

From: *Roma, Magistra Mundi. Itineraria culturae medievalis. Mélanges offerts au Père L. E. Boyle à l'occasion de son 75^e anniversaire. Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Études du Moyen Âge*, ed. J. Hamesse (Louvain L-Neuve 1998) 265-289.

BERNARD FRISCHER

(University of California, Los Angeles)

**NOTES ON THE FIRST EXCAVATION
OF HORACE'S VILLA NEAR LICENZA (ROMA)
BY THE BARON DE SAINT'ODILE**

Alessandra Contini has recently called for a full-scale study of the life and career of one of the more fascinating figures on the stage of Rome in the Age of the Grand Tour: the Baron de Saint'Odile, the Tuscan ambassador to the Papal States from 1752 to 1774¹. In this article, a small start will be made on the larger project, which should be of interest to a wide range of scholars occupied with the Settecento and that we may hope Dottsa. Contini herself may soon take in hand. The episode to be treated here is Saint'Odile's excavation of a Roman villa — long identified as Horace's — near the small Sabine hill town of Licenza, about 40 kilometers northeast of Rome. For students of antiquity, Saint'Odile's work at Licenza — never published by the excavator and never studied in depth by modern scholars — is no less fascinating than are his efforts to transfer to Florence most of the ancient sculpture collection of the Villa Medici, which is the subject of a forthcoming article by Maria Maugeri². Indeed, since new excavations are being

¹ A. CONTINI, « Pompeo Neri tra Firenze e Vienna (1757-1766) », in *Pompeo Neri* (Castelfiorentino, 6-7 May, 1988), pp. 239-331, at p. 250n18.

² See M. MAUGERI, « Il trasferimento a Firenze della collezione d'antichità di Villa Medici in epoca leopoldina », p. 17 (forthcoming in *Paragone*). The fullest accounts of the history of studies of Horace's Villa since the Renaissance are to be found in G. LUGLI, « La villa d'Orazio nella valle del Licenza », in *Monumenti antichi pubblicati dall'Accademia dei Lincei*, 31 (1926), cols. 453-598 and F. DIONISI, « Le ville di Orazio. La villa rurale del Digentia e la villa signorile di Tibur », in *Atti e Memorie della Società Tiburtina di Storia e d'Arte*, 39 (1966), pp. 15-97. Lugli does not discuss Saint'Odile's excavations (the only mention of Saint'Odile is

conducted at the Licenza site from 1997-2000, co-sponsored by the American Academy in Rome and the Soprintendenza Archeologica per il Lazio, and because the work undertaken there earlier in this century by Angiolo Pasqui and his continuators has never been fully published³, a precise account of the first excavation in the time of Saint'Odile is now more than ever a desideratum.

Born Mathieu-Dominique Charles Poirot de la Blandinier in Blamont (Lorraine) sometime during the early 1700s, Saint'Odile came to be one of the leading diplomats of mid-eighteenth century Rome⁴. Practically nothing is known about his childhood and upbringing, except that his father's name was François Poirot, who does not appear to have been a nobleman⁵. Saint'Odile first appears on the historical record in his adulthood as a functionary in the Habsburg foreign service. For students of Horace, he is mainly of interest as the person who usually receives credit for being the first excavator of the Licenza villa site, which he

in a quotation at col. 467 from p. 43 of D. DE SANCTIS, *Dissertazione sopra la villa d'Orazio*, first edition, Rome, 1761). F. Dionisi, at p. 29, gives only passing notice to them in the context of C. De Chaupy's defense of his priority in discovering the site of Horace's Villa against the claims of others (C. DE CHAUPY, *Découverte de la maison de campagne d'Horace : ouvrage utile pour l'intelligence de cet Auteur, & qui donne occasion de traiter d'une suite considérable de lieux antiques par M. l'Abbé Capmartin de Chaupy*, Rome, 1767-69, vol. 1, p. xli).

³ For Pasqui's work at Licenza see G. LUGLI, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2).

⁴ On Saint'Odile's birth name see R.B. LITCHFIELD, *Emergence of a Bureaucracy. The Florentine Patricians, 1530-1790*, Princeton, 1986, p. 268. In eighteenth-century sources and in modern scholarship his name is spelled variously as Sainte-Odile, s. Odill, Saint-Odile, St. Odil, St. Audil, Saint-Odill, di Santedille, Saint Odyle, Santodile, Sant'Odile. I will spell it Saint'Odile, which is how he signed himself in his official correspondence.

⁵ On his father's name see H. WALPOLE, *Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Sir Horace Mann*, ed. W.H. SMITH, W.S. LEWIS, AND G.L. LAM, New Haven, Connecticut, 1954-, vol. 4, p. 305n7; on his non-aristocratic lineage, cf. *Le lettere di Benedetto XIV al Card. De Tencin*, ed. E. MORELLI, Rome, 1955-1984, vol. 2, pp. 448-450 (nr. 501). A sketch of his family history, showing its long service to the House of Lorraine, is given in a forthcoming article by A. CONTINI, « Gli uomini della Maison Lorraine : Ministri, 'savants', militari e funzionari lorenesi nella Toscana della Reggenza », at pp. 533-534.

identified as Horace's Sabine estate⁶. If we want to understand what drove him to study Horace's villa while in the midst of an active and successful diplomatic career, we need to delve into his career and world.

In doing so, we are aided by an ample documentation concerning his ministerial affairs, consisting primarily of several thousand dispatches and other documents in the Archivio di Stato, Firenze ; in the Archivio Diplomatico Storico of the Italian Foreign Ministry in Rome ; and in the Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv in Vienna⁷. The great gap in our primary sources at the moment is Saint'Odile's personal correspondence. This was inventoried at the Tuscan Embassy in Rome after Saint'Odile's removal from office early in 1774 but apparently did not pass in 1859 with his ministerial papers to the Archivio Diplomatico Storico of the Italian Foreign Ministry after Tuscany's incorporation into the new state of Italy⁸. To date, the whereabouts of the personal papers is unknown.

⁶ Cf. F.A. SEBASTIANI, *Viaggio a Tivoli, antichissima città Latina-Sabina. Lettere*, Fuligno, 1828, p. 397 ; F. GORI, *Viaggio pittorico-antiquario da Roma a Tivoli e Subiaco sino alla famosa grotta di Collepardo*. Rome, 1855, p. 23 ; F. DIONISI, op. cit (supra n. 2), p. 21.

⁷ There are also several documents in the Archivio di Stato, Roma (hereafter : ASR) and in the Biblioteca Nazionale, Firenze. I have personally inspected these as well as the Archivio di Stato, Firenze (hereafter : ASF) and the Archivio Diplomatico Storico of the Italian Foreign Ministry in Rome (hereafter : ADS). I thank Dr. Eva-Katharina Ledel for researching the Haus- und Hof- und Staatsarchiv in Vienna (hereafter : HHSA) for me. Prof. Carlo Mangio of the University of Pisa kindly alerted me to material concerning Saint'Odile in the Archivio Segreto Vaticano under « Nunciatura di Firenze », which I have been personally able to consult. Additional light might be shed on Saint'Odile by the correspondence of his friend, Cardinal Alessandro Albani, in the Public Record Office, London, on which see L. LEWIS, *Connoisseurs and Secret Agents in Eighteenth Century Rome*, London, 1961, pp. 12-13. Saint'Odile (whose name is spelled « St. Odil ») is mentioned in a letter cited by Lewis at p. 228.

⁸ Saint'Odile was forced by Peter Leopold to leave Rome for Tuscany hurriedly in February 1774. He hardly had time to pack his bags, let alone to arrange for the removal of his personal property. Indeed, when he first left Rome, Saint'Odile did not even know that he was not to return after successfully defending himself before the Grand Duke. It is possible that Saint'Odile's personal letters and effects were retrieved by his nephew (known to have been with him when he died in Aix-en-Provence in 1775) after his death, but, if so, all trace of them in public records has been lost. For

As will be seen, this complicates research of our immediate topic, since the excavation of Horace's Villa would appear to be something that Saint'Odile undertook privately and very possibly clandestinely, and no mention of it has yet come to light in the aforementioned archives in Rome, Florence, or Vienna. Thus we must rely on accounts by third parties, several of which fortunately survive.

Despite being born in Lorraine, Saint'Odile served in his prime as Tuscany's representative at the papal court. The background to this seemingly unlikely posting was the Treaty of Vienna in 1735. The last Medici Duke of Tuscany, Giangastone (1671-1737), died childless, and for some years before his death the dynasts of Europe debated the succession of the Grand Duchy of Tuscany. Under the terms of the Treaty of Vienna, Tuscany was given to Francis I, Duke of Lorraine (1708-1765), in return for which Francis gave Lorraine to the Polish King, Stanislaus I Leszczyński. In 1736, Francis married Maria Theresa, Archduchess of Austria, and with her ruled the Habsburg possessions from the court in Vienna. Francis was elected Holy Roman Emperor in 1745. When Giangastone died in 1737, Francis came into possession of Tuscany, installing as his regent Prince Marc de Beauvau-Craon (1679-1754). He was to stay in Florence until his retirement in 1749, after which the dominant Lorrainer in Tuscany was Déodat Emmanuel Count of Nay-Richecourt, a member of the Council of the Regency in Florence, who had for years vied for power with Prince Beauvau-Craon. A number of civil servants were sent from the court at Lunéville to hold important offices in Florence. Saint'Odile was to be one of these Lorrainers helping the Habsburgs to rule their new state, as were several of his relatives. As might be expected, native Tuscans, proud of their past, did not take kindly to foreign rule, and « Lorrainer » quickly came to have a pejorative connotation⁹.

the inventory mentioned in the text above, see ASF, Fondo : Segreteria del Gabinetto, Filza 80 (dated March 31, 1774). For a printed inventory of the state papers of Tuscany formerly in the Tuscan Embassy in Rome and now in the ADS see R. MORI, *Le scritture della Legazione e del Consolato del Granducato di Toscana in Roma, dal 1737 al 1859*, Rome, 1959.

⁹ Cf. F. DIAZ, *I Lorena in Toscana. La Reggenza*, Turin, 1987, pp. 3-4, 12-13, 224-25 ; E. COCHRANE, *Florence in the Forgotten Centuries, 1527-1800. A History of Florence and the Florentines in the Age of the Grand Dukes*, Chicago and London,

Saint'Odile's career began before Giangastone de' Medici died. He was first employed at the Francis' court in Lunéville, where he is mentioned in surviving documents dating to the period 1734-36. Shortly after the Lorrainers moved to Tuscany in 1737, Saint'Odile was sent to Vienna, the Habsburg capital and the real power center for a dependency like Tuscany. Locally, Florence was ruled by the Council of the Regency, which in turn reported to the Council of Tuscany in Vienna. Vienna's role was especially predominant in foreign affairs, and Saint'Odile served on the Council of Tuscany from around 1740, becoming its Secretary in 1744¹⁰. He was appointed to the position of Tuscan ambassador to the Holy See in 1752.

While in Vienna, Saint'Odile received a solid preparation for dealing with the duties of his office in Rome. During the decade or so in which he followed Tuscan developments from the Foreign Ministry in Vienna, Saint'Odile witnessed the gradual rise in tensions between Habsburg Tuscany and the Papacy. These tensions grew in part out of the

1973, pp. 346-347. On Saint'Odile's two De Poirot relatives see R.B. LITCHFIELD, *op. cit.* (supra n. 4), pp. 268, 317n8. One wonders whether they were the two relatives of Saint'Odile who served as witnesses when Pope Benedict XIV canceled the Edict of the Roman Inquisition in Tuscany in May-June, 1754 ; see G. MORONI, *Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastico*, Venice, 1846, vol. 78, p. 190 ; vol. 5, pp. 46-47. As early as 1743-45 we hear of Joseph Poirot's employment in the Customs House of Florence ; see J.-C. WAQUET, *Le Grand-Duché de Toscane sous les derniers Médicis, Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, Rome, 1990, p. 557 (the name Joseph is given in the Index at p. 634).

¹⁰ See F. DIAZ, *op. cit.* (supra n. 9), pp. 11, 15 ; R.B. LITCHFIELD, *op. cit.* (supra n. 4), p. 267. Cf. ANON., *Guida generale degli archivi di stato italiani*, Rome, 1983, vol. 2, p. 90 : « con l'avvento di Francesco Stefano di Lorena i rapporti con gli Stati esteri erano tenuti attraverso la diplomazia austriaca. » The date of Saint'Odile's appointment as Secretary of the Council of Tuscany is given as 1739 at H. WALPOLE, *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 4, p. 305n7 ; and as 1744 in F. DIAZ, *op. cit.* (supra n. 9), p. 15. Before his employment in Vienna, he was the author and recipient of several documents in the Lorrainer House Archive (now in Vienna) ; see J. SEIDL, « Das Lothringische Hausarchiv », *Gesamtinventar des Wiener Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchivs*, ed. L. BITTNER, Vienna, 1937, Box 206.681 (1736), Box 214.815 (1734-36). Reference to Saint'Odile's earlier service in France (i.e., Lorraine ?) is found in a story told by Benedict XIV ; see *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 2, pp. 519-520 (nr. 542).

Habsburgs' desire to clean house after a period of what they considered to be misrule by the last of the Medici¹¹. Among other measures to which the Vatican objected were Tuscany's negotiations with the Turks over release of Tuscan prisoners and over a general improvement of commercial relations. Even more worrisome to Rome was the new Tuscan Press Law issued by edict in 1743. Under the law, the government had the right to censure the press in general, while the Church could only control religious publications. Shortly after it went into effect, the Holy Office declared the law heretical and threatened to excommunicate authors and publishers who obeyed it. Eight years later, in 1751, the Tuscan ambassador to Rome, Count Migazzi, was recalled for failure to resolve an even more bitter controversy centering on the Tuscan Dead-hand Law (*Legge sulla Manomorta*) regulating bequests to the Church¹².

The importance of Rome to Tuscany in this period should not be underestimated. Archduke Peter Leopold (1747-1792) was to write toward the end of the century, « on [my] arrival in Tuscany, I found that ecclesiastical affairs were generally in the same state of dependency on the Court of Rome as Tuscany has always had because of several factors, including : its proximity [to Rome] and the relationship that the two countries have to each other ; and the continuous relationships — i.e., dependency — that the House of the Medici affected to have with the Court of Rome ; the principal families — especially in Siena and Pistoia — have gained their wealth from various popes and cardinals who were related to them ; and the quantity of people (especially among the nobility) who studied at Rome where they were employed or

¹¹ Cf. F. DIAZ, « Agl'inizi della dinastia Lorenese in Toscana. I problemi della reggenza », in *Studi di storia medievale e moderna per Ernesto Sestan*, 2 vols, Florence, 1980, vol. 2, pp. 669-702 ; F. DIAZ, *op. cit.* (supra n. 9), p. 4.

¹² G. MORONI, *op. cit.* (supra n. 9), vol. 5, pp. 46-47 ; F. DIAZ, *op. cit.* (supra n. 9), p. 54 ; N. RODOLICO, *Stato e Chiesa in Toscana durante la Reggenza lorenese (1737-1765)*, Florence, 1910, pp. 225-256, 302. On Count Christophe Migazzi see A.L. JADIN, ed., *Relations des Pays-bas, de Liège et de Franche-Comté avec le Saint-Siège d'après les 'lettres di vescovi,' (1566-1779)*, Brussels – Rome, 1952, fasc. IV, p. 569.

gratified by that Court with pensions and monasteries in Tuscany »¹³. Meanwhile, for its part, the Papal court had grave doubts about the piety of the Lorrainer regime in Florence. In particular, Count Richecourt, who ran the Council of the Regency until illness forced his retirement in 1757, was considered no friend of the Church, and the Pope wrote to the Holy Roman Emperor claiming that he was receiving many letters from Tuscan bishops stating their concern — a concern they were afraid to express openly in Tuscany itself for fear of reprisals against their relatives¹⁴. Relations had become so bad that the Pope was refusing to deal directly with the Council of the Regency in Tuscany and instead insisted on going to the top — the Holy Roman Emperor himself — to get satisfaction¹⁵.

Such was the state of affairs when Saint'Odile arrived in Rome. He had the delicate task not only of pacifying a disgruntled pontiff but also of serving two masters : the Habsburg court in Vienna, and the Council of the Regency in Florence. Through the correspondence of Pope Benedict XIV and of Horace Walpole, the English ambassador to Tuscany, we can follow Saint'Odile's progress from Vienna to Florence and from there to Rome in 1752.

The Pope was informed of the new appointment in a letter written to him by Migazzi on January 7, 1752. Saint'Odile's predecessor assured the Pope that the Emperor hoped that in sending his new ambassador to Rome, he could clear up all the difficulties plaguing the Holy See's

¹³ P. LEOPOLDO, *Relazioni sul governo della Toscana*, ed. A. SALVESTRINI, Florence, 1969-1974, vol. 1, p. 163 ; cf. F. DIAZ, *op. cit.* (supra n. 11), vol. 2, pp. 682-689. In general on Church-State relations in Tuscany during the Regno Lorenese see N. RODOLICO, *op. cit.* (supra n. 12)

¹⁴ *Correspondance de Benoît XIV*, ed. E. DE HEERKEREN, Paris, 1912, vol. 2, p. 164 ; E. MORELLI, ed., *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 2, pp. 448-49. On Richecourt's retirement and his replacement by Marchese Antonio Botta Adorno (a career diplomat who had previously served in such offices as Austrian commander at Genova and ambassador in Russia), see R.B. LITCHFIELD, *op. cit.* (supra n. 4), p. 267 ; F. DIAZ, *op. cit.* (supra n. 4), pp. 19, 224-225.

¹⁵ H. WALPOLE, *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 4, p. 305 : « [Saint'Odile] is expected here soon on his way to Rome to settle many disagreements, which the Pope declared long ago he would not treat about with the Regency of Tuscany. »

relations with Tuscany¹⁶. Several days after receiving this letter, Benedict wrote that he had learned that the newly nominated Saint'Odile was « a man of intelligence, learning, and good will, » but the Pope also wrote cautiously that « we will have to test him to know through his deeds whether he is really such as he is described »¹⁷.

Before Saint'Odile could be tested by the Pope, he first had to stop in Florence where Count Richecourt, whom at least one observer called Saint'Odile's antagonist, was anxiously awaiting his arrival. He arrived on March 16, 1752 and was to stay for over two months, apparently kept in virtual isolation by Richecourt and able to communicate with the Pope only in writing. When Saint'Odile finally got to Rome only to find that the Pope was leaving immediately for a vacation at his villa at Castel Gandolfo, Saint'Odile followed him out of town and pressed business upon him¹⁸.

¹⁶ A.L. JADIN, ed., *op. cit.* (supra n. 12), fasc. IV, p. 569 : « ...L'empereur m'a prié également de vous assurer de son désir de voir s'aplanir les difficultés avec la Toscane. Il a chargé le baron de Saint'Odile de régler le différend.... »

¹⁷ E. MORELLI, ed., *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 2, pp. 448-450 (nr. 501) : «Si dà da tutti per un uomo di garbo, di buona cognizione e di sincera volontà. A Noi toccherà sperimentarlo e conoscere in atto pratico, se è tale, quale viene dipinto.... »

¹⁸ Cf. the letter from Mann to Walpole, Florence, 10 March 1752 H. WALPOLE, *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 4, p. 305 : « The Florentines flatter themselves with the hopes of some agreeable event by the arrival of Monsieur St Odil, who has long been at Vienna the professed antagonist of our earl here.... » For the arrival date in Florence, see H. WALPOLE, *ibid.*, vol. 4, p. 305n8 ; for the arrival date in Rome, see E. MORELLI, ed., *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 2, pp. 478-79 (nr. 519). On Saint'Odile's stay in Florence cf. H. WALPOLE, *ibid.*, vol. 4, p. 308 : « ...people have nothing to employ themselves about except the motions of Monsieur St Odil, who is going minister to Rome to give more power to the priests and Inquisition. He was always the greatest antagonist at Vienna of the Earl, who is vastly jealous of him here, and excludes everybody from him. » For Saint'Odile's letters to the Pope at this time see E. MORELLI, ed., *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 2, pp. 476-477 (nr. 518) : « Il barone di Sainte-Odile spedito da Vienna per gli affari dell'Imperadore, come granduca di Toscana con questa Santa Sede, fra i quali in ciò che appartiene ad esso non entra quello della Carpegna, arrivò a Firenze sino nel passato mese di marzo. Di ciò diede parte a Noi, accennando che quanto prima sarebbe stato in Roma ; in tal maniera che fummo in procinto di non rispondergli in carta, ma d'aspettare di rispondergli in voce, ma ciò non ostante, li risponderemo cortesemente in carta. Da quel tempo in qua,

Whatever Richecourt thought of Saint'Odile, Pope Benedict grew to appreciate the energetic, new Tuscan ambassador as he got to know him better¹⁹. Although the Pope was at first disappointed that the envoy served less as a creative diplomat than as a postman, simply transmitting letters to and from Vienna, within a short time of his arrival Saint'Odile did indeed prove himself to be a man of intelligence and good will, solving the outstanding problems nagging Tuscan-Papal relations by 1754²⁰. He even revived a lapsed Medici custom of the giving the Pope an annual Christmas present²¹. Needless to say, the change in Saint'Odile's comportment and the improvement in Tuscan relations pleased Benedict. Driving these developments was a shake-up in the Habsburg Foreign Ministry, which was taken over in 1753 by Wenzel Anton Kaunitz, an impressive administrator and diplomat who was to dominate foreign policy in Vienna for the next four decades²².

nulla abbiamo saputo di lui, se non che per anche si tratteneva in Firenze.... » For Saint'Odile's arrival in Rome and ceremonial reception at the Papal court, see E. MORELLI, ed., *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 2, pp. 478-479 (nr. 519). For Saint'Odile at Castel Gandolfo see E. MORELLI, ed., *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 2, p. 480 (nr. 520). From Saint'Odile's letters sent to Richecourt from Rome, no particular sign of antagonism between the two can be detected; see ASD, Fondo Legazione del Granducato di Toscana in Roma, pacco 3 (1751-60).

¹⁹ See E. MORELLI, ed., *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 2, p. 535 (nr. 550).

²⁰ On Saint'Odile's resolution of the controversy regarding the Tuscan Press Law and the role of the Inquisition in Tuscany see E. MORELLI, ed., *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 2, pp. 154-156 (nr. 634); G. MORONI, *op. cit.* (supra n. vol. 78, p. 190; vol. 5, pp. 46-47; F. DIAZ, *I Lorena in Toscana. La Reggenza*, Turin, 1987, pp. 130-131. On Saint'Odile's success in settling the quarrel over possession of Carpegna, see E. MORELLI, ed., *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 3, pp. 145-146 (nr. 628). A great deal of documentation about the Carpegna affair can be found in ADS, Fondo Legazione del Granducato di Toscana in Roma, Pacco 3 (1751-1760), including an interesting 30-page printed document stating the Papal position dated January 30, 1739; see *Lettera di un Anonimo ad un suo Amico sopra l'affare presente della Carpegna per quello riguarda alle pretese ragioni del Ministero di Toscana fondate sù certe Accomandigie*.

²¹ On the present, see E. MORELLI, ed., *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 2, p. 107 (nr. 604).

²² For Pope Benedict's complaint that Saint'Odile was a mere postman, see E. MORELLI, ed., *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 2, p. 527: « Tutti i gravi affari, che ha questa Santa Sede colla Corte di Vienna, dormono, ma non per colpa nostra. Il barone

Saint'Odile served as Tuscan ambassador in Rome until 1774, when he was fired by Archduke Peter Leopold (1747-1792, Holy Roman Emperor from 1790) for reasons that are not entirely clear but that involved a series of mishaps and missteps. We are told in one source that Saint'Odile was dismissed because he was caught sending secret reports to the Archduke's mother, Maria Theresa of Austria. This fact was revealed in the midst of an investigation of the charge that Saint'Odile was secretly selling antiquities from the Villa Medici collection to Cardinal Albani²³. Whatever the truth of this charge, the fact that Saint'Odile was dealing directly with his sovereign's mother, from whom he jealously guarded his independence, was sufficient to put him in bad odor with the court in Florence. Another possible reason for his dismissal was the Baron's involvement in an ill-fated scheme started by a German named Johann Christian Miller to settle parts of the malaria-infested Maremma with colonies of Romans. The plan failed after just one year in 1773, costing Miller his job and Peter Leopold his substantial investment. Whether Saint'Odile incurred any of Peter Leopold's displeasure for this is not known, but it would not be surprising, especially since in the investigation of the affair, it became clear that Miller did nothing without Saint'Odile's knowledge and approval. The immediate cause, however, of the Baron's dismissal was undoubtedly his high-handed arrest of the head of the Tuscan post office in Rome²⁴. In a letter to Archduke Peter Leopold dated February 17, 1774, Maria Theresa wrote that Saint'Odile was now « mad » and

di Saint'Odile, che doveva fare qui la comparsa d'un plenipotenziario e d'un angelo di pace, in sostanza non può far altro che prender fogli, mandarli alla sua Corte, e portare le risposte, quando vengono, il che sino ad ora non è succeduto, ancorché siano mesi che gli furono consegnati i fogli di risposta col piano di quanto poteva farsi per accomodamento in tutto ciò che appartiene alle intollerabili novità, violentemente introdotte nella Toscana. » On Kaunitz, see F.A.J. SZABO, *Kaunitz and Enlightened Absolutism, 1753-1780*, Cambridge, 1994.

²³ For the details, see M. MAUGERI, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2), p. 17.

²⁴ See the long report on the affair in ASF, Fondo Segreteria di Gabinetto, Filze 76-82. For accounts of Saint'Odile's dismissal in the recent secondary literature, see A. WANDRUSKA, *Pietro Leopoldo un grande riformatore*. Florence, 1968, pp. 317-329; *Leopold II. Erherzog von Österreich, Grossherzog von Toskana, König von Ungarn und Böhmen, Römischer Kaiser*, 2 vols. Vienna, 1963-65, vol. 1, pp. 292-297; M. MAUGERI, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2), p. 10.

should be sent off into retirement²⁵. Soon, the hapless ambassador was taken by the Archduke's agents from Rome to Siena, where he was put under house arrest. There Saint'Odile spun his own theory for the various scandalous accusations made against him : a conspiracy by the Prince Bartolomeo Corsini to destroy his close relationship with the Pope²⁶. The full truth behind these charges and Peter Leopold's decision to pension off his ambassador to Rome will probably never be known. At any rate, by March 3, his resignation had been offered and accepted, and he was given a pension and told never to set foot again in Rome or Florence²⁷. One year later, he died in Aix-en-Provence, leaving behind a nephew who tended him in his last days but apparently no wife or offspring²⁸.

We have seen that the report reaching Pope Benedict shortly before Saint'Odile's arrival in Rome about his intelligence and good will was reliable, at least as far as the early years of his mission are concerned. The report about Saint'Odile's learning and culture, while exaggerated, was fairly accurate as well. To his credit, from the early years of his mission Saint'Odile took steps to preserve the famous but dilapidated Villa Medici. In late 1755, he expressed his concern to Richecourt about

²⁵ ASF, Fondo Segreteria di Gabinetto, Filza 80.

²⁶ ASF, Fondo Segreteria di Gabinetto, Filza 80, letter by Cav. Francesco Siminetti to Giovanni Evangelista Humbourg, dated March 4, 1774.

²⁷ ASF, Fondo Segreteria del Gabinetto, Filza 80, letter of Count Piccolomini to Saint'Odile dated March 3, 1774.

²⁸ On the year of Saint'Odile's death see H. WALPOLE, *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), vol. 4, p. 305n7 ; on the story of why Saint'Odile was fired in 1774, see A. ZOBÌ, *Storia civile della Toscana dal MDCCXXXVII al MDCCCXLVIII*, Florence, 1850, vol. 2, pp. 155-157. On the Miller affair see P. LEOPOLDO, *op. cit.* (supra n. 13), vol. 3, pp. 30-31, 175-179, 190-191 ; L. BORTOLOTTI, *La Maremma settentrionale 1738-1970. Storia di un territorio*, Milan, 1976, pp. 23-94 (without reference to Saint'Odile's activities). On Johann Christian Miller see E. DIANA, *In viaggio con il granduca*, Florence, 1994, p. 106n20 ; D. BARSANTI, *Castiglione della Pescaia. Storia di una comunità dal XVI al XIX secolo*, Florence, 1984, pp. 106, 107, 116 ; D. BARSANTI AND L. ROMBAI, *Leonardo Ximenes, uno scienziato nella Toscana lorenese del Settecento*, Florence, 1987, p. 76. That Saint'Odile was not survived by a wife or child can be inferred from the fact that only his nephew was with him when he died and from the silence of R.B. LITCHFIELD, *op. cit.* (supra n. 4).

the sad condition of the Villa's statues and bas reliefs²⁹. From 1756 to 1764, the Baron had the villa restored to its former glory by the architect Antonio Asprucci, even adding an obelisk with fountain to the gardens³⁰. The villa had long been an obligatory destination for the powerful and talented passing through the city or residing there. During Saint'Odile's tenure, we hear particularly about visits there by those in the circle of Cardinal Alessandro Albani, who, as Austrian Chargé d'Affaires and Imperial Minister Plenipotentiary in Rome, was Saint'Odile's close colleague and collaborator on behalf of Habsburg interests³¹.

Through Albani, Saint'Odile met Winckelmann, who became a welcome visitor to the Villa Medici, an admirer of its antiquities, and an acquaintance of the Baron. We can only guess what Saint'Odile felt when he had to organize the transfer of many of the prize antiquities decorating the Villa to Florence from 1770 to 1774. Saint'Odile's keen interest in antiquity extended beyond Rome and the Villa Medici. He enjoyed touring the Roman Campagna, and we happen to hear of one trip he made to the Tivoli area, during which he traveled far and wide, staying at Count Fede's villa, which stood on the grounds on the Villa of Hadrian. He himself wrote that Tivoli was his « customary place to breathe fresh air »³². On another trip, he traveled up the Anio Valley,

²⁹ See ASD, Fondo Legazione del Granducato di Toscana in Roma, Pacco 3 (letter dated December 27, 1755 of Saint'Odile to M. de Richcourt): « il n'est past douteux, que les Statues, et Bas reliefs de la Ville Medici ont beaucoup souffert, mais c'est un objet negligè de longue main, et d'une depense considerable... »

³⁰ G. MORONI, *op. cit.* (supra n. 9), vol. 100, p. 271 ; E. FUMAGALLI, « La villa sous les derniers Médicis et les Lorraine », in *La Villa Médicis*, ed. A. CHASTEL, 3 vols. Rome, 1991, vol. 2, pp. 587-600. In 1758, Saint'Odile also engaged Asprucci to restore the Palazzo di Firenze, the seat of the Tuscan embassy and the residence of many embassy employees ; see the letter dated August 30, 1758 by Saint' Odile to Colloredo in the HHSA, Staatenabteilung, Rom-Korrespondenz, Karton 162 (= old 226, 227). On Antonio Asprucci (1723-1808) see *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*. Rome, 1962, vol. 4, p. 425.

³¹ On Albani's diplomatic role, see L. LEWIS, *op. cit.* (supra n. 7), pp. 11, 12, 14, 123, 137, 179.

³² ASF, Fondo Affari Esteri, Filza 2284, in a dispatch to Count Piccolomini dated July 31, 1773.

eventually reaching Ancona before returning to Rome³³. An unconfirmed source tells us that Saint'Odile even corrected the map of the Campagna published in 1711 by the great French cartographer, Guillaume Del'Isle³⁴. This map was not noticed by Frutaz in his comprehensive collection of the maps of Lazio³⁵, and no trace of it

³³ On Saint'Odile's friendship with the philo-Austrian Albani, see F. DIAZ, *op. cit.* (supra n. 9), pp. 130-131. On Winckelmann's visits to the Villa Medici, see C. JUSTI, *Winckelmann und seine Zeitgenossen*, zweite durchgesehene Auflage, Leipzig, 1898, vol. 3, p. 285; J.J. WINCKELMANN, *Briefe*, ed. W. REHM, Berlin, 1954, Nr. 362 to Musil von Stosch; Rome, May 4, 1760 (pp. 87-89, at p. 88); Nr. 364 to Musil von Stosch, Rome, June 14, 1760 (pp. 89-90); Nr. 376, to Musil von Stosch, Rome, Nov. 1, 1760 (pp. 104-106); Nr. 486, to Mengs (draft), Rome, first half of May, 1762 (pp. 230-231; also in J.J. WINCKELMANN, *Lettere italiane*, ed. G. ZAMPA, Milan, 1961, p. 195); Nr. 605, to Musil von Stosch, Rome, Nov. 23, 1763. On the removal of many antiquities from the Villa Medici to the Uffizi between 1770 and 1774, see R.R. VILLANI and G. CAPECCHI, « Per Francesco Carradori copista e restauratore », in *Paragone*, 41 (1990), p. 134; E. FUMAGALLI, *op. cit.* (supra n. 30), p. 597; M. MAUGERI, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2). For Saint'Odile's visit to the property of the Count Fede at Hadrian's Villa see J.J. WINCKELMANN, *Briefe*, ed. W. REHM, Berlin, 1954, Nr. 486, to Mengs (draft), Rome, first half of May, 1762 (pp. 230-231; also in J.J. WINCKELMANN, *Lettere italiane*, ed. G. ZAMPA, Milan, 1961, p. 195). It is not surprising that Saint'Odile and Count Giuseppe Fede (? - 1777) should have been friends: the Count's ancestor, Antonio Maria Fede (1649-1718; see *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*. Rome, 1995, vol. 45, pp. 553-54) served under the Medici as Tuscan ambassador to Rome from 1693 to 1718. Little has been written about Fede; some interesting remarks may be found in R.R. VILLANI and G. CAPECCHI, *ibid.*, pp. 132, 154, 164n39; on his property at Hadrian's Villa see now W.L. MACDONALD and J.A. PINTO, *Hadrian's Villa and Its Legacy*, New Haven and London, 1996). On Saint'Odile's trip up the Anio Valley to Ancona, see the dispatches to the Council of the Regency sent in October, 1757 by Saint'Odile's secretary, Antonio Valentini, in ASF, Fondo Affari Esteri, Filza 2278.

³⁴ See G. MORONI, *op. cit.* (supra n. 9), vol. 36, p. 195. For Del'Isle's map see G. DEL'ISLE, *Tabula Italiae Antiquae in regiones XI ab Augusto divisae et tum ad mensuras itinerarias tum a observationes astronomicas exactae*, Paris, 1711; Amsterdam, 1745, on which cf. A.P. FRUTAZ, ed., *Le carte del Lazio*, 2 vols. Rome, 1972, vol. 1, pp. 81-82. I have been unable to confirm the existence of Saint'Odile's map.

³⁵ A.P. FRUTAZ, ed., *op. cit.* (supra n. 34).

remains in the cartographical collections I have consulted in Washington, D.C., London, and Rome.

Great as may have been his love for the physical remains of Greece and Rome, we have no evidence that Saint'Odile was, or pretended to be, a scholar, as the following vignette attests. On October 24, 1758 the Council of the Regency forwarded to Saint'Odile a request from Antonio Maria Bandini, the Librarian of the Bibliotheca Laurentiana, that he check to see whether the missing folio of *codex Mediceus* 39.1 containing *Aeneid* VIII.585-642 might be in the Vatican Library³⁶. This was a reasonable guess, since the manuscript was known to have been in Rome before its purchase by the Medici in 1587³⁷. Saint'Odile wrote back promptly on October 28 informing the Council that the Vatican Library was closed for vacation and that he would attend to the matter immediately upon its reopening. But in there is no sign that Saint'Odile ever followed up on his promise.

Horace's Villa is not mentioned in the Saint'Odile documents I have examined, but that he was the first to excavate the site of a Roman villa near Licenza is attested in contemporary printed sources. Why Saint'Odile became interested in Horace's villa is unclear from these informants. A Papal excavation permit, which the Baron ought to have obtained and that would give us information about the date and exact spot where Saint'Odile dug, is not to be found in the surviving documents in the Archivio di Stato, Rome³⁸. He himself never

³⁶ ASF, Fondo : Affari Esteri, Filza 2277. For bibliography on *codex Mediceus* 39.1 see SCHANZ-HOSIUS, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, Abt. VIII. Munich, 1935, vol. 2, p. 95.

³⁷ For the history of the ms., see K. BÜCHNER, *P. Vergilius Maro. Der Dichter der Römer*, Stuttgart, 1966, col. 455.

³⁸ In 1750 a Papal edict was published requiring a permit from the Commissioner of Antiquities « for the extraction of statues of marble or bronze, pictures, and similar antiquities » ; for the text see Biblioteca Comunale e Dell'Accademia Etrusca di Cortona, ms. *Notti Coritane*, tomo VII, pp. 43-44 ; and A. EMILIANI, *Leggi, bandi e provvedimenti per la tutela dei beni artistici e culturali negli antichi stati italiani, 1571-1860*, Bologna, 1978, pp. 96-108 (where are also to be found earlier Papal edicts on this subject dating from 1624 to 1733). Conceivably, Saint'Odile could have claimed not to have needed a permit if he was only digging to

published anything about the site. His personal letters — a packet of which was still to be found in the Segreteria del Real Palazzo di Campo Marzio after Saint'Odile was fired in 1774 — might reveal important clues, but, as noted, they did not pass with his ministerial correspondence to the Archivio Storico Diplomatico in Rome, and I have not been able to determine their present location.

Our best source of information about Saint'Odile's excavations of Horace's villa is Domenico de Sanctis, who in 1761 published the following account near the end of his *Dissertazione sopra la villa di Orazio Flacco* :

....I will conclude by making honored mention of the further lights shed by the most praiseworthy care and diligence of the Baron di Saint'Odile, the Plenipotentiary to the Holy See of his Majesty the Emperor and Grand Duke of Tuscany, a man who in the midst of his duties nourishes a strong love for learning and literature. He, too, completely persuaded that Horace's villa was located in Licenza, did not neglect to investigate the truth of the matter in a more certain way. Since having observed the remains of an ancient structure not far from the site I have indicated, and under a spring from which without doubt the stream of the Digenza takes its name, he imagined that Horace's house once stood here, and he undertook its excavation [*scavamento*]. There he discovered well-built foundations and a cellar, which may be signs of a dwelling that — if not magnificent and luxurious — was at least proper and comfortable. There a pipe is also seen bringing water from the spring to the house both for domestic use and also, perhaps, for the convenience of a domestic bath complex³⁹.

identify the site of Horace's Villa and not to extract any antiquities. The licenses issued in the period 1750-1780 may be found in ASR, Camerale II, Inventario 113/6.

³⁹ D. DE SANCTIS, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2), p. 43 : « ...finirò col fare onorata menzione degli'ulteriori lumi, che à potuto somministrare la lodevolissima cura, e diligenza del Signor Baron di Santodille, Ministro Plenipotenziario della Maestà dell'Imperadore Gran Duca di Toscana appresso la Santa Sede, Uomo che in mezzo alle sue cure nutrice il bon genio dell'erudizione, e delle lettere. Persuasissimo anch'egli che in Licenza situata fosse la villa di Orazio non ha lasciato di investigarne

De Sanctis' short book was first published in 1761, which gives us an *ante quem* for Saint'Odile's excavations in Licenza. We can also establish a *post quem* of 1756, the year in which the Abbé Capmartin de Chaupy arrived in Rome in exile from his native France⁴⁰. De Chaupy enters the story of Saint'Odile's excavations because, as his acquaintance, Joseph Jérôme La Lande, wrote in 1769 :

All the antiquarians placed the house of Horace at Tivoli because he often speaks of Tivoli in his works. But the Abbé Chaupy having thoroughly discussed this matter, and having combed the whole area with the Baron de Saint'Odile, wrote a work in several volumes in which he strongly argued the view that when Horace speaks of Tivoli, he refers to the house of Maecenas or of someone else ; but when he speaks of his own house, he speaks of the Digentia [River], the Mons Lucretilis, or the Sabine valleys, which is therefore where one has to find its location⁴¹.

Thus, by dating the beginning of De Chaupy's work at Horace's Villa, we can also date the project of Saint'Odile. De Chaupy tells us that he started work on Horace's Villa « a few years after the discovery » of the inscription now referred to as *CIL XIV.3482*, which was found in 1757 near Mandela⁴². Elsewhere, he writes that he arrived at his first sketch of the idea that the Licenza villa was Horace's a few months before the publication of De Sanctis' *Dissertazione*, which could not

anche più sicuramente la verità. Poichè avendo osservati i vestigj d'antica Fabrica nel sito appunto da me indicato non molto lungi, ed al di sotto di un Fonte da cui senza fallo prese il suo nome il Ruscello Digenza, immaginossi che quivi un dì fosse il Casino di Orazio, e ne intraprese lo scavamento. A egli di già scoperte le fondamenta & un sotterraneo di molto bene intesa struttura, che indicar possono, se non un magnifico, e ricco edificio, almeno una ben propria, e commoda Abitazione. Vi si osservano ancora gli avanzi di un piccol condotto, che l'Acqua del Fonte al Casino portava non solo per gli usi domestici, ma forse ancora per comodo di qualche domestico Bagno.... »

⁴⁰ On the Abbé Capmartin De Chaupy, see *Biographie Universelle*, Paris, 1854, vol. 8, pp. 45-46.

⁴¹ J.J. LA LANDE, *Voyage d'un François en Italie, fait dans les années 1765 et 1766*, Venice and Paris, 1769, vol. 5, pp. 385-386 (my translation).

⁴² C. DE CHAUPY, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2), vol. 3, p. 249.

have happened before mid-April of 1761⁴³. Putting these two passages together, we may infer that De Chaupy and Saint'Odile were exploring the countryside sometime in late 1760 or early 1761⁴⁴. From an archaeological point of view, such a dating makes sense, since sites in central Italy are most easily studied in the months between the harvest and planting season.

Whatever the exact date of their collaboration in 1760/61, the baron and abbot do not make as odd a couple as they might at first glance appear to do. Both fervent believers in the absolutist state, they were ideological soulmates. De Chaupy had been exiled in 1756 for publishing two books attacking the Parliament of Paris. Later, at the beginning of the French Revolution, he was to publish a harsh attack on Voltaire and republicanism⁴⁵. Saint'Odile had campaigned to be the head of Regency in Florence after the death of Richecourt. In support of his candidacy, he drafted a *Mémoire sur le gouvernement de la Toscane* in late 1756 or early 1757, in which he criticized Richecourt's regime for tolerating too many features of the old Florentine republic⁴⁶. The tract failed to gain the Baron the promotion he sought, which went instead to Marshal Antonio Botta Adorno. Adorno ruled Tuscany from 1757 to 1766 as head of a regime that reduced the influence of Lorrainers such as Saint' Odile⁴⁷.

⁴³ vol. 1, p. xxxix. The earliest De Sanctis' book could have been printed is after he received permission from the Holy Office to publish it on April 18, 1761 (see *op. cit.* [supra n. 2], p. [v]).

⁴⁴ The preface to De Sanctis' third printing of his book in 1784 makes the date of early 1761 more probable, since there (at p. x) we read of De Chaupy that he « accidentalmente con un Personaggio di qualche rango capitò nel 1761 in Vicovaro. » The « Personaggio di qualche rango » was presumably Saint'Odile.

⁴⁵ For details and bibliography, see *Biographie Universelle*, Paris, 1854, vol. 8, pp. 45-46.

⁴⁶ On the date and authorship of the *Mémoire*, see A. CONTINI, *op. cit.* (supra n. 1), p. 247n14.

⁴⁷ See A. CONTINI, *op. cit.* (supra n. 1), pp. 242-248, on the « delorenizzazione » of the Grand Duchy of Tuscany under Botta Adorno; and see A. CONTINI, *op. cit.* (supra n. 5), p. 535 specifically on the political marginalization of Saint'Odile in the 1760s.

It is no surprise that, with Tuscan-Church relations in good order, and with his political ambitions blocked, the Baron should have turned to such recreational, if edifying, activities as studying Horace's country house. He certainly had the resources and staff needed for an excavation: in addition to twelve secretaries working on ministerial business, his truly baronial household employed over twenty servants, lackeys, cooks, footmen, coachmen, musicians for the hunt, tailors, etc.⁴⁸

De Sanctis' account of Saint'Odile's discoveries at Licenza cannot be considered a definitive record, which only the excavator himself could have written. On the other hand, we have no reason to doubt De Sanctis' accuracy, especially since his observations are corroborated by De Chaupy, who adds several more details about an excavation he reports without mentioning Saint'Odile's name as his partner or patron. We will consider this oddity in a moment; for now we simply need to note that La Lande's notice cited above makes it all but certain that the excavations of De Chaupy and of Saint'Odile were one and the same.

De Chaupy presents two consistent descriptions of the finds in the third volume of his book. These are too lengthy to quote, so a summary must suffice. He reports finding two separate structures, both in *opus reticulatum*, which he dates to the first century B.C. and takes as evidence that the villa is Augustan. The first structure, he tells us, occupied the ruined church of St. Peter. Because of its small size, the water pipes found leading to it, and its low position, he conjectures that it was probably a bath complex⁴⁹. The second building was located in a more open position and was much larger, implying to De Chaupy that it was the residence. Also found scattered around the site were *tesserae* of mosaics — some polychrome⁵⁰ — as well as fragments of columns and entablatures⁵¹. Near these structures was a garden, which, from De Chaupy's description, corresponds to the area below what today is called the Nymphaeum of the Orsini several hundred meters to the west

⁴⁸ See ASF, Segreteria del Gabinetto, Filza 80, *Affare di Baron di S. Odile, Visitatore Miller, & Del Sig.^o Vaseige*, Tomo V (1774), « Nota di tutte le persone che sono al servizio del Sig.^e Barone di Saint'Odile ».

⁴⁹ C. DE CHAUPY, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2), vol. 3, pp. 10, 352-353.

⁵⁰ C. DE CHAUPY, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2), vol. 3, pp. 10, 353-354.

⁵¹ C. DE CHAUPY, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2), vol. 3, p. 10.

of the archaeological site we know from Pasqui's excavations in the period 1911-16. In this area the local wine-growers found fragments of lead pipes inscribed T. CLAVDI BURRI and TI. CLAVDI B. These were destroyed later in the eighteenth century when the Archpriest of Licenza, to whom they had been entrusted, used them for birdshot, as the Scottish painter, Allan Ramsay, recounted some years later in an unpublished manuscript on Horace's Villa now in Edinburgh⁵².

It is tempting but frustrating to integrate the contemporary descriptions of Saint'Odile's work with what is known about the site today. The absence of a site plan in De Chaupy and De Sanctis is a major impediment to relating the eighteenth-century reports to features now visible in the archaeological zone ; and the requirement that this article not be illustrated means that a detailed discussion must be reserved for another occasion in any case. Nevertheless, several important points can be made. The first is that digging occurred in the area known then and now as the Vigna di S. Pietro⁵³ around the cascade today known as the Nymphaeum of the Orsini, which is several hundred meters to the west of the twentieth-century archaeological area and has not yet been studied. Not surprisingly, ancient pipes were found here, directing water downhill to the east, where two structures were seen at some distance from each other. At least one of these, the larger of the two, was excavated. All over the surface, ancient fragments were seen, ranging from *cubilia* and *tesserae* to marble architectonic elements such as column drums and pieces of entablature.

⁵² C. DE CHAUPY, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2), vol. 3, p. 356-357. The inscriptions are CIL XIV.3487 and XV.3897b. For the story about the Archpriest, see A. RAMSAY, *An Enquiry into the Situation and Circumstances of Horace's Sabine Villa*, N.p., 1784 (Edinburgh University Library ms. La. III.492), p. 39n* : « We are obliged to the Abbé Chaupy for the knowledge of these inscriptions, which would otherwise have been, before this time, consigned to eternal oblivion. For, after selling the bulk of the leaden pipes, the late Arciprete of Licenza preserved the two bits containing the name of Burrus and would have transmitted them to his successor, had not, unhappily, a want of shot for killing partridges made it necessary to employ them in that service ». C. De Chaupy, at vol. 3, p. 10, confirms Ramsay's statement that the fragments inscribed with Burrus' name were entrusted to the local priest.

⁵³ Cf. D. DE SANCTIS, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2), p. 31 ; C. DE CHAUPY, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2), vol. 3, p. 2.

Identification of the two structures would be desirable, but any efforts to do so must obviously be speculative. It is safer to say where they were *not* located : on the grounds of the modern archaeological zone. We can make this perhaps unexpected assertion because the scope of Saint'Odile's project is ascertainable from what was not found in the 1760s but is known to have been discovered by the late 1770s and afterwards. Near the end of the next decade, visitors were shown remains of several rooms whose mosaic floors are still intact. One — labeled G 1 by Lugli — is illustrated at the upper right-hand corner of the relief map published Jacob Philipp Hackert and in an unpublished manuscript by Scottish painter Allan Ramsay⁵⁴. This, and four other mosaics in rooms labeled by Lugli C 1, C 2, G 2, and G 3 are preserved in the residence section of the modern archaeological site. Three other mosaics in the same general area have been reported by late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century visitors. These floors do not survive today and do not appear in the accounts of Saint'Odile's project. Had Saint'Odile dug in this area, he would undoubtedly have uncovered at least one of these mosaics. The silence of De Sanctis and De Chaupy is telling evidence that he did not.

From these facts we may infer that, having observed pipes near the Nymphaeum of the Orsini taking water downslope to the east, Saint'Odile and De Chaupy looked for related structures nearby. Working their way eastward, they encountered one small building still seen and sketched by Allan Ramsay in the late 1770s but which has since vanished⁵⁵ ; and beyond this, at an indeterminate distance but not as far as the residence area of the twentieth-century site, they found foundations of the second structure. Ramsay's description of the Vigna

⁵⁴ J.P. HACKERT, *Carte generale de la partie de la Sabine où étoit située la Maison de Campagne d'Horace, suite de dix Vues des sites de cette Campagne et de ses Environs, nommés dans les Oeuvres d'Horace, et relatives aux dissertations que Mr. l'Abbé de Santis, Mr. l'Abbé Capmartin de Chaupy et Mr. de Ramsay ont publié à ce sujet*, Rome, 1780 ; A. RAMSAY, *op. cit.* (supra n. 52), p. 53c.

⁵⁵ See A. RAMSAY, *View of the Licenza Valley from the Orsini Palace*, National Gallery of Scotland, RSA 509 ; black chalk on paper, 44.7 x 61.0 cm. This sketch was the basis of a watercolor commissioned by A. Ramsay from Jacob More, which is also in the National Gallery of Scotland (D 1417).

di S. Pietro as it appeared just seventeen years later may shed further light on this building :

....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 only of a mosaic pavement of very elegant foliage, and expensive workmanship beyond what was to be expected from the simplicity profest by Horace...⁵⁶.

If Ramsay's second building corresponds to De Chaupy's, then we can say that it was about 90 meters to the east of the first, and smaller, structure ; and that sometime between 1760/1761 and 1777, the local farmers continued the work and found the mosaic seen by Ramsay with « elegant foliage. » No other observer has reported seeing this mosaic, which may still exist under the modern surface. Ramsay tells us that the two buildings he saw were on an east-west axis. This corroborates our conclusion that Saint'Odile's site differs from the modern archaeological zone, which has a north-south orientation. In this connection the map of the Licenza Valley on the title page of the second edition of De Sanctis' *Dissertazione* is helpful in that it shows the rectangular plan of « ruins » of Horace's Villa running in an east-west direction. For the contemporary student of Horace's Villa, this is welcome for two reasons : first, it suggests that the eighteenth-century excavators did not disturb a large part of the site we know today ; secondly, it implies that further explorations to the north and west of the twentieth-century archaeological zone may well turn up evidence of the two structures seen by De Chaupy and Ramsay.

That Saint'Odile published no account of his excavations is certain ; but it is less clear that he wanted his important discoveries to remain completely unknown. In favor of the hypothesis that Saint'Odile wanted to keep silent about his finds is not only the lack of a publication but also the odd fact that De Chaupy never explicitly mentions his partner, or sponsor, Saint'Odile, in his three-volume work on Horace's villa.

⁵⁶ A. RAMSAY, *op. cit.* (supra n. 52), p. 25.

Instead, Saint'Odile is named only by De Sanctis, a man who was to become De Chaupy's bitter rival in a dispute about who could rightly claim priority in identifying the Licenza site as Horace's Villa. Yet, the excavations at Licenza, if made known to the world, could only have raised the Baron's standing in the eyes of the cultural and political elite of Europe in this Age of the Grand Tour. In this context we may compare Robert Adam's archaeological publication of Diocletian's palace at Split, which was begun in the mid-1750s and was intended to be, in Adam's memorable words, « a great puff, conducive to raising all at once one's name & character »⁵⁷.

If Saint'Odile chose to forego the glory of being known as the discoverer of the site, then this may have been a necessary consequence of his failure to obtain an excavation permit : publishing a report would have been a *de facto* admission of flouting the law⁵⁸. Another reason is that Saint'Odile may have felt that his project was not yet finished and hence not ready for publication. At the end of the first printing of De Sanctis' *Dissertazione* of 1761, we read : « thus continuing the enterprise he [*scil.*, Saint'Odile] has begun — as is most desirable for the Republic of Letters — one can hope that some more singular monument can be found, which will make the identification of Horace's Villa in Licenza even more secure »⁵⁹. At the end of the third, and final, printing of De Sanctis' study in 1784, this expression of hope has been changed into a statement of disappointment that « well-known events have prevented [Saint' Odile] from completing the enterprise he began »⁶⁰. The allusion is undoubtedly to Saint'Odile's abrupt dismissal from office in 1774 and to Archduke Peter Leopold's order that his erstwhile ambassador never set foot in Rome again.

⁵⁷ Cited apud I.G. BROWN, *Monumental Reputation. Robert Adam & the Emperor's Palace*, Edinburgh, 1992, p. 11.

⁵⁸ One may compare Saint'Odile's similar failure in 1769 to obtain a licence to export the Niobe group and Apollino from the Villa Medici to Florence. M. MAUGERI, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2), p. 7 speculates that this failure resulted from the Baron's unsuccessful attempt to export the statues through legal means and his resort to corruption of the relevant Papal authority.

⁵⁹ P. 44.

⁶⁰ P. 62.

This may explain Saint'Odile's silence in his own behalf, but it does not account for De Chaupy's silent treatment of his former partner. We can easily imagine that the abbot's account suppressed the illustrious ambassador's name in order to protect him. This may also explain why De Chaupy never uses the word « excavation » to describe the work at Licenza, implying instead that activities there were limited to a close reading of the surface finds on the site. Yet we must agree with De Sanctis that what was involved was really a *scavamento* — a term he could presumably use because, as an outsider, he was not privy to the fact that Saint-Odile lacked an excavation permit⁶¹. Besides De Sanctis' report that foundations of the residence were dug up, a revealing piece of evidence is De Chaupy's report about pipes leading into the smaller structure as well as the fragments of pipe found inscribed with the name of Burrus. The latter, he tells us, were found by the wine-growers while he was working on the site. What he does not tell us is that these farmers had probably been hired by him as diggers ; and that, in any event, the other pipes found around the smaller « bath » structure (on the particulars of whose discovery De Chaupy does not report) could only have been found by digging below the surface, which today and in Pasqui's time is roughly 1 meter above the ancient level.

But something more than discretion and the laudable attempt to protect a patron may have motivated the quarrelsome De Chaupy : near the beginning of his lengthy work, he refers obliquely to « c'étoit ceux qu'on avoit cru pouvoir recevoir sur le fondement d'un part qu'on avoit eu à la découverte qui avoit consisté à en faire naitre l'idée, & à être le chef du premier voïage fait pout l'entreprendre »⁶². Dionisi was correct to read into these discreet words the abbot's irritation that Saint'Odile had tried to claim credit for the project and the discovery of Horace's Villa⁶³. De Chaupy goes on to argue that merely initiating the undertaking does not suffice to earn one the credit for its success : for that, one has to have made the crucial discoveries that alone confirm the site as Horace's. These, the proud abbot claims, he alone has made —

⁶¹ D. DE SANCTIS, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2), p. 43 ; cf. D. DE SANCTIS, *Dissertazioni sopra I. La Villa d'Orazio Flacco. II. Il Mausoleo de' Plauzj in Tivoli. III. Antino Città Municipio ne' Marsi*, third ed. Ravenna, 1784, p. 61.

⁶² C. DE CHAUPY, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2), vol. 1, p. xli.

⁶³ F. DIONISI, *op. cit.* (supra n. 2), p. 26.

one as recently as the previous winter of 1766, five years after the actual work at the site. At any rate, De Chaupy's failure to name and indeed to thank Saint'Odile in his publication of 1767 strongly suggests that in the six years since their collaboration, something had gone wrong in their relationship. De Chaupy's text also informs us that Saint'Odile was only present during « the first trip » made to start the project, implying thereby that there were other — and more rewarding — trips on which the actual work of studying and digging the site were conducted. In view of the Baron's burdensome duties in Rome, this is not at all surprising. Moreover, we can well doubt that Saint'Odile was a detail man. The operational chores of studying the site in detail he doubtless felt he could, and should, delegate to an underling like De Chaupy.

From these considerations we may conclude that Saint'Odile's otherwise puzzling nonchalance about publicizing his work about the place he believed to be Horace's Villa stemmed from one or more of the following factors : his failure to obtain an excavation permit, forcing him to keep a low profile ; his absence from some or all of the actual work of studying the site ; and his subsequent falling out with his collaborator, De Chaupy, without whose detailed knowledge of the investigations on the site any publication would have been impossible. What motivated the Tuscan ambassador to Rome to excavate Horace's Villa in the first place is still a mystery, though, in view of his reputation as an intriguer, the scandalous end to which he came, and the eighteenth-century view of archaeology as a business the purpose of which was to find salable treasure⁶⁴, we may well suspect that Saint'Odile's motives were more mercenary than scientific. Be that as it may, at least we know from De Chaupy that it was the Baron de Saint'Odile who first had the idea of digging at the Licenza site and of initiating the long project, still very much alive today, of empirically testing the thesis that the Roman villa located there was Horace's *Sabinum*. Given how fruitful that project has turned out to be, we can be grateful to Saint'Odile's

⁶⁴ See the brief but pertinent remarks of I. BIGNAMINI and I. JENKINS, « The Antique », in *Grand Tour. The Lure of Italy in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. A. WILTON and I. BIGNAMINI, London, 1996, pp. 203-205 (with bibliography).

initiative, however dubiously motivated from a late twentieth-century perspective it may have been⁶⁵.

⁶⁵ It is a pleasure to thank the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts at the National Gallery in Washington, D.C. for awarding me the 1997 Paul Mellon Senior Fellowship in order to pursue research on Horace's Villa. I also wish to thank the following for their help: Dr. Iain Gordon Brown, Dott.sa Alessandra Contini, Prof. Gino Corti, Prof. Elena Fumagalli, Christine Graffinger, Prof. John Dixon Hunt, Dr. Eva-Katharina Ledel, Dr. Claudia Kryza-Gersh, Prof. William MacDonald, Dott.sa Maria Maugeri, and Prof. John Pinto. It is a special honor to be able to present this article to Father Leonard Boyle, whose exemplary service as Vatican Librarian facilitated my research on this and many other projects in countless ways. I dedicate this *opusculum* to my friend, the Princess Minnie de Beauvau-Craon, who first interested me in the history of Florence under the Lorrainers.