic”), Rinaldi is widely known as the villa’s custodian-poet. He worked there from the mid-1960s until the late 1970s. It has been frequently noted that chronology in folk culture is not linear. Historic periods can become conflated (e.g., the frequent “promiscuous” mixing or historic “leveling” of objects in folk spaces, of songs in individual repertoires, etc.). In Giuseppe Rinaldi we may witness this process as it unfolds. Here there appears a curious and unusual meeting of worlds, where ancient poet meets modern rustic and transfers to him both a sensibility for pastoralism and a fervor for poetry. The result is a folk reconfiguration of the poet’s own themes, forms, and sensibilities, for Rinaldi evidently sees himself (and is seen by others) as a lesser Horace. Some would call it a delusion of grandeur, others the reincarnation of a Horatian spirit. To folklorists this phenomenon merely appears as a remodeling of tradition, much examined in the Anglophone folk poetry traditions, but to a lesser extent among southern European traditions.

To return for a moment to landscape paintings: at the margins of this monumental tableau of Horace’s Villa is someone deeply affected by the monument itself.

74. The oral tradition therefore here records the possible appropriation of collective resources by private parties.

75. The Rinaldi family’s nickname “Baccelli” was earned by his grandfather, a magus of sorts. Baccelli was actually the name of the village doctor in those times. However, when most villagers needed health care, they turned to Rinaldi’s grandfather, whose powers were great and greatly feared. Rather than call Dr. Baccelli, therefore, they called this other—

76. Rinaldi provided me with a copy of a newspaper article written about him over 20 years ago by Rinaldo Panetta, “La Villa di Orazio e il suo custode,” in L’Osservatore della Domenica (n.d.). Here, he is portrayed as an inspired and passionate disciple of Horace, who in reading Horace, is mystically moved to respond in kind. The accompanying photo of Rinaldi shows him as a rather confident fellow with a slightly defiant chin.

There is no timelessness, but instead transformation and evolution, as Rinaldi merges with Horace, and fully realizes his own full potential and genius while at the villa. Walking where a great historic figure has walked; reading and internalizing what a poet has written (while at the very site), has given more than one cultural historian or literary critic a similar eerie feeling of *déjà vu*. This was experienced, too, by another, more learned, octogenarian Licentine, Arturo Foschi, who was also deeply affected by Horace and his presence on Licenza soil: *Le passeggiate mie erano di Orazio* (“my walks were Horace’s walks”), and *rivivo la vita di Orazio* (“I relive Horace’s life”).

Foschi even attributes sightings of Horace, phantom-like on the landscape, to local peasants (see above).

Rinaldi is an autodidact with little formal education (fig. 14). How could Horace have come to move him so deeply, and how is it that Rinaldi enjoyed citing Horatian passages in Latin? Native intelligence, a fierce will to learn, and a prodigious memory certainly helped him. Even at the age of 86 Rinaldi conveys his continuing enthusiasms. He was also endowed with a talent for verse. From a young age Rinaldi was known for his poetic improvisations and lyrical penchant (*vena poetica*). Hence on this fertile soil Rinaldi’s poetic spirit could blossom more fully, once he formally encountered the world of Horace. Perhaps too, as a result of spending 15 years as a solitary custodian on the site, *dall’alba al tramonto* (from sun-up to sun-down, as he repeats as though it were a personal mantra), lovingly caring for the site, walking the corridors and *atria* of an imagined villa, he was ready to receive Horace’s inspirations, passed down by who knows what mysterious avenue (fig. 15). Rinaldi’s persona became more complex as his custodianship evolved into the role of custodian-poet-guide of the villa (fig. 16). How did this metamorphosis occur?

In this solitary place day after day, where time to mentally spin out his verse was abundant, Rinaldi was a war orphan by the age of two. Later, his stepfather would not allow him to continue his schooling beyond the 2nd grade since his labor was needed in the family economy. However, eager to learn, Rinaldi absorbed as much as he could from disparate sources. During the Second World War he spent some years in England as a prisoner of war, and benefited from the willingness of a fellow-prisoner, who happened to be a professor, to teach him. In Licenza, a neighbor (another professor) taught him what he needed to learn about Horace, assisting with the Latin. And later in life, thanks to an anniversary gift from his son and his fiancé, Rinaldi became the proud owner of the Sansoni edition of Horace’s works in translation, edited by Ezio Cetrangelo. He memorized much of Horace’s oeuvre in this way.

---

78. In this instance, such feelings are expressed as returning in old age, to the passions of his youth: the study of ancient Greek, as well as to classical and peasant cultures (Foschi, personal communication).

79. He was a war orphan by the age of two. Later, his stepfather would not allow him to continue his schooling beyond the 2nd grade since his labor was needed in the family economy. However, eager to learn, Rinaldi absorbed as much as he could from disparate sources. During the Second World War he spent some years in England as a prisoner of war, and benefited from the willingness of a fellow-prisoner, who happened to be a professor, to teach him. In Licenza, a neighbor (another professor) taught him what he needed to learn about Horace, assisting with the Latin. And later in life, thanks to an anniversary gift from his son and his fiancé, Rinaldi became the proud owner of the Sansoni edition of Horace’s works in translation, edited by Ezio Cetrangelo. He memorized much of Horace’s oeuvre in this way.

80. Rinaldi recalls an early and humorous experience of lyrical improvisation. As an older boy, he had been called to serve as waiter at an important wedding (two sisters marrying two brothers) of two prominent Licenza families, the Centroni and Foschi families. Each course was preceded by a witty verse, improvised by Rinaldi to the delight of the 200 guests. As the main meat course (consisting of prized quartered chicken, rather than the usual mutton) was about to be served, the cook, knowing that the pieces had been carefully counted and would not allow for anyone taking a second helping, told Rinaldi to invent something (*inventa qualche cosa!*) to pass on this information in a polite way. So, to the assembled company’s amazement, Rinaldi recited the following:

_E qui che si vedono i camparotti:_
_I Centroni con i Foschi._
_Per i sposi che hanno fatti,_
_C’hanno dato dei pollastri._
_Ma non fate i scostumati,_
_Che i pezzetti so’ contati._
_Per goderci questa festa,_
_Ce ne tocca un pezzo a testa!_  
Eviva gli sposi!

(“And here we see the well-to-do:/The Centronis and the Foschis./For the wedding they are celebrating./They have provided us with chickens./But don’t be greedy/Because the pieces are counted./To enjoy this feast,/We can have only one apiece!/Long live the bride and groom!”)

Despite peals of laughter, however, the poem did not prevent the groom’s brother nor the bride’s cousin from taking two pieces!
must have begun musing on the site’s natural beauty and tranquility. The more he heard and read about Horace, and as his own encounters with tourists required, the more he learned. Rinaldi became a sponge for information on the great poet, taking what he could from disparate sources (including visiting professors), in response both to his natural inclination and to a sense of professional duty. *Avevo preso una cotta per questo Orazio* (“I had developed a crush for this Horace”) he states; *la mia passione era non forte, [ma] troppo forte* (“my passion was not merely great [but] really great”), and Rinaldi’s self-imposed mission was to pass on this passion for Horace and his villa to others. There were, after all, no official guides to the villa in print, and so the oral word would have to suffice.81

As a guide, Rinaldi must have enjoyed the thrill of the performance—as he still does. Wanting to experience his talent, I requested a personal tour. He was transformed: his guide persona spoke in a distinct, crisp way, alternating his own questions with answers, and interspersing his set narrative with poetry (Horace’s and his own). He alluded to scholarly debate and offered his own opinion on various *questioni*. He even recounted stories of previous linguistic mishaps with foreign tourists. Although he did not like the English language (as a result of his experience in England as a prisoner of war), he never allowed a linguistic barrier to keep him from the task of guiding visitors around the villa.

His role as custodian of the physical site should not be overlooked. The villa was *his* territory and he cared for it as “a true custodian” (*ma un vero custode*, he states polemically) and he treated it with the love and care of a peasant for his own land. His identification with the villa was complete. Rinaldi lived, breathed, dreamed the villa. His sense of hospitality might be compared to the ritual tour of one’s home to visitors, according to Italian folk etiquette, for he displayed great pride of place and was easily (personally) insulted by gestures of disrespect to it. When an early visitor complained of not being able to walk around the villa, Rinaldi and his wife spent days clearing the land, making a path. When another visitor casually picked a rose, the only rose growing on a carefully-tended vine, he rebuked her, and then wrote a poem on the incident (see E.6.16). But when anyone dared to litter the “sanctum,” he became incensed and used strong tactics to intimidate the vandal, for the villa was to remain impeccably clean and orderly.82 He was ever vigilant for visitors, even while at home, watching from his window. Once he even interrupted his New Year’s Day dinner to return to the villa where a visitor had just arrived.

Throughout his tenure, Rinaldi was a custodian with a peasant’s sensitivity to land management.83 He tilled his own land in the early morning and then continued similar work at the villa, caring for the grounds, fencing them to keep out animals, tending plants and trees, and slowly reclaiming the fruit-bearing plants from wilderness (loquats, pears, pomegranate, walnut,

---

81. An official *printed* guide to the villa was once planned but never saw completion. A local school teacher, Graziella Avoni Mandolini, had written the Italian text, and others were to have translated it into German, Spanish, and English, but lack of public funds and procrastination killed the project. The Pro-Loco seems to have provided an improvised photocopy in the meantime.

82. **Rinaldi is a fanatic about order and cleanliness**, a trait he considers un-Italian (in its public dimension). That is, if 200 foreigners were to come to the villa one wouldn’t find a cigarette butt, while, if two Italians visited, he would inevitably have to argue with them about litter! One day, a couple spread out some newspapers under the villa trees, and stayed all day. When they were about to leave, he called them back to enquire whether they had found those papers when they arrived that morning, and if not to clean up. When a group of picnickers arrived from Vicovaro with watermelons, they first refused to clean up, but when Rinaldi threatened that they would be reckoning with him later (*poi ci vedremo appresso*) and pretended to take note of it in writing (implying that there would be a later and more official encounter), they cleaned up every last watermelon seed.

83. **While a night custodian for 25 years at the Baths of Diocletian**, Rinaldi took holidays in winter to coincide with the olive harvest. While working at Horace’s Villa, beginning in the mid 1960s (for about 15 years), he continued to tend his 140 olive trees, waking at 4:00 a.m., arriving in his grove near Roccagiovine by 6:00, and thereafter beginning his workday at the villa, which lasted until sundown.
apple, etc.).\textsuperscript{84} Similarly, archaeologists recover sites of human activity from the wilderness. Indeed, Rinaldi recounts improvements in the archaeological site as a “we” effort.

Rinaldi seems very much aware of the social disparity between himself and various hierarchies of authority. In an interesting way, he has channeled these concerns by drawing on, although not actually composing in, a traditional oral genre: the contrasto (a poetic debate between traditional opponents, still practiced in parts of central Italy). While traditional contrasti pitted city against country dweller or peasant against master, in long, poetic battles of wits, Rinaldi added his own variant on this theme: the country bumpkin vs. the professor. He narrates exploits pitting David (Rinaldi, a humble autodidact) against his Goliaths (learned men), encounters which took place during his guided tours or at official Horatian events such as commemorations and conferences. Such vindications of the humble, of course, are the stuff of folk heroism.

He even engaged in disputes with foreign academics. He enjoyed telling of his momentous encounter with a German professor visiting from Berlin, who contested the identification of the site as Horace’s Villa. Rinaldi picked up the gauntlet (actually, he took off his hat): \textit{questa è una sfida professor; non è altro} (“this is a challenge, professor, nothing else”) and proceeded to persuade him as to why it was the site, using literary citations as well as personal, direct experience to make his point. Note the colloquial style and barbed tone in this narrative. Its reasoning is based on what appears to be simple common sense, and ends with a definitive coup: a quotation in “perfect” Latin:

\begin{quote}
Lo mette in dubbio? Prego, si accomodi. Scusi, professo’, s’è letto tutte le opere di Orazio? […] Guarda un po’, gli è sfuggita proprio quella parte dove diceva che aveva
\end{quote}

\textit{You doubt it? Please, come this way. Excuse me, Professor, have you read all the works of Horace? […] Well, what do you know, you missed just that passage where he says he had a modest house [near?] Monte Lucretile. Here [if you please] is Monte Lucretile! A “semi-shaded valley with an uninterrupted chain of mountains; the rising sun illuminated the right side, and at sunset the left.” Professor: here is the rising sun side, and the left at sunset! [Let me see] what else...the harvest’s surplus was taken to market in Varia (today Vicovaro). If he had been in Tivoli, he would have taken it to Rome, not Vicovaro […] Then he told him […] based on that question Quintius asked him, when he said: “Horace, how goes it in the Sabine hills?” He answered: me quosciens reficet, gelidus Digesta […] They have told me this is perfect (classical) Latin. A priest told me this: this is really classical Latin!}

\textsuperscript{84} How appropriate, since Horace didn’t apparently appreciate flowers, but in good peasant fashion preferred edible products of the land! On this bias in Italian peasant (and immigrant) culture, see L. Del Giudice, “The ‘Archvilla’: An Italian Canadian Architectural Archetype,” in \textit{Studies in Italian American Folklore}, ed. L. Del Giudice (Logan, UT 1993) 53-105.
providing some “local color” and yet with a natural ability to enliven even academic meetings; and for popular audiences, because in sharing local idiom and style, he was able to relate to them as no other.

But it is on the terrain of the written word that Rinaldi could not hope to compete with the learned, and the one area in which he recognizes defeat. Rinaldi may be a master of the oral word, but the written record takes little note of him, and his own poesie del custode have never been published. The few poems offered here attempt to right this situation (see E.6.16). The paradox of oral poetry is, of course, that it is meant to convey its force and beauty via the oral word, not the written. A sound recording would have been more effective. Exiled from the physical site and from the written record, he has been relegated to a certain degree of invisibility (although visitors continue to ask for him). Poets—folk and otherwise—are concerned about posterity and do not take well to anonymity. And the economic possibilities of publication did not elude him, for he recognized that a small brochure of his poetry on the villa would have sold well among the tourists, just as postcards had earlier on. In his estimation this would have been a small, but well-earned, compensation for his many years of service to tourists, sometimes entertaining them for hours at a time.

Here follow a few words on Rinaldi’s poetry. The villa was both the backdrop and the topic of his poetry, as its themes included Horace, his women, the villa itself, and tourists. It is homegrown poetry and in some instances connects in its octave form to the predominant Italian oral poetic form—l’ottava (the eight-line strophe). Therefore, while he took inspiration from his literary poetic muse, he drew on traditional folk meter for his compositions. But the novelty of Rinaldi as folk poet is that Horace and his villa became the very object of his poetry. Further, poetry was evidently viewed by Rinaldi as a gift, and he regaled tourists and others with it, considering anything, however humble (a vine, a rosemary plant), to be worthy of poetic attention. Rinaldi composed orally and improvised his compositions. The question of his extempore verse and the nature of its oral formulaic diction will not be analyzed here. Suffice it to say, however, that the improvisational verse tradition of agro-pastoral cultures in central-southern Italy (cf. shepherd-poets in classical times) has been well documented. The tradition existed until quite recently, with its greatest virtuosos being Sicilians.

---

85. There is no mention of Rinaldi in Foschi’s volume, for instance—a curious omission for a book on local history and folklore. A silent battle of socio-political hierarchies may here be present, whereby the question of whose voices are heard and whose silenced is determined by hierarchies of exclusion. Peasants may figure in reminiscences of local history, and in local poetry, but they rarely speak in first-person narratives. Yet exclusion may be practiced on various levels, not merely in print. Rinaldi, for instance, was quite aware of the power of the spoken word, and carefully censored his interviews, indicating when the tape recorder should be turned off. The nagging suspicion of partisanship—not easily decipherable—followed me during many of my interviews and even in my readings of locally-produced literature (e.g., fortuitous boosting of certain local establishments, obsequious praise for certain families while passing over others in silence, etc.), which seemed to point to traditional socio-political strategies based on client relationships and raccomandazioni.

86. Rinaldi was encouraged not to return to the villa after retirement, and certainly not to continue conducting tours there. But he insists nonetheless that he would have enjoyed training his successors in a sort of apprenticeship program.

87. He recalls selling postcards for 30 lire each, and since he paid 20 for them, making 10 lire on each card. In his early days as a new custodian at the Terme di Diocliziano, he was evidently embarrassed and disgusted by the jostling for tips among custodians. According to Rinaldi, it’s a matter of style and true passion. Although he did not refuse such tips, they had to be well-earned and only secondary to the main point: the pleasure of imparting information and of captivating a crowd—the more diffident the group, the greater the triumph. Apparently, his moment of supreme glory was winning the respect of a large group of teenage students, a feat not even their teacher thought possible.

88. But Rinaldi’s poetry also dealt with special personages such as Don Tonello, the orphan’s priest (perhaps of special interest to an orphan such as Rinaldi), the war years, love poems, and other topics.

89. L. Del Giudice, “The Sicilian Oral and Literary Tradition,” preface to V. Ancona, Malidittu la...
Rinaldi is a master of the spoken word. His personal narratives, retold with a meticulous repeatability, reflect an extraordinary memory, despite his advanced years. The narratives which tell of his employment history as custodian, first in a Roman museum, then in Licenza, create a persona of impeccable honesty and fierce loyalty—both of which, after all, are essential to the job description. In such emblematic narratives, he is honest to a fault, follows the letter of the law to his own detriment, and displays extreme loyalty and respect for authority and seniority. His feats as a custodian of the villa appear somewhat Herculean as well. He worked from sunrise to sunset, rain or shine, all year round, and was therefore still wedded to an old world peasant work ethic (when one did not count hours). In fact, with evident relish, he notes that fully three custodians were hired to replace him.

Did the lack of scientific accuracy in Rinaldi’s guided tours create a problem for the archaeologist, as such narratives may have perpetuated antiquated and fanciful notions of the site? The archaeologists consulted diverged in their opinion of Rinaldi. But we must keep in mind that Rinaldi’s narrative on Horace’s Villa is a highly personal one: he tells of his villa and his Horace, selectively merging his few literary and historic readings into an idealized version of reality. It forms an alternative discourse. I tend to see Rinaldi’s as a creative interpretation, not unlike the contemporary works of art inspired by Horace on display in the annual Oraziana festivals. Rinaldi, however, may speak a more accessible idiom informed by a folk perspective, in a style nevertheless capable of eloquently communicating his sense of wonder and respect for Horace and his villa. As a living cultural treasure (an intangible bene culturale) and as a repository of oral tradition and local memory, he was keenly aware that the art of this mestiere should have been transmitted to the next generation—had any interest been shown for such matters.

Rinaldi bridges two worlds, where peasant and monument meet. At the landscape’s center, rather than margins, we hear how such figures experience and interact with that landscape and the historic monument. Rinaldi was exceptionally proud that Horace’s monument in Licenza was placed just down the road from his own house (fig. 17). As a spontaneous gift to Horace and to his fellow Licentini, Rinaldi took up where Horace left off, completing a poetical tribute to Licenza in the poet’s behalf. Had Horace come to know Licenza and Rinaldi, surely he would have applauded the effort and returned the favor.

E.6.16. Appendix A. Le poesie del custode (The Custodian’s Poems)

Poems by Giuseppe Rinaldi

[As he sat at the villa one day, Rinaldi looked at the rosemary bush and decided: anche a te voglio fare una poesia (“I want to write a poem even for you”).]

Al rosmarino
Oh nano cespuglio tutto ramoso,
Anche d’inverno col verde più cupo,
E ogni fogliolina l’aroma tu butti,
Venendo nei piatti de tutti gli [y’]arrosti.

For the rosemary bush
Oh dwarf bush, all branches,
Even with winter in darker green,
And [with] each little leaf, an aroma you release,
Going into dishes and all roast meats.

Lusia Del Giudice
e.6. Interpreting Treasure: Oral Tradition, Archaeology and “Horace’s Villa”

O vite contorta
O vite contorta che sull’albero sali,
Più vai in alto e più uva mi dai.
Dividendo la forza ai grappoli tutti
Per degradarti nelle botti e nei fiaschi.

Oh twisted vine
Oh twisted vine that climbs up the tree,
The more you climb, the more grapes you give.
Dividing your strength among all the bunches
To spend yourself in barrels and flasks.

Per chi colse la rosa
Piccola rosa che il custode t’ha visto nasce
Ora sei colta da chi neanche conosci
Ed io penso che anche Orazio veramente ci soffre.

For the one who picked the rose
Little rose whose birth the custodian witnessed
Now you have been picked by someone you don’t even know
And I believe that even Horace is truly pained by it.

Le terme ampliate da Orazio
Orazio che ingrandidi queste terme
Per darti a tutta vita nelle orgie
Non fusti mai legato ad una moglie
Ma degli altri ne avevi tante.
C’era la tua Lidia preferita,
E Cloe la tenevi a lei celata,
Leucone ti sembrava un po’ leggera
non le confessavi di Cinarra,
La Clarinda che per te fu più onesta
Tu la chiamavi donna critichetta.

The thermal baths enlarged by Horace
Horace, you who enlarged these thermal baths
To give yourself fully over to orgies
You were never tied to a wife

But of others you had many.
There was Lidia, your preferred one,
And Chloe whom you kept hidden from her,
Leucone seemed to you a little frivolous
And to her you did not confess about Cinarra,
And Clarinda you judged to be more honest
You called her a little grumbler.

[Composed after a woman visiting the villa picked a rose on the site. Rinaldi was much upset by her audacity.]

Orazio che a me sei tanto caro
Orazio che a me sei tanto caro
Mi sembra di vederti tutto d’oro.
Io sono di Licenza e per te muoro
Per questo son venuto insieme a loro.

Horace, you who are so dear to me
Horace, you who are so dear to me
You appear to me [dressed] all in gold.
I am from Licenza and I die for you
And because of this I came along with them.

[On the occasion of accompanying speakers to a Horace conference in Venosa.]

Orazio a Licenza
Lucretile non fosti dignitoso
Al grand’Orazio tuo mandasti un lupo,
Per un albero stecchito tu c’avevi
Deciso di spezzargli testa e reni.
Se Fauno, il dio del bosco, a te supremo
Col braccio destro non mettessi il freno,
Pronto a liberarti dal disastro,
Pensando che eri il grande Quinto Orazio Flacco.

[On the occasion of the dedication of Horace’s monument in Licenza, Rinaldi improvised the following poem, to great applause. He was pleased that the monument had been placed close to his home, and mused that it was because it was perhaps generally known that he loved Horace more than anyone else. He here considers Horace’s hard times in this area (e.g., a pine tree almost falling on top of the poet, an encounter with a wolf, etc.), but in looking at the profile of the mountains, Rinaldi nonetheless, laments the fact that Horace never dedicated a poem to them and concludes: “I will do it for you.”]
**Horace in Licenza**

Lucretile, you were not dignified
[to] send a wolf to your great Horace,
[For] a dead tree which you harbored
Intent on breaking both his head and back.
If Faunus, god of the woods, yours supreme
With his right arm, did not stop it,
Ready to free you from disaster;
Thinking that you were the great Quintius Horatius Flaccus.

[On the occasion of artists attending the contemporary art exhibit (Oraziana) at the Museo d’Orazio. This poem was improvised on the spot.]

**Orazio che immortale sei restato**

Orazio che immortale sei restato
Ma pochi sanno il loco dove sei vissuto,
Conosce solo te e il ruscello in cui hai bevuto
Chi per molti anni ha studiato.
D’allora solo il leccio è cambiato
Purtroppo da un salice sostituito.
Tu dicesti [non se ne floribus?]
Oggi siamo noi senza fiori
Ma siamo circondato dai pittori
Dando a quelle tele un chiaroscuro,
Per ricordarti sempre nel futuro.

**Horace, you who immortal have remained**

Horace, you who immortal have remained
Yet few know the place where you lived,
They know only you and the stream where you drank,
Those who have studied for many years.
From those times only the oak has changed
Alas, by a willow supplanted.
You said [non se ne floribus?]
Today, it is we who are without flowers.
But we are surrounded by painters
Who give to those canvasses a chiaroscuro,
By which to remember you always in the future.

**Oh Sweet nature**

Oh sweet nature who regales the villa
With a splendid mane of a modest woods.
And to the foreigner you give your green
Who always will remember the eternal poet.

**O dolce natura**

O dolce natura che doni alla villa
Una splendida chioma di una modesta selva.
E al forestiere le doni il tuo verde
E sempre ricorda il poeta perenne.

**Illustrous Tourist**

Illustrous tourist whose name I do not know,
Who comes up here, attracted by the spot,
Where the Latin lyric poet
Exploited nature for each and every thought.

**O nobile villa**

O nobile villa che dai monti è circondata
Donavi ad Orazio un’eco profonda,
Lanciando quei versi in aria impetuosa
Sacrificando capretti nella fonte Bandusia.

**Oh noble villa**

Oh noble villa surrounded by mountains
You gave Horace a deep echo,
Throwing those verses to the impetuous air
[While] sacrificing little goats in the Fonte Bandusia.
Egregio turista
Egregio turista che sei molto gioioso
Di aver costatato dove si gode il riposo.
Ed anche Orazio disse a Mecenate:
E qui si godeva veramente la pace.

Esteemed tourist
Esteemed tourist who are most joyous
To have learned of this restful place.
And even Horace said to Maecenas:
Here one really could enjoy peace.

L’offesa alla villa
C’è qualche turista che al cancello si affaccia
E subito esclama: che brutte muraccia,
Non rendendosi conto di tutto il passato,
Su queste muraccia chi può aver dimorato.
Ma se poi scendendo il custode le spiega
Si rendono conto ch’era un grande poeta.
Se poi il turista è stato già liceale
Non esclama pungente parole,
Avendo tradotto il duro latino,
Nelle odi immense del poeta venosino.

The villa insulted
There is sometimes a tourist who looks in at the gate
And immediately exclaims: what ugly walls,
Not knowing anything about the past,
[And] who could have lived among these ugly walls.
But then, if the custodian comes to explain,
They understand that he was a great poet.
If, on the other hand, the tourist has studied,
He does not exclaim with such harsh words,
Having translated the difficult Latin,
Of the grand Odes of the poet from Venosa.

Da giovane, Villa, non sembravi una tomba
Da giovane, Villa, non sembravi una tomba,
Qualsiasi affresco ti rendeva giocondo.
Colle bellezze delle fontane
Che alimentavi le vasche termali.
Cendendo poi nel porticato,
Un ricco giardino avevi a un lato.
E possedevi una grande piscina
Come un trono di una regina.
Per tale complesso avesti il destino
Di ospitare un sommo poeta latino.
E se oggi pur vecchia sei diventata
Da ogni turista sei ammirata.
E se ne torna felice e profondo
Ricordandoti sempre, in Italia e nel mondo.

In youth, Villa, you did not seem tomb-like
In youth, Villa, you did not seem tomb-like,
Any fresco made you joyous.
With the beauty of the fountains
Which fed the thermal baths.
Descending then, into the portico,
A lavish garden you had on one side.
And a great pool you possessed,
Like a queen’s throne.
Because of such a complex, your destiny was
To welcome the great Latin poet.
And even if today, you have become old
You are [nonetheless] admired by every tourist.
Who goes forth, happy and thoughtful
Remembering you always, throughout Italy and the world.

Ustica
Ustica, Licenza si chiamava
La zona da Orazio preferita.
La valle semioscura da lui cantata
Ancor tutt’oggi al mondo è conosciuta.
La quiete com’allora l’è restata
Solo da qualche uccello armonioso.
La decadenza
Piccola villa da millenni scomparsa
Solo di ruderi una piccola traccia,
Già più volte restaurati
Per tanti ricordi che avete lasciati.
Ma ogni studioso che segue il latino,
Questi ricordi li sente vicino.
E pensa ad Orazio che qui ha vissuto
Dove ha trascorso un lieto riposo.

Decay
Little villa gone now for millennia
In ruins, leaving only a small trace,
Already restored several times
So many memories have you left behind.
But every scholar who has studied his Latin,
Does such memories hold dear:
And thinks on Horace who lived here
Where he spent his years in joyful rest.
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F. CONCLUSION

BY BERNARD FRISCHER

The Horace’s Villa Project began in 1997 with the idea that after two major excavations earlier in the twentieth century, all that was left to do on the site was to fill in some gaps in our knowledge and to clarify some remaining questions about details of the design and phasing of the villa. As the project developed, it became clear that our focus was gradually shifting, as evidence kept coming to light, all around the site, that the earlier excavators had misdated many features to the Augustan age—doubtless because they were laboring under the preconceived notion that the villa had been owned by Horace. Finding structures in opus reticulatum, they leapt to the conclusion that these were datable to the late first century B.C. and stopped digging before reaching virgin soil.

Application of the technique of stratigraphic excavation and reconsideration of the material found by our predecessors (especially the mosaics, marbles, and the fresco fragments) suggested that what the earlier excavators considered Augustan should really be assigned to a period many decades later, and study of inscriptions on pipes, tiles, and bricks brought forth the names of a number of people who owned the villa in the first century B.C. through the second century A.D. Horace’s name, unfortunately, did not appear on the list.

Meanwhile, despite our redating of the bulk of the architecture found earlier to the first or second century A.D., the case for Horatian ownership at an earlier phase was not thereby fatally compromised, since we also brought to light some hitherto unknown features all around the site that did date to the first century B.C. Hence, much to our surprise, what began as a small project to put the final touches onto the large canvas painted by our predecessors turned out to be a feasibility study for a whole new major study of the site. In the end, we probably raised more questions than we answered, and so instead of bringing three centuries of research on the site to a neat conclusion, we laid the basis for major new studies in the twenty-first century.

F.1. PERIODIZATION OF “HORACE’S VILLA”

The foregoing should not be taken to suggest that we have not made some concrete progress toward a better understanding of the site. The studies undertaken from 1997 to 2002 have turned up enough new information, both from the ground and from the archives, to enable us to have an entirely new view of how the site functioned at various periods in antiquity, and of how it developed. Up to now, Lugli’s chronology, which follows in table 1, has been standard.

It should be noted that Lugli furnishes no such table, and table 1 has been created by us on the basis of his scattered remarks about the date and phases of the various components of the villa (see Frischer, B.4). Even if not neatly summarized in tabular form, Lugli’s views have understandably greatly influenced how scholars have viewed the phases of the structures on the site. For example, Mielsch, Mari, and Centroni—to mention only several recent authors—have accepted Lugli’s views as reflected in our table 1.

In table 2 can be found the new periodization that represents our attempt to synthesize the various studies in this volume into a coherent new picture of how the site developed from the mid-Republic to the Middle Ages. In arriving at the synthesis, all the individual reports were scrutinized for chronological indications, and numerous discussions were held with their authors to clarify details. Special attention was paid to potential disagreements among the authors, but, in the event, none emerged. It turned out to be relatively easy to harmonize the views of experts who in many cases had never even met and who independently of each other had proposed new interpretations of old finds (here we think especially of Angelelli, Mols, Strazzulla, and Werner). It is clear that the first and last periods (mid-Republic and Middle Ages) can only be identified and dated.

1. Mari 1994, 68; In Sabinis, 3-8; Mielsch, 61.
in an approximate way, given the paucity of finds. In contrast, there are three major periods from the late Republic to late antiquity where the finds are plentiful enough to permit us to attempt a phasing that is more differentiated and precise than what Lugli was able to propose.

The advance in precision should not, of course, be exaggerated: our new periodization is presented as no more than a working hypothesis that needs to be tested and modified by new fieldwork. Nevertheless, we present it in the hope that, until such work is undertaken (which, judging from the history of the site, may well take some years or even decades), the consensus that emerges from the work of over twenty scholars in a variety of disciplines will be of some interest and utility to others. Whatever the limitations of our new periodization, we would at any rate claim that it represents an advance over what Lugli was able to propose.

In developing our chronology, we use two approaches: 1) the results of our stratigraphic excavation; 2) logical deductions based on the excavations, on other information that has emerged about the site, and on practical considerations. Needless to say, datings based upon the first approach are much more reliable, but those of the second class will always be necessary expedients on a site where previous work has destroyed so much of the ancient stratigraphy. Purists might object, but our response would be simply to recommend that they not attempt to grapple with “Horace’s Villa” but turn their attention to one of the hundreds of other known sites in central Italy that have not been the subject of so much archaeological intervention over the past three centuries. Given the site’s intrinsic interest—the prime cause of those interventions in the first place—both to archaeologists and to cultural historians and students of Latin literature, it is clear to us that a synthetic chronology, however tentative, is a justifiable expectation after a project that has done as much as ours to probe the site and to exhume the records of earlier work done here.

Before presenting a narrative account of our periodization, a preliminary discussion of the kinds of logical deductions we have made is advisable. These fall into the following categories:

1. Evidence of coins, pottery, and other material found out of context (or whose context was not recorded according to the stratigraphic method). Once such material has been removed from its archaeological context, it is no longer of any use for the stratigraphic method, but it can at least attest activity somewhere on the site in the period to which the object can be dated. We assume that in filling holes or raising floor levels, if potsherds, marble fragments, and other refuse is used, it will generally come from on or close to the site and not be imported from other sites far afield. Of course, this assumption may not always be warranted, but it usually will be. The distribution of such material, even if based on a non-quantitative reckoning, can give a sense of the intensity of activity on the site (occupation, building, etc.) at a certain period.

2. Evidence of pipes, drains, and sewers. When a hydraulic feature is found that cannot in itself be dated (e.g., by an inscription), several hypotheses are to be sure possible about its relationship to the structures below or through which it passes. Skeptics will argue that they could have been built before, contemporaneously with, or long after those structures. Our assumption is that, in the absence of evidence that they were inserted later, hydraulic features are contemporaneous with the structures with which they are associated. For example, the drain of the pool 25 could certainly have been built before or after the pool, but we hold it much more likely that the drain was built contemporaneously with the pool, since we find it hard to imagine a pool without a provision for overflow; and we see no reason for a drain to have been built in the middle of the garden before the pool was added. Moreover, we assume that hydraulic features can be used to provide a chronological link to the structures under, or through which they pass. Again, it is possible that, e.g., pipe f was built to drain Area 8 before or after rooms 15 and 21, under which the pipe passes. We consider it more likely, in the absence of any evidence that rooms 15 and 21 were modified to permit the passage of the pipe, or that they were built atop a preexisting pipe built for no known reason, that the pipe provides logical proof for the claim that Areas 8, 15, and 21 were in phase with each other and the pipe.
3. Evidence of occupation levels. Levels can change for any number of reasons, including even an arbitrary desire to redecorate with a new floor at a higher level. Without in any way denying such a scenario, we consider it more likely that levels are generally modified as a secondary reflection of more primary processes at work on the site, e.g., the construction of adjacent structures naturally occurring at a different level and requiring, for functional reasons, an adjustment of preexisting floors to enable easy communication from one space to another.

F. Conclusion

F.1.1. Periods on the Site of “Horace’s Villa”

Mid-Republican occupation. Residual mid-Republican pottery was found in the area of the atrium in Areas 38-39-40 during the 1997-1999 excavations (see Angelelli, D.2.1). One aes grave coin was also found (see Buttrey, D.11.1.4, with note 8). The lack of context of these finds and the absence of corresponding architectural features does not allow us to do more than express the suspicion that the site was in use as early as 300-200 B.C.

Period IA. During the course of the first century B.C. (but we cannot say in what year or even decade) several major features were built on the site: the atrium in Areas 38-39-40 (whose late first-century B.C. date is securely based on stratigraphy; see Angelelli, D.2.1), drained by sewer m; the opus incertum wall running along the western side of the future quadriporticus (whose date is based upon pottery finds and its situation beneath the wall in opus reticulatum that was erected on it; see Nerucci, C.4.2 and De Simone, C.4.3); and the basin in Area 12 (whose date is based only on its relative position at the lowest built stratum on the site; see De Simone, C.2.1). We do not know the relative chronology of these three structures, nor do three isolated points permit us to have a sense of the overall plan of the site at any time in the first century B.C. Nevertheless, the three features (all discovered during the 1997-2001 excavations) do entitle us to conclude that in the first century B.C. the site plan was quite different from what was found in the next century: the dwelling was in the area of the future baths; the future area of the residence had a very different use, as the water basin attests; and, pace Lugli, there was no quadriporticus in this period. This is also the period to which we assign the first ancient level in the garden (see Gleason, C.3.4.2). Only a trace of decoration survives: the three bits of red painted plaster still in situ on the opus incertum wall (see Mols, D.9.3.1). One owner may be associated with the site in this period, or possibly in the next: Manius Naevius (see Filippi, D.4).

Period IB. After IA, at an indeterminate time that might have been relatively brief or long, but which in any case predated ca. 100 A.D., the basin in Area 12 was suppressed and covered by new building (see De Simone, C.2.1); the first phase of rooms 19-20-21 in the area of the future residence was built (see De Simone, D.1.3.2), and it is not inconceivable that this building was part and parcel of the first phase of the entire residence in Areas 1-26; and somewhere on the site pavements in opus sectile made of palombino and slate were laid (see Angelelli, D.6.2). The suppression of the basin cannot be precisely dated in the absence of dating material in the stratigraphy (see De Simone, C.2.1). The first phase of 19-20-21 is known (but not dated) from the fact that originally drain f debouched at point g in room 21, as is evidenced by a photograph from the Pasqui excavations (see De Simone, D.1.3.6). The drain was rerouted to the south in the next period with the construction of room 33 of the baths, adjacent to 19-20-21. The fact that f existed implies that the first phase of Area 8 had also been built, as had room 15, since f runs beneath its northwest corner. Since drain d connects with f, it may date from the same period, and, in any case, we know that room 12 was remanaged with new construction at some point after the basin of IA was built (see De Simone, C.2.1). The fact that 8, 12, 15, 19, 20, and 21 existed could be taken as a strong hint that the rest of the residential rooms in the Areas 1-26 also were built at this time. There is no evidence at all that the quadriporticus had yet been built. Since drain f debouched into an area directly on line with a hypothetical extension of the main drain of the site, i, we can assume that i existed in some form (whether in its original state as a natural gully or as an artificial channel is unclear).

We do not know anything certain about the wall decoration of this phase, but it is clear that we should assign to the later years of this period wall-painting fragments, datable to the second half of the first century A.D., used as fill in room 38 and in Area 35.
We have evidence of various kinds of frigidarium o. Drain. At some point in the period from the colonnade, 35. Since 33 abuts the older rooms thermal complex including new rooms 31-34 and not a freestanding bath room but was part of a new function with the new room 37. The frigidarium was not a freestanding bath room but was part of a new thermal complex including new rooms 31-34 and the colonnade, 35. Since 33 abuts the older rooms 20-21, one of which (21) had opening g for drain f, they had to be rebuilt with a new thermal function (e.g., 20 became a calidarium) and the drain was redirected to the south through channel h. The garden level was raised (see Gleason, C.3.4.2), doubtless in connection with the construction of the surrounding quadriporticus, built in opus reticulatum. Drain o, running from the pool (25) in the middle of the garden, cuts under the western branch of the quadriporticus; the pool is flush with the new garden level, implying that the drain and the pool were built at the same time as the rise in the garden level and the construction of the adjacent quadriporticus. Yet another water feature was added in the center of Area 8, and at this time the residence must have been enlarged to the north, in part with the result that the new fountain in 8 was centered in the middle of the peristyle (see De Simone, D.1.3.2; for traces of other structures beyond the present northern perimeter wall, see Cerri, C.2.2). The ornamental structure (which might have been a nymphaeum) in the middle of the eastern branch of the quadriporticus was added on a line conforming to the main axis of the pool (25). The main drain of the villa (i) had the form of an artificial channel, replacing a natural depression that had carried off the waste water in earlier phases. The colonnade in Area 35 was decorated with terracotta plaques with palmettes and Erotes (see Strazzulla, D.5). The baths also contained wall mosaics made of pasta vitrea, though we do not know exactly where these were located (see Werner, D.8.3.6). Random finds of pavements in palombino and marble can be dated to this same general period (see Angelelli, D.6.2). The surviving mosaics in the residence (rooms 1, 4, 11, 16, 26, and 27) also date from this period (see Werner, D.8). It is consistent with the increase in activity and luxury in this period that we have evidence of at least one important owner: Ti. Claudius Burrus, the son of the chamberlain (and assassin) of Domitian (See Rudich, E.2).

Period IIb. At some point in the period from the later years of Hadrian and the first decade of the reign of Antoninus Pius (i.e., from ca. 130-150 A.D.) the degree of luxury already apparent in IIA was increased. The bath complex was enlarged with new rooms (41-49, 51-53) added to the south (see De Simone, D.1.3.7). Parietal marbles, which have close parallels at nearby Hadrian’s Villa (see Angelelli, D.6.1), were used to decorate at least some of the
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rooms (we have no information allowing us to be more specific). The level in room 50 was also raised (see Camaiani et al., C.5.2.1). New mosaics were laid in 38-39-40 on the newly raised floor (see Werner, D.8.3.5). It is consistent with this construction that we have a series of brickstamps, all unfortunately found out of context, that can be dated to the 120s A.D. (see Filippi, D.4). As for owners, we have P. Hostilius Firminus, who was either the disgraced senator mentioned by Pliny or else a close relative (see Bruun, D.13). A waterpipe, b, with his name was found somewhere in, or under, rooms 44, 47, 48, 49, firmly linking him with the extension of the baths in this part of the villa (see De Simone, D.1.3.6 and Frischer E.4 for discussion of why the pipe should be placed here and not in 34, as reported in Lugli 1926).

Period IIIA. During much of the long period from 200-370 A.D. the villa continued to function, but without new building or even remodelling, as far as we can tell. At some point in the fourth century, at least part of the bath complex ceased to function, and the area was used for burials (see Camaiani et al., C.5.3).

Period IIIB. Sometime after 370 A.D. the Roman-period villa, now severely degraded, was abandoned (see Camaiani et al., C.5.3.1).

Medieval Period. Random bits of evidence indicate the reoccupation of the villa at a time and for reasons that are hard to specify. Forum ware fragments found in Areas 37-40 imply occupation by the eighth to ninth centuries (see Camaiani et al., C.5.4.1, and Angelelli, D.2.1.4). At this time, the old frigidarium was divided into three rooms, whose walls can still be seen on the site. Structure 53 may have been used as a chapel; at any rate, its lower level (where Pasqui found the bones of many skeletons, which have since disappeared and so cannot be dated or studied) was used as a crypt.

F.2. Ownership of “Horace’s Villa”

The ownership of most Roman villas is not known, and the difficulty of determining who owned “Horace’s Villa” should always be understood in that context.2 The new studies of 1997-2002 could not, unfortunately, shed any more light on the vexed question of Horatian ownership of the property. No new evidence came to light either confirming or disconfirming the eighteenth-century identification. At the moment, the question must remain a non liquet.

In contrast, the new research did add the names of a series of hitherto unknown ancient owners (Manius Naevius, Claudia Epicharis, Ti. Claudius Burrus, and P. Hostilius Firminus: see Bruun, D.13; Filippi, D.4; and Rudich, E.2), whose tenure would appear to run from the mid-first century B.C. to the mid-second century A.D. This result establishes the exceptional interest of “Horace’s Villa,” even if, for the moment, we can say nothing definite about Horace. Whether the tenures of our owners were uninterrupted or not is at present impossible to say. In favor of the latter possibility—which would imply that we do not have the complete list of ancient owners in the period of ca. 50 B.C. to 150 A.D.—is the fact that there appears to be a large gap between the first owner and Claudia Epicharis, a gap that may be echoed in the numismatic record, with its paucity of coins between the death of Augustus and the reign of Claudius. Into this gap Q. Horatius Flaccus could conceivably be someday fitted, if future fieldwork in the areas to be proposed below turns up more inscriptions with owners’ names.

In this regard it might be noted that our first two imperial owners (Claudia Epicharis of the Claudian-Neronian age; and Ti. Claudius Burrus from the reign of Domitian) are closely connected to the imperial court. One could imagine a situation in which the property had become part of the imperial fiscus early in the first century A.D., was rented out to tenants or simply allowed to lie dormant, causing its degradation, and then was given as a gift or loan to

2. That the owners of Roman villas are rarely known is a commonplace of scholarship; cf. N. Morley, Metropolis and Hinterland. The City of Rome and the Italian Economy 200 B.C.-A.D. 200 (Oxford 1996) 101 (about the difficulty of identifying the owners of Settefinestre and other villas in the ager Cosanus); Millar, 24 (“the history of any individual site or villa is exceptionally difficult to trace”); U. Pappalardo, Le ville romane (Naples 2000) 10.
Epicharis’ husband, Ti. Claudius Abascantus, by the emperor. Such an owner would have easily had the resources needed to pay for the expensive upgrades seen in our Period IIA. Then, after Abascantus’ death and Epicharis’ suicide, it reverted to the fiscus and was given a decade or two later to another important imperial freedman, Ti. Claudius Parthenius, the father of Ti. Claudius Burrus. Be this as it may, the undeniable connection of the property with the imperial fiscus may provide an important, if indirect, new argument in favor of Horatian ownership, since we know from the Suetonian biography that when Horace died in 8 B.C., he left his entire estate to Augustus. Nevertheless, as we conclude our second study season in 2003, the property should still properly be called “Horace’s Villa,” not Horace’s Villa.

After the middle of the second century A.D., darkness descends on the ownership of the estate until the thirteenth century, when it becomes part of the feudal holdings of the Orsini family. The new fieldwork of 1997-2001 did not shed much new light on the earlier medieval period, nor on the validity of the old hypothesis of the establishment of a monastery of St. Peter, which could explain the name of the parcel, Vigne di S. Pietro. But the find of Forum ware from the eighth-ninth century in Area 35 (see Angelelli, D.2.1.4) does at least give us our first concrete proof of reoccupation of the site in that period. Conceivably, whatever group (whether religious or lay) was living here was killed or chased out with the Saracen occupation of the area in the late ninth and early tenth centuries (see Frischer, B.1.7), and the site was abandoned for some centuries. Much of the Orsini period (see Allegrezza, E.3) was not one of intense agriculture or settlement before the eighteenth century, when new colonists were brought in (see Frischer, B.1.8). This means that the archaeological remains on the site should have been left undisturbed for eight or nine centuries, and when they were discovered through the new planting of the eighteenth century, the ruins in Areas 1-4 came rather quickly to the attention of antiquarians and the Papal authorities. Thus, it is probably not an accident that we found a gap in the archaeological record between the ninth and seventeenth centuries.

With the end of feudalism, a number of families that had been farming the area of the former villa as serfs of the Orsini and Borghese became the owners of the various parcels of land. As we have seen, their property lines corresponded conveniently with the main divisions of the villa (see fig. 17 in Frischer, B): Caponetti land covered the southern half of the site, cutting through the bath complex, quadriporticus, and garden (parcel 1213); the Angeletti holding cut across the next quarter of the site, but, in terms of Pasqui’s excavations and the parts of the ancient villa that it uncovered, the Angeletti property falls over the central area of the baths (parcel 1214). The residence and northern zone of the baths south of the former road was originally a single parcel (1215) divided by the time Pasqui started digging between two siblings: Maria Assunta Foschi in Ricciotti (1215a) and Rocco Foschi (1215b). North of the road were two properties of the heirs of Vincenzo Onorati (parcels 1339 to the north and 1340 to the east). As we have seen throughout this report, our knowledge of the real estate situation in 1911 when Pasqui started to excavate has allowed us to recuperate some useful information about the provenance of many of Pasqui’s finds as recorded in his unpublished catalogues (see Frischer, E.4 and G.1.12), information that was not, for some reason, included in the publication of the catalogues in Lugli 1926.

F.3. Theory for the Upgrading of the Site in Periods IB and IIA

The final conclusion of the Horace’s Villa Project, 1997-2003 is that the enhancement of the site in Periods IB and IIA may not be an accidental or inevitable development, but had a specific geographical cause. That the process was connected to high-ranking imperial freedmen such as Ti. Claudius Abascantus, an official in Nero’s treasury, and Ti. Claudius Parthenius, Domitian’s chamberlain, suggests an interest in the Licenza valley by the imperial court. Before the first century A.D., as we have seen, the valley was an outlying part of the Roman hinterland, not particularly affected by commercial or political developments in the nearby capital. In the second half of the first century A.D., this suddenly changed. Why? A regional perspective may offer an explanation.
A list of the natural advantages of the site would include its ample, year-round water supply and the security it offered its residents by its remoteness from major population centers. But to the wealthy Roman, another and even more important advantage was its location 28.5 miles from the center of the city, along well-known and well-maintained public roads: the Via Tiburtina, from Rome to Tivoli (16.5 miles); the Via Valeria to Vicovaro (7.6 miles); and up the Via Licinian to the villa (4.4 miles). This put “Horace’s Villa” a comfortable one-day journey from the center of Rome by traditional means (horse, mule, coach, etc.).

In choosing a suitable rest stop, the records of the imperial fiscus must have been combed for candidate properties in the right area. One such property may well have been “Horace’s Villa,” which was the right distance from both Rome (28.5 miles) and Subiaco (20 miles) to make it appropriate, and which could have been enhanced precisely for this purpose. To be sure, it required a four mile detour off the Via Valeria down the Via Licinian, but this added less than an hour to the trip and had the advantage of making it easier to guarantee the emperor’s security than would a stopover along the more heavily traveled Via Valeria. An alternative scenario would see Nero bestowing the Licenza property on Abascantus while Subiaco

This fact would not have interested the imperial court before the time of Nero, since no emperors are known to have had villas beyond Licenza (as one travels from Rome) before Nero built his enormous retreat at Subiaco. Once the villa Sublacensis had been built, a practical problem arose: it was about 44 miles from Rome, more than a day’s journey. If the journey was to be broken up, as seems almost inevitable, one or more places had to be found that could suitably accommodate not only the emperor and his family but the great entourage of officials, escorts, bodyguards, etc.

On the rarity of a good water supply in central Italy and its importance to a villa site such as “Horace’s Villa,” see Morley (as n. 2), 104.

The distances were calculated using GIS software for a route along the corresponding modern roads and may, as a result, be slightly inaccurate. But given the range of a typical day’s travel, 25-35 miles (see Casson, 185), this inaccuracy (which is probably less than 5%, perhaps considerably less) will not affect the basic point that “Horace’s Villa” was a comfortable one day’s journey from Rome. On the Via Licinian in antiquity, see Mari 1994, 52, no. 8. Licinian is the modern name for a Roman road whose ancient name is not known.

See Casson, 184-85: “We know the operations of the cursus [publicus] best in the fully developed form it achieved by the second half of the fourth century A.D., when it had long been in use as a transport as well as dispatch service. All along the routes at strategic intervals were more or less well-equipped inns called mansiones or stationes; the first term originally applied to places with the facilities to handle an imperial party, the second to posts maintained by the road policy, but by this time the two had gradually merged. In between the mansiones or stationes were very simple hostels, mutationes ‘changing places’ as they were sometimes called, which could supply the minimum of a traveler’s needs…The distance from one mansio to the next depended on the terrain and how thickly an area was populated, but in general an effort was made to keep them twenty-five to thirty-five miles apart, that is, the length of an average day’s travel” (my emphasis). Casson’s estimates are accepted by K. D. White, *Greek and Roman Technology* (Ithaca 1984) 138, and basically agree with the calculations given by A. Hyland, *Equus. The Horse in the Roman World* (New Haven 1990) 254-255, 260-261. For means of transportation in

Roman times generally, see G. P. Sartorio, *Mezzi di Trasporto e Traffico* (Rome 1994).


Cf. Casson, 180-181: “The emperors and others of high society or of wealth took to the road in the grandest imaginable style. They packed a veritable household to spare them the ignominy or discomfort of stopping at any inns save those able to accommodate a royal party: tents and commodities as well as the usual cooking utensils, bedding, and tableware; some of the last could be so precious and fragile it had to be carried by hand and not trusted to a jolting wagon. An army of attendants was de rigueur. Horace ridicules one Roman worthy who, for the short trip from Rome to his villa at Tibur, took along no less than five slaves…The emperor Claudius, who liked to play dice, had a travelling carriage fitted as a gaming room…” See also Millar, 61-69, on the escorts and attendants of traveling emperors.
was being constructed with the understanding that “Horace’s Villa” would be used for overnights for imperial parties traveling to and from the villa. Such a practice would fit with what we hear elsewhere of emperors using the villas of their freedmen, starting with Augustus.  

The conjecture that “Horace’s Villa” was converted for the use of imperial entourages in the time of Nero could explain the presence of a Fourth Style decorative scheme somewhere in the complex, as well as the construction of the residence.

Under Vespasian, “Horace’s Villa” retained this use, not only for imperial visits to Subiaco, which was by no means abandoned after the death of Nero, but also for the new emperor’s trips to his villa *Aquae Cutiliae* near Reate, where Suetonius tells us he was in the habit of spending his summers. As it happens, the Via Liciniese debouches into the Via Salaria south of Reate. Moreover, *Aquae Cutiliae* (near modern Cittaducale) is over 50 miles from Rome down the Via Salaria, so again a stopping place for overnighting was needed. The zone that is 25-35 miles down the Via Salaria from Rome on the way toward Reate, and might be suggested as a place for breaking up a trip from Rome to *Aquae Cutiliae*, is not known to have had a villa suitable for an imperial entourage. “Horace’s Villa” offered a possible solution: it was 28.5 miles from Rome and 40 miles from Reate. Stopping there would have lengthened the trip to *Aquae Cutiliae*, but in compensation it offered a suitable facility, equipped since Nero’s day to handle an imperial visitor. Since “Horace’s Villa” is also in the middle zone of a triangle made up of Rome, Subiaco, and Reate, it could have equally well served as a rest stop for trips between Subiaco and *Aquae Cutiliae* (see fig. 1).

That Vespasian knew the area immediately adjacent to “Horace’s Villa” is demonstrated beyond any doubt by his restoration of the temple of Victoria at nearby Roccagiovine (*CIL XIV.3485*, cf. Frischer, B.1.4). His concern for this out-of-the-way temple in an obscure valley becomes much less mysterious if he passed through the area on his trips to and from his summer villa. If Vespasian ever stayed, at least for a day or two, at a villa near the temple of Victoria, his desire to see the old shrine restored becomes even more comprehensible.

Vespasian’s use of “Horace’s Villa” for trips to *Aquae Cutiliae* and Subiaco could explain the most prominent and enigmatic feature of the complex’s design in Period IIA: the fact that the quadriporticus and bath complex (first phase) are disproportionately large with respect to the residence. But this design makes practical sense if, most of the time, the villa was used just by one family, but occasionally also had to provide hospitality to several hundred attendants of the emperor. After bathing in the thermal complex (rooms 19-21, 31-34) and swimming in the enormous pool (25), they could sleep under cover in the quadriporticus and, if necessary, in tents set up in the garden. Special guests, like the imperial family, could be hosted in the residence, which, even if “small” in comparison with the quadriporticus and baths, still contained over 20,000 square feet, or more, of living space on its two floors.

Unlike the *villa Sublacensis*, which emperors continued to use and restore through the third century (see Frischer, B.1.4), Vespasian’s villa at *Aquae Cutiliae* quickly fades from history, and as early as Domitian it is likely that it fell out of imperial use. Vespasian’s younger son built an impressive new villa at Castel Gandolfo, the ruins of which are still to be seen on the Papal property on the grounds of the

---

8. Dio 57.72, cited by Millar, 72. Other anecdotal evidence that is relevant is the fact that Nero fled to the villa of Phaon, his freedman, to commit suicide in 68 (Suet. *Nero* 48-49); Phyllis, Domitian’s nurse, buried the emperor’s body on the grounds of her suburban villa (Suet. *Domitian* 17.3).


10. I thank Claudia Angelelli for this information.


12. On the use of tents by imperial entourages, see Casson, 180-181.
F. Conclusion

old Villa Barberini. This is the moment in which one can imagine Domitian giving his chamberlain, Ti. Claudius Parthenius, the property known as “Horace’s Villa.” It was no longer needed as a resting point on the way to Aquae Cutiliae and was, of course, in the wrong direction entirely for trips to Domitian’s new Albanum.

With Parthenius’ terrible execution, the property passed to his son, Ti. Claudius Burrus, whose name was inscribed on a water pipe found in the eighteenth century. At this point, the connection with the imperial court ends (something Trajan may have rued when he was building his new villa at Arcinazzo), and the further enhancement of the villa in the mid-second century A.D. (our Period II B) must have been motivated by new considerations having nothing to do with imperial visits—now, less likely than ever with the construction of Hadrian’s Villa at Tivoli. At most, it had to do with aping the imperial style in a minor key, exemplified so well by bath structure 53 (cf. De Simone, D.1.3.5).

Indeed, if we are correct in seeing the enhancement of “Horace’s Villa” as a function of the practice of imperial villeggiatura in areas like Subiaco and Aquae Cutiliae beyond Licenza, then the stagnation found at “Horace’s Villa” after Phase IIB may have resulted from the construction of Hadrian’s Villa, the fact that “Horace’s Villa” was now firmly in private hands and no longer connected to the imperial court, and the shift in vacation habits of the mid-second century emperors, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. Without the motive force of imperial visits and patronage, “Horace’s Villa” gradually reverted to the deserta et inhospita tesqua it had formerly been.

F.4. Future Directions for Research at “Horace’s Villa”

As noted above, what began as a project in 1997 to clarify a few final issues about the site of “Horace’s Villa” turned out to be a feasibility study about the desirability and practicability of undertaking major new fieldwork on the site. If this had been our announced goal, we could now report complete success, since we have strong reason to believe that, despite the excavations of Pasqui and Lugli-Price, as well as the various interventions of the Archaeological Superintendency in the twentieth century, much good ancient stratigraphy and certainly many ancient features still remain below the surface.

If a major new campaign of excavation and other fieldwork is thus practicable, it is also desirable, because the 1997-2001 project has raised many important new questions and offered enticing new areas for further study. These include:

- Where was the late-Republican residence on the site, and what was its design and décor? This question can only be answered by destructive excavations in the area of rooms 41-46 and in the residence.
- What are the dates of the features from Period IA? Answering this question would require further excavation in room 12, along the western branch of the quadriporticus, and in the garden.
- Can the construction of the residence in our Period IB be more precisely dated, and can the plan be more accurately defined than is possible today in view of Pasqui’s heavy (and sometimes fanciful) restorations? This question could be answered if there were extensive new excavations in the residence, including excavations under the mosaics (which could then be restored and reset).
- What was the extent of the villa north of Areas 6, 8, 17 and 26 in Period IIA? To address this issue, the most promising area to excavate would be under the road to the north of the site, which has protected the ancient layers since it was built at the conclusion of Pasqui’s excavations, and which Pasqui himself did not touch. The road is today unpaved and so could

13. To punish him for his role in the murder of Domitian, Parthenius was castrated and then suffocated with his testicles; cf. Epit. De Caes. 12.8.
14. See Bruun, D.13; Frischer in Frischer and Brown, 154 n39.
15. See M. G. Fiore and Z. Mari, La villa di Traiano ad Arcinazzo romano (Villa Adriana 1999).
16. On the critical attitudes toward villeggiatura of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius see Mielsch, 158.
easily be removed, if proper arrangements were made with the Archaeological Superintendency and the Comune di Licenza (both of which have expressed receptivity toward receiving an official request to undertake the project).

- **Can the construction of Periods IA and IIB be made more precise by means of the newly announced radiocarbon dating technique for Roman mortars?**

- **In view of the positive results in the trial garden trench in Area 24, can more of the garden design be reconstructed?** Prof. Gleason sees our site as one of the most promising for garden archaeology in central Italy. Given the thick, 2 meter overburden protecting the ancient layers, “Horace’s Villa” might well provide the best opportunity outside the Bay of Naples area to reconstruct an entire villa garden. In this connection, the entire pool (25) should be excavated.

- **Can more light be thrown on the occupation of the site in the period 400-900 A.D.?** The investigation of this matter would require excavation into the hillside behind 50, 51, and 53, where the 1997 campaign showed that good medieval layers and remains are still to be found.

- **Can the villa be better contextualized in its landscape?** Answering this question would require an intense survey of the area from Roccagiovine to the Fosso delle Chiuse, looking at evidence of ancient roads, sources of water and drainage, claypits (whose chemical analysis could allow for a more decisive attribution of bricks and roof-tiles from the site of “Horace’s Villa” to local producers), and including a special exploration of the area around the abandoned church of S. Maria delle Case at Roccagiovine, which may have been the site of the shrine of Vacuna/Victoria.

Finally, there are a number of loose ends that should be cleared up. **These include:**

- **analysis of the human bones found in 1997-1999**
- **analysis of the sculpture found prior to 1997**
- **analysis of the instrumenta domestica found prior to 1997**
- **analysis of the magnificent coffer in the Licenza museum (see Stinson, D.7, no. VHA 59; SAL inv. 62969)**
- **analysis of the “Horace’s Villa” parietal marbles at the storehouse of the Archaeological Superintendency for Lazio**

We conclude this report by expressing the hope that this list of new and unfinished business will be found helpful in formulating the agenda of scholars of the future, when they are privileged, as we were, to have the opportunity to pursue new fieldwork and research in Licenza.

---
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