II LANDSCAPE AND AESTHETICS

Ac principio terra uniuersa cernatur…uestita floribus herbis arboribus frugibus, quorum omnium incredibilis multitudo insatiabili uarietate distinguitur. Adde huc fontium gelidas perennitates, liquores perlucidos amnium, riparum uestitus uiridissimos, speluncarum concauas altitudines, saxorum asperitates, inpendentium montium altitudines inmensitatesque camporum… Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.98

In the first place, the whole world is subject to our gaze…clothed with flowers, grass, trees, grain, all of which are incredibly numerous and relentlessly varied and diverse. Add to these unceasing cool springs, the pellucid streams of rivers – their banks clothed in vivid greenery – the deep vaults of caves, the cragginess of rocks, the peaks of sheer mountains and the immeasurability of plains…

Defining a space as landscape suggests that it is visually distinctive and interesting, that it attracts the eye, and engages the senses and faculties. Agriculture (or productivity) can be one important feature of what makes space into land and divides it up into -scapes and territories, but it is not always the main issue.[1] Typically, classical texts featuring something akin to our 'landscape' showcase the natural environment supporting, threatening, or ornamenting human existence.[2] So at the beginning of the Graeco-Roman tradition we see that the landscapes of Homeric epic, or pastoral verse (for example, the Hellenistic poets Bion and Theocritus), gain order and meaning from the inclusion of human figures, but they also contribute atmosphere and a distinctive sense of place that enriches the stories that play out against them.[3] Chapter I introduced one particularly delightful and hugely popular topographic trope: an idyllic space where sensory and aesthetic

[1] Venturi 1989; M. Carroll 1992.

[2] An excellent example is Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.87: the structure of the world could not have been bettered in respect either to utility or beauty (another good example is Ov. *Fast.* 4.125–9). Compare how Thoreau – a philosophically inclined naturalist and author – characterizes the American wilderness as 'necessary…for a resource and a background, the raw material of all our civilization'. Thoreau is useful as an example of someone describing landscape in terms that Cicero might recognize (e.g. 2004: 39–40). For an introduction to Thoreau's pastoral, see Yu 1996; on reading Thoreau against contemporary critical theory, see Bennett 2002. On 'Greek' poetic landscapes, A. Parry 1957 gets things started.

[3] Gill 1995: 67–89 sums up on nature's ethics and norms. See also Giesecke 2007: 35–41; Osborne 1992. For background, see Hes. *Op*. 'Natural environment' is rarely a neat translation for *natura* (Pellicer 1966). To compare the pragmatics, see Alcock, Cherry, and Davis 1994.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000392 Published online by Cambridge University Press

qualities encourage harmony between humans and nature. The *locus classicus* or touchstone for this *locus amoenus* is Plato's dialogue *Phaedrus.* Famously, this dialogue riffs on a very specific landscape scene, one which was to have an intense and far-reaching effect on subsequent landscape discourse, and which provides an ideal point of departure.[4]

A day out with Socrates

Strolling with a philosophically inclined friend, Phaedrus, along the lovely banks of the river Ilissos outside Athens, Socrates is moved by the beauty spot to extol its spreading plane tree, the shade and fragrance provided by the blossoms, the delightful chill of the stream, the cooling breeze, the summery chirruping of the cicadas, and the gently sloping bank. These are the 'natural' features. This is not, however, by any stretch of the imagination, an untouched and unrefined 'wilderness'.

For a start, the sensory and intellectual (or **somatic**) impressions described by Socrates are dependent upon human experience and agency (the water is cold, we learn, because Socrates dips his foot in it); **epistemology** (the particular placement of statues and offerings allows Socrates to infer that the place is sacred to nymphs and Achelöos); **taxonomy** (this is a summer scene – sounds are being made by cicadas, a cooling breeze is welcome); and desire for physical gratification (the sloping grassy bank presents a perfect headrest). Secondly, **anthropomorphic** gods and goddesses (Hera, Dionysus, riverine deities) are key presences in the scene. By recalling and alluding to them, Socrates pulls extremes of free and controlled sexuality into the picture, and implicitly hints at a tension between civic and rustic order (Hera; Dionysus) and wild nature (Dionysus; the nymphs).[5] Socrates benefits intellectually from the controlled distance from Athens offered by this charming spot (like Rome's portico gardens, it offers a getaway where one can stroll, converse, and think), but the site itself also gains significance precisely as a day trip recalled in a literary dialogue.[6] Philosophically cultured and textualized memory transforms Socrates'

[4] Pl. *Phdr.* 230b2–c5 (set in the late fifth century BCE, but probably composed in the first half of the fourth century). Rosenmeyer 1969: 179–203 is still the best introductory discussion; Ferrari 1987 discusses the whole dialogue in depth; Hass 1998 summarizes what *locus amoenus* denotes and evokes. M. Edwards 1987: 267 draws out Christian use of the topos.

[5] Dorter 1971 provides a clear reading of the imagery involved.

[6] Hindin 2008 shows how memory is key to the perception of beauty in this dialogue.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000392 Published online by Cambridge University Press

delightful day out from an instance of serendipity into a privileged site visit. In the process, it prefigures the role of cultivated nature in the great Athenian philosophical schools such as the Academy and Lyceum.[7]

We also see echoes of this in Epicurean philosophy. The site of the Hellenistic philosopher Epicurus' Athenian philosophy garden remains uncertain. Writing in the mid-first century CE, Pliny the Elder makes Epicurus' Garden – in effect, a landscaped, outdoor setting for philosophical study – the inspiration for the luxury estates beloved of Rome's wealthy families.[8] In the wake of Epicurus, the close association of philosophy with withdrawal to a quasi-natural, out-of-town site of intellectual cultivation, combined with the productive agricultural associations of growing-your-own, gained momentum. We have few contemporary descriptions of how Greek philosophers used landscape and garden settings, but the association is strongly reflected in the settings for 'doing' Greek philosophy as described in (much) later authors – Lucretius, Cicero, Plutarch, Diogenes Laertius, among others. Romans enthusiastically redrafted and gave new context to Greek philosophy by locating it in the colonnaded gardens of suburban and rustic villas (see the frescoed garden in Figure 9), blending the traditional agricultural focus of the villa with Greek civic architectural form (the stoa). Cicero's work suggests that how humankind related to nature was also a hot topic conceptually in the late Republic. His *De natura deorum* (probably set in the late 70s BCE) has Balbus, a Stoic, say that human intervention transforms nature's landscape into an *altera natura* (an 'other' or alternative nature), recalling Augé's 'second nature' quoted in Chapter I.[9] In his dialogue *Academica* (set in the late 60s BCE), Cicero himself comments that 'there is a kind of natural fodder for the spirit and intellect in the study and contemplation of nature'.[10] Missing from this reading, however, is the 'wilderness' aesthetic.[11]

[7] Osborne 1987: 168–9 discusses the schools' natural settings and provides an excellent contextualizing overview of classical Greek rural landscapes. Giesecke 2007: 88–91 connects 'garden' philosophy to Athens and its aftermath at Rome. See also Alcock 2007.

[8] Plin. *HN* 19.50–1, discussed briefly by von Stackelberg 2009: 10–11. On Epicurus' Garden, see now D. Clay 2009. Cic. *Fin.* makes it a landmark. On Epicureanism, see Sharples 2006: 226–32. Cima and La Rocca 1998 is a go-to collection on what 'garden' means at Rome.

[9] Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.152.

[10] Cic. *Acad.* 2.127.

[11] Cf. Garrison 1992, a contrasting reading of 'bad' nature in Augustan literature – published just when global warming, natural disasters, and international eco-politics were gaining headline status; Stibbe 2009 develops this angle.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000392 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wild at heart

Untamed 'nature' was often associated with the god Dionysus (Bacchus). It is particularly significant for our investigation of landscape that a key quality in Dionysiac worship was going out of the *polis* and into the unknown, 'up the mountain'.[12] These trips are emblematic of the alien, ecstatic, or frenzied qualities that gave Dionysus added bite as a god: his cult drew together forces of **entropy** and order and encouraged cult worshippers to act in a manner appealing to the increasingly urbanized fourth century BCE and onwards – though there is no clear evidence that cult followers made actual rather than symbolic excursions to wild mountains and caves.[13] Just the idea of going to the wild lands induced enough of a *frisson* of mystery and danger. Some of the most potent **memes** circulating in the Hellenistic world drew together Dionysus and the king who tried to outdo him, Alexander the Great, to show how, even in the here and now, exceptional, semi-divine mortals could still hope to experience the world of myth.[14] After Alexander's death, these memes spread and developed in the super-states carved up by his successors, and enthusiasm for exuberant Dionysiac imagery made his cult a pan-Mediterranean winner.[15]

The cult's popularity inevitably filtered into Roman experience, in particular in the years after the First Punic War.[16] It made for a potent mix: a god-king-commander encouraging his own worship and imprinting his ethos onto strange new worlds, exotic civilizations, and wild territories. This imagery increasingly fitted Rome's status as the new imperial power and, by the first century BCE, Dionysiac motifs had become high fashion in the decor of luxury villas.[17] Cultural **syncretism**

[12] Eur. *Bacch.* 977–86, 1043–52.

[13] See Bérard and Bron 1986. See also Paus. 3.24.3–4 (Dionysian landscape), 5.19.6 (Dionysus on the chest of Kypselos; cf. Paus. 10.23.1–7 on the god Pan). Alcock 1993: 200–10 discusses rural cults and the sacred landscape. On performance and the Hellenistic Dionysiac cult, see e.g. Kuttner 1999b: 102–5.

[14] Burkert 1985: 291 argues that a lack of fixed cult centres made Dionysus particularly interesting when worldviews were expanding and societies fragmenting and reconfiguring. For Alexander's epic Dionysiac quest, see e.g. Arr. *Anab.* 5.1; also Gallini 1970: 97–155.

[15] Jaccottet 2003 analyses wide-ranging inscriptional evidence; Burkert 1985: 290–6 considers Dionysiac cult as a pre-Hellenistic mystery religion. On Dionysus in the Hellenistic world, see concisely Mikalson 2006: 209, 211–12, 214–15, 221; on ancient Greek religion more generally, see Bremmer 2004 (excellent introduction) and Mikalson 2005.

[16] See e.g. Bruhl 1953; Gallini 1970: 11–52; Foucher 1981.

[17] Wyler 2008 sums up (in French) on Dionysus in Roman villas, but is less attentive to the spatial dynamics of villa use (on which see e.g. J. T. Smith 1997). In English, Beard, North,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000392 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and growing interest in explaining Rome's rise to power probably enhanced the lure of Dionysus towards wide-ranging significance. His diverse sexual and political associations bundled paradoxical notions of personal **autarky** (putting individuals in control of their own destiny and salvation), ecstatic freedom, and uncompromising autocracy. Despite Rome's suppression of cult practices by senate decree in 186 BCE,[18] Bacchic nature continued to feature in Roman cultural production. It offered something of the mystery and danger associated with the natural environment in Homer, and hinted at aspects of the sublime (as later described by Pseudo-Longinus).[19] It also keyed into Epicurean philosophy's paring away of the fears and tensions associated with civilization in order to plug all entities directly into the elemental cosmos. Finally, it offered scope for Stoic philosophers to speculate on the beneficence of nature in particular contexts, its relationship with divine reason, and how best to live in harmony with the universe.[20]

The complex flourishing of Bacchic nature in Roman culture is complemented by the success of one influential strand in Hellenistic 'nature' discourse: pastoral verse. Theocritus' *Idyll* 7 is the most perfectly realized Greek example, reinventing a landscape immediately recognisable from *Phaedrus*, and showcasing just how amenable the franchise was. Pastoral verse came to Rome complete with tightly controlled numinous qualities and delightful rustic landscapes replete with amenity value, but still offering thrilling hints of wilderness just offstage.[21] This aspect is exemplified in the frightening, off-kilter

and Price 1998: 161–6 take Pompeii's Villa of the Mysteries as a case study; Wyler 2006: 224–8 examines Dionysus at Rome's Villa 'Farnesina'.

[18] *S. C. de Bacchanalibus*; writing in the late first century BCE, Livy (39.8–19) makes this a sensible response to a contagious, Greek underground cult. The reasons for the Senate's action probably related to political instability at Rome. Takács 2000 summarizes lucidly. See also Gruen 1990; Pailler 1988; Beard, North, and Price 1998: 92–6. Pagán 2005: 50–67 explores the literary angle (cf. Bacchus' walk-on at Lucr. 5.743; Liber/Bacchus in Ov. *Fast.* 3).

[19] Porter 2007 is the ideal introduction. [Longinus] *Subl.* 9.8 refers to Homer directly (the purity and majesty with which Homer's description of the sea endows Poseidon). Innes 2002 discusses [Longinus] *Subl.* 15.6: Bacchic frenzy on a Euripidean mountain is preferable to an Aeschylean palace. Compare the more familiar model: Verg. *Aen* 8.349–50; Schrijvers 2006 shows how this plays out in Silius Italicus (late first century CE).

[20] See Segal 1963. On Plato, Aristotle, and Epicurus in these terms, see e.g. Gill 1995 (on the norms of nature). For Stoicism, the whole cosmos was a living and coherent entity. M. J. White 2003: 124 summarizes Stoicism's rejection of value-neutrality when investigating nature. Rosenmeyer 1969: 181–203 examines the unity of nature (humans, cosmos) in pastoral.

[21] See also e.g. Bion's poetry; evocative scenes in Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* On Horace's melding of Bacchic and pastoral nature, see Leach 1993; Spencer 2006. Cf. Lucretius' primal landscape (Lucr. 5.925–1010). Petsalis-Diomidis 2007 explores the relationship between landscape and (divine) epiphany.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000392 Published online by Cambridge University Press

locus amoenus imagined in Apollonius' third-century-BCE epic poem *Argonautica* (2.727–51), where the scenography embodies nature's implacability and destructive potential. Apollonius achieves this effect through subversion of the same pastoral tropes we first met in Plato – shade, the spreading plane, woodland, rocks, slopes, and a river. Just like the Theocritean landscapes, this conjures up intense sensory responses: emotive triggers draw the audience into the frame. Here, however, the familiar sites induce a frisson of tension between macrocosmic order (the sun always rises; waves break against the shore; summer follows spring) and the microcosmic vagaries of individual human interventions and attempts to control nature.[22]

Evidence for the attractiveness of pastoral's combination of wild and tamed nature crops up not just in literature but also, as recent studies have emphasized, in visual culture, in particular as subject material for domestic landscape frescoes.[23] In fact as reinvented at Rome, the signs of pastoral become memes in a multimedia discourse that shapes, reflects, and interrogates culture. This sits well with a comparison of memes to genes: (landscape) memes generate (Roman) culture by replicating and evolving just as genes create organisms.[24] Pastoral's internal logic, as influentially recast for Rome by Virgil, turns away from both physical and intellectual labour and conjures up a nostalgic, melancholy Golden Age scene of freedom, pleasure, and ease.[25]

Perhaps a decade or so after Virgil's *Eclogues*, Horace *Odes* 2.19 presents an excellent example. The poet gazes beyond the confines of fields, groves, and woodland, fixing his eyes instead on remote crags. Here Bacchus is in control, hinting at a challenging, entropic, and dangerously wild landscape of the imagination. Horace's attempts to

[22] E.g. the cave is Hades', the river turns out to be the Acheron. The landscape is personalized and ethicized by the introduction of animating descriptors, and by the ways in which nature threatens and saves groups of passers-through. M. F. Williams 1991 looks generally at landscape in Apollonius. Cf. Livy's description of the landscape of the Caudine Forks (9.2.6–9, 9.3.1–3), useful when we look at Columella in Chapter V.3.

[23] Recognizably 'landscape' scenes become iconographically significant in the early first century BCE (the so-called 'Second Style' frescoes). Ling 1977 is a usefully concise, if dry, starting point (Peters 1963 is also still important); Mazzoleni and Pappalardo 2004 offer lavish illustrations; Chapter VI investigates further (see Figures 13–16). On the interplay between literary and visual pastoral, see e.g. Leach 1974: 70–112; 1988: 27–72, 197–306; 2004: 123–52; and (looking at Greece and Rome) La Rocca 2008. See also Conan 1986; Mitchell: 1986: 47–50; Bergmann 1991, 1992, 1995a. More generally, see Daniels and Cosgrove 1988.

[24] Adapting Taylor 2002: 229.

[25] Scully 1988 assesses the tension between cities and Golden Age discourse. A. T. Smith 2003: 105, 109–11 offers useful methodological caveats against swallowing whole the textual, elite, oligarchic presentation of this nexus. Papaioannou 2003 discusses Virgil's Evander (*Aeneid*) and the Golden Age. Contrast Evander in Ov. *Fast.* (Fantham 1992).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000392 Published online by Cambridge University Press

conjure up Bacchic nature are heavily indebted to the kind of consensual and shared 'memory' of what the untamed and dehumanized nature that we have been exploring ought to look like.[26] It becomes landscape rather than a non-place by dint of shared understanding of topoi that can signify 'wilderness' – Bacchus and rocky crags. This is 'wilderness' as one might see it painted on a Roman villa wall, and description in Latin codifies it as Roman space.[27] Slipping between Bacchus and Liber as names for the god enhances the sense of cultural duality (Greek/Roman), and the landscape's malleability is emphasized when we hear how Bacchus/Liber (in the spirit of Roman engineering) can reroute rivers and tame the sea. This is also a landscape of plenty (springs flow with wine, and streams with milk; honey pours from cavities in the trees) but it is a plenty that serves the god's purpose, not humankind's.[28] In this, if anything, its unknowability or at least strangeness is most obviously located. Here, the *locus amoenus* trope disconnects Horace's villa and country landscapes from their tenuous connection with the reality of life on the farm. The intellectual and aesthetic complexity of these landscapes obeys no rational pattern of spatial organization to suit a productive and profitable villa.[29] In this, as in other Latin literary pastoral texts, artfully wild but intrinsically productive and fertile nature frames and nourishes the figures that populate it, enabling them to compose music and song while participating in a world that straddles myth, history, and reality.[30]

Meaning, morality, and beauty

The *locus amoenus* is at least notionally a scene within which poets and philosophers find that verse and thought come naturally and with divine support. Pastoral verse imagines a rustic landscape populated by poet-shepherds whose favoured mode of expression is song; and Roman bucolic poets such as Virgil and (a century or so later)

[26] Alcock 1993: 24–32, 53–4, 80–92, 201–2 traces perceptions of rural Greece under Rome. Pentheus is name-checked at Hor. *Carm*. 2.19.15.

[27] Hor. *Carm*. 2.19.1, 7, 17–18. Cf. the late first-century-BCE landscape with Perseus and Andromeda from the Villa at Boscotrecase, Campania (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, cat. 20.192.16).

[28] Hor. *Carm*. 2.19.10–12, 18.

[29] Frischer, Crawford, and de Simone 2006 present an excellent overview of what the reality of an estate such as Horace's might have been like.

[30] Segal 1981: 226 comments on the mystic qualities of this poem.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000392 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Calpurnius Siculus continue this trend. The pleasurable qualities of pastoral's *locus amoenus* are often associated with the trials of love, sex, and literary composition, which in turn draw in Venus, fertility, and the process of authorship – a *locus* (place) gains *amoenitas* (delightfulness) by being rendered in words, conceptualized, or depicted, and through engendering or inspiring composition.[31] Latin literary pastoral explicitly and often self-consciously negotiates the boundaries and shared spaces of rural and urban ways of life and attitudes to the world.

Virgil's *Eclogues* present landscapes 'charged with human feeling', and these ten short poems' contribution to understanding how humans respond to and inhabit a fragile environment under threat from political and social change has generated voluminous scholarship.[32] Like the *Eclogues*, rustic landscapes in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* mark another key phase in the development of pastoral, showcasing the complex symbolism of a countryside that is both archetypal and constantly in a state of flux, always subject to the demands of narrative and context.[33] Latin literary pastoral also gains a visual vocabulary in dialogue with the kinds of pattern-book rusticity on display in fashionable wall-painting from the first centuries BCE and CE. Pastoral in itself, however, is not our main focus here. Instead, in this and the next section I suggest three less obvious authors who sample elements of pastoral in ways that show its wider impact, specifically, how landscape marries aesthetics and morality more generally in Roman discourse: Catullus (mid-first century BCE), Horace (late first century BCE), and Statius (late first century CE).

...landscape acquires significant organization as a result of certain extrinsic and intrinsic factors… The frame literally defines the landscape, both in the sense of determining its outer limits and in the sense that landscape is constituted by its frame…the landscape

[31] On authorship in pastoral, see Breed 2006. Definitions of pastoral were key to twentieth-century scholarship (e.g. Empson 1935; Rosenmeyer 1969; R. Williams 1973; Poggiolo 1975; Halperin 1983; Loughrey 1984; A. Patterson 1987; Gutzwiller 1991; Alpers 1996; Hubbard 1998; Gifford 1999; Marx 2000 [1964]; see now Fantuzzi and Paphangelis 2006). On reception, see e.g. A. Patterson 1987; Skoie and Velázquez 2006; Paschalis 2007.

[32] Alpers 1979: 231. Hardie 1998: 5–27 introduces concisely; Martindale 1997b sets the *Eclogues*' politics of pastoral into the European tradition. Segal 1981 influentially draws Virgil and Theocritus together. On contextualizing landscape in the *Eclogues*, see Leach 1974; Geymonat 2000. Putnam sums up the tensions: Virgil will make pastoral's woods 'worthy of a consul, performing the impossible through song' (1970: 137).

[33] Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, too, have a lengthy bibliography. For Ovid's landscapes see Grimal 1938 (examining links with landscape art); H. Parry 1964; Segal 1969; Hinds 2002 (setting Ovid within a tradition of landscape reception); and Newlands 2004 (connecting Ovid's landscapes with those of Statius). Useful and accessible on Calpurnius Siculus are Leach 1973, 1975; P. J. Davis 1987; Newlands 1987; Mackie 1989; Hubbard 1996; R. G. Mayer 2006: 453–63.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000392 Published online by Cambridge University Press

may also be internally focused and organized by its relation to what is non-landscape – a human figure in heroic action, for instance… Remove the frame…and the landscape spills into a shapeless gathering of natural features. It has nothing to contain or shape its constituents, nothing to environ, nothing for which to be a setting, nothing to supplement.[34]

Catullus 61 locates us in the ultimate 'framed' poetic landscape – Greece's Mount Helicon, sacred to the Muses and complete with springs and grottoes. This mythic landscape is not just an idyll (literally, a 'little picture'); it also stimulates its audience to think about the more contained scenography of the garden (invoked by the presence of Venus, the protector of *horti*).[35] Recent study of what gardens mean and represent in Rome helps decode Catullus' poem.[36] At its heart is a bride-to-be, like a blooming hyacinth in a rich man's charming garden.[37] Marriage is entwined here with visual pleasure, sexuality, and fertility, zoning the garden as a place where the family is collectively sustained and nurtured. The poem is saturated with fruitful, Golden Age symbolism and vivid colour. Gardens, like families and marriages, are also strictly contained sites. As literary constructs and physical spaces they associate the cultivation of food with the pursuit of wisdom, and Catullus' heavily symbolic set-up signals that his carefully framed scene is designed to make us think about the constituent elements in society, and how best to foster a positive relationship between individual and collective, human and nature.

Roman interest in the biographical qualities of the relationship between nature and cultivator (we grow like our gardens and vice versa) suggests that Catullus' link between gardens, marriage, and childbearing is particularly meaningful for understanding how families thrive and endure.[38] This poem's optimistic vision is,

[34] Andrews 1999: 5.

[35] Varro marks Venus as a natural fertility goddess (e.g. *Rust.* 1.1.6; cf. *Ling.* 6.20); the other, and obvious, late Republican comparator is Lucretius' Epicurean poem on what makes the world go round, i.e. categorizing 'Venus' appropriately (see Gale 1994: 67, 71, 153, 211–31). Lucr. 5.907–15 sends up a ludicrously exaggerated Golden Age, and then (5.945–52) reinvests it with 'rational' pastoral sensibility (cf. the Platonic Lucr. 2.29–33). On Lucretian landscapes, see e.g. Gillis 1967; De Lacy 1964; and concisely, Giesecke 2007: 128–34. Virgil's didactic landscapes (Verg. *G.*) are very much in tune with this.

[36] Chapter VI returns to gardens. In brief: Beard 1998 has proved influential on how and why gardens matter; Zanker 1988: 285–91 concisely sums up on cultural production; Pagán 2006 strolls through some famous textual gardens; von Stackelberg 2009 prioritizes spatial analysis. Jashemski 1979 is encyclopaedic on the gardens of Pompeii and nearby towns; Grimal 1984 catalogues Roman garden texts and sites; Andreae 1996 is less detailed, but well illustrated.

[37] Catull. 61.87–9.

[38] Pagán 2006: 13–14 provides a taste of the debate.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000392 Published online by Cambridge University Press

however, immediately reworked at 62.38–44.[39] Here, the natural and unmediated beneficence of the breezes, the sun, and showers is no adequate substitute for the lord of the manor's lack of attention to his plot. This is a garden in which the natural order of things is out of sync with human behaviour. As in poem 61, a flower stands apart, but here it has no proper context for display, thus cancelling its aesthetic value. It is an object of desire, but in this '*hortus saeptus*' (*enclosed* garden) there is little hint of sustaining productivity, or civic or social duty.[40] Pushing the imagery hard, we might see Catullus alluding pointedly to a differently framed 'enclosure'. We do not know when construction commenced on Caesar's Saepta Julia in Rome (see Figure 3), eventually completed by Augustus' aide Agrippa in 26 BCE, but Cicero's allusion in 54 BCE puts it in Catullus' mix.[41] More straightforwardly available as an associative allusion is the Republican Saepta (or Ouile, 'sheepfold') that it replaced. This was where the *comitia centuriata* met, and 'chutes' funnelled citizens (like sheep) into the appropriate spaces for casting their votes.[42] No such communal 'productivity' characterizes Catullus' enclosure, and beauty alone is not enough to make such landscapes viable.

In *Epistle* 1.14, Horace presents himself as an enforced exile – trapped in the city by his friend Lamia's grief after a bereavement and longing for a return to the autarky that the countryside seems to offer.[43] This is in contrast to his addressee, his estate manager (*uilicus*), who suffers this exile in reverse (sequestered at Horace's country property). Horace describes this rejuvenating estate as woodland (*siluae*) and a smallholding (*agellus*), and comments that only hateful business affairs (*negotium*) can drag him from there to Rome.[44] In his mind's eye, this delightful and ethically idyllic space is characterized specifically as the opposite of wilderness:

> *…Nam quae deserta et inhospita tesqua*
> *credis, amoena uocat mecum qui sentit, et odit*
> *quae tu pulchra putas.* Hor. *Epist.* 1.14.19–21.

[39] Cf. a similar image at 11.21–4.
[40] On gardens and fences, see Pagán 2006: 10–12; von Stackelberg 2009: 21–4, 66–72.
[41] Cic. *Att.* 4.16.8.
[42] The *comitia centuriata* (Centuriate Assembly) was a political assembly, for the purposes of which the citizen body was divided into six property classes that generated 193 block 'votes' (the 'centuries'). Its first-past-the-post system favoured wealthier citizens' interests.
[43] Hor. *Epist.* 1 was probably published *c.*20/19 BCE.
[44] Ibid., 1.14.17.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000392 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> …For that which is a desert and inhospitable wilderness
> in your eyes, becomes a delightful spot when he who thinks like me
> describes it, and hates
> the very thing you think beautiful.

The rural landscape is, here, one without urban amenities – no cantinas or taverns, no sex for sale, no entertainers (set out in the complaints of the estate manager, *Epist.* 1.14.21–6). Horace quickly moves to overwrite these 'criticisms' by sketching in the idyllic rustic archetypes that might by contrast characterize the country life of his implied (that is, elite, intellectual) audience: a modest meal, a refreshing doze on the grassy riverbank, and perhaps the prospect of some light work shifting turfs and stones later (cf. Figures 13 and 15). This imagined task draws Amphion into the poem and, by allusion, Horace also evokes Orpheus, the quintessential musical celebrity fatality.[45] In myth, Zeus's son Amphion used his lyrical talent to help build the walls of Thebes, moving rocks through music alone. Horace's poem conjures up the scene, but his versified earth- and rock-moving has neither the grandeur of epic nor any impressive outcome. Making Amphion and Orpheus points of reference for a gentleman-farmer's rustic idyll emphasizes how much of a literary cliché the topos of country retreat as private kingdom had become by the late first century BCE. It also hints at the impossibility of turning back the clock to recover a notional lost world of authentic *labor* and frugality. Civilization is the defining context for this kind of landscape. Here in Horace, the country landscape is most productive when helping him to write (we see this motif later with Pliny in Chapter V), and he writes because – as he tells it – his career at Rome (rewarded by the grant of a country estate, from his patron Maecenas) depends on his literary skills. The lines quoted above emphasize the subjective and imaginary nature of these literary landscapes.

Layers of meaning

Jumping forward to the 90s CE, Statius' *Woodland* (*Siluae*) collection of poems shows the symbolic potential of case studies of individual

[45] Ibid., 1.14.35, 39. A significant intratextual link is to Hor. *Ars P.* 395 (cf. *Carm.* 3.11.2, and see also Ov. *Ars am.* 3.321–5 and Prop. 3.2.5–6). Stat. *Silv.* 2.2.62 offers a similar combination of '*saxa*' and '*moueo*' (Statius' referent is Pollio *qua* Amphion). Linking Amphion and Orpheus, see e.g. Cic. *Arch.* 19; Paus. 6.20.18. Frazer 1992 teases out 'pastoral' as a villa quality.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000392 Published online by Cambridge University Press

plants in a visually rich landscape. *Siluae* 2.3 imagines an aetiology for a plane tree on the Roman estate of one of Statius' wealthy dedicatees, Atedius Melior.[46] The poem ranges through the prehistory of urban Rome's landscape, exploring the local sites before they were enclosed by Melior's boundaries.[47] This landscape showcases an alternative version of the intense relationship between person and place that we saw in Catullus' marriage poem (61), and hints at similarly embedded ethical qualities. Melior and his landscape are inextricably linked, as set out in the opening lines' juxtaposition of terms and elision of syntax, and intertwining of man and tree:

> *Stat quae perspicuas nitidi Melioris opacet*
> *arbor aquas complexa lacus*; Stat. *Silv.* 2.3.1–2
>
> *There stands* one which to the *pellucid* waters of *gleaming* Melior *gives shade*:
> *a tree embracing* a pool;

The first words of these two lines strike the eye. The tree marks a fixed point: it stands, controlling the landscape vignette (emphasized when the eye spots the embracing '*complexa*'). Where the first word plants the tree, the last word of that line gives us the 'pastoral' clue: this is a tree designed to give shade; unsurprisingly it turns out to be one of pastoral's favourites, a (water-loving) plane, implicitly flagged up by the last word of the sense unit ('*lacus*'). *Perspicua* and *nitidus*, juxtaposed, mark a contrast to the shade that syntactically closes the embrace on Melior: the two terms imply something very similar, connecting gleaming Melior with the luminous clarity of the pool, which turns out eventually to be both refuge and prison for a nymph fleeing the god Pan. This is a refined landscape of hills, streams, and groves – a god-haunted, mythic landscape, familiar from pastoral (as Pan's presence emphasizes). But it is not just a titillating and artful pastoral scene. The explicit setting amid Rome's seven hills makes a difference (see Figures 3 and 5). For Hardie,

> the poem operates with a twofold set of metaphorical equivalences…constituting the aetiological deposit, as it were, of the mythic narrative…the closing description of… Melior reflects aspects of the ensemble of tree and pool, and of the narrative thereby

[46] On Melior, see Nauta 2002: 226–7. See also Myers 2000, 2005.

[47] Hardie 2006 is a key recent discussion. Echoes of late-first-century BCE literary landscapes abound in Statius; Vessey 1981: 46 comments on similarities with Ov. *Met.* 5. 572–642; see also Newlands 2004. Keep an eye out for echoes of Tib. 2.5.23–56, Prop. 4 (*aetia*, 'origin stories'), and Verg. *Aen* 8 – see Chapter IV. Rea 2007 sets up the big issues for the Palatine.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000392 Published online by Cambridge University Press

memorialised, with the further result that the two framing descriptions, of physical landscape feature and abstract qualities of the soul, also reflect each other.[48]

The shifting points of view in this poem encourage us to read **intratextually**. We are offered an array of different perspectives on the plane tree and its site, each one actualizing a different experience of the landscape.[49] We first see the tree primarily as a function of Melior himself: tree and man share a characteristic sparkling liquidity which is set off by their shady setting. The tree's shape and alignment then render a naturalistic scenography, voiced by the narrator:

> *…quae robore ab imo*
> *<in>curuata uadis redit inde cacumine recto*
> *ardua, ceu mediis iterum nascatur ab undis*
> *atque habitet uitreum tacitis radicibus amnem.* Stat. *Silv.* 2.3.2–5.
>
> …from the base of its trunk
> it is bent into the waters, then it turns back, with crown erect
> towards the heights, just as if from the midst of the waves it was born afresh
> and living with hidden roots in the *glassy* stream.

Vitreus echoes *perspicua* (line 1), but otherwise this could stand as a straightforward nature description. Reading on, Pan becomes the aggressive agent of change. Now we see the fleeing nymph Pholoë running from her pursuer, through woods and streams, catching glimpses now of his shaggy legs, then of his horns. As the focalizing subject, her headlong flight takes her into explicitly proto-Roman and therefore implicitly civilized urban space. She passes (and is visible from) the 'warlike grove of Janus', the dark country seat (*rus*) of Cacus, the agricultural landscape of the Quirinal, before ending up in the Caelian wilderness (that is, where Melior's estate 'now' sits), exhausted.[50] Statius' toponyms suggest temporal flux with historical

[48] Hardie 2006: 208. See also Vessey 1981: 51.

[49] E.g. Stat. *Silv.* 2.3.1–5 (omniscient narrator), 6–8 (poet), 10–17 (Pholoë), 20–6 (Diana), 39–42 (Pan-as-gardener), 43–52 (Pan-as-lover), 53–61 (personified tree). Hardie 2006: 213 suggests a more monological reading, emphasizing the primacy of Statius' poetic voice. Merleau-Ponty's formulation of the ***voyant-visible*** is useful here (1964 or, more challengingly, 2002; cf. Varela, Thompson, and Rosch 1991).

[50] Stat. *Silv.* 2.3.10–14. Janus' grove is a puzzle – no other references exist. Janus is very much in the air in the *Siluae*: he was an important feature of Domitian's new Forum Transitorium (a reconfigured Temple of Janus Quirinus [Geminus] where the Argiletum entered the Forum Romanum), and *Siluae* 4.1 makes Janus the protagonist, with an encomium of Domitian taking up twenty-six of that poem's forty-seven lines. Janus' bellicosity crops up again in Statius' paean to the new Via Domitiana (4.3.9); see also 1.6.3; 4.2.60–1. As suggested e.g. by Virgil (*Aen* 8.82)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000392 Published online by Cambridge University Press

eras blending into one another: Janus' grove conjures up a wooded landscape (perhaps the Quirinal slopes) as backdrop, yet also suggests a discrete and managed copse (rather than uninterrupted forest) and evokes contemporary Rome's temple – three phases in the taming of this scene. The Quirinal itself features not as a woody hill but as a farmscape, hinting at Melior's estate in its future, but also representing a stark contrast for any readers familiar with the hill in the mid-first century CE; by then the hill was quite built up, including mixed-use urban units (*insulae*) and luxury housing.

Cacus, a popular monster in Roman mythic history, was memorialized in urban Rome by a flight of steps climbing the Palatine from the Circus Maximus valley. His seat in the country is hard to pin down, located variously in antiquity on the Palatine or the Aventine. Here I tend to favour the Palatine, both because of the 'steps' and because the Aventine is already in play (as tagged by Diana). Out hunting Aventine deer, Diana spurs Pholoë on with a well-aimed arrow (2.3.20–30) into the pool's dubious refuge. Cacus' gloomy domain marks a contrast to the light, translucent qualities of the pool/Melior nexus and, by inference, stands in opposition to Melior's own dwelling. Melior's plot straddles a range of semiotic systems. Sited on a former wilderness, which is now zoned urban (Caelian), it is characterized by pastoral scenography and located in a historically rural landscape; yet the estate is far from being a country villa.[51] Finally, it is described as a *tesca*: an inhumane desert or wilderness.[52] Into this scene runs semi-anthropomorphic Pan, too late:

> *primaeuam nisu platinum, cui longa propago*
> *innumeraeque manus et iturus in aethera uertex,*
> *deposuit iuxta uiuamque aggessit harenam*
> *optatisque aspergit aquis…* Stat. *Silv.* 2.3.39–42
>
> with an effort, a sapling plane – with a long stem
> and countless twigs, and a crown en route to the heavens –
> he planted next [to the pool], and he packed in fertile sand
> and sprinkled longed-for water…

and Ovid (*Fast.* 1.243–4; 3.71–2), the site of future Rome, and indeed Latium as a whole, was typically envisaged as forested. See e.g. Hardie 1992; Carandini 2007 (archaeological focus); Rea 2007 (literary analysis).

[51] See Plin. *HN* 36.48.

[52] Stat. *Silv.* 2.3.14. A disputed archaic term (*OLD s.v. tesquum*) – see also Hor. *Epist.* 1.14.19; Luc. 6.41; cf. Varro, *Ling.* 7.10–11.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000392 Published online by Cambridge University Press

These lines, echoing lines 2–5, ramp up the artifice of the location. Pan the garden-protector has landscaped the wilderness, articulating how much less autochthonous it is than its first, magisterial appearance suggested. This quasi-technical exegesis cuts to the heart of Roman interest in landscape. There is real hard graft involved: even for Pan it is an effort to get this sapling uprooted and replanted, to make expert choices of sand to dig in, and to moisten. His choice of specimens combines aesthetics and scientific husbandry: the young tree is clearly healthy and vigorous, but it will also be the best possible plane tree by being stereotypically tall and leafy, and therefore generative of that cliché: pastoral shade. Pan is engineering a Pan-friendly landscape.

The following lines mark a further change in perspective. Pan becomes the active looker (rounding out his role as ***voyant-visible***): he apostrophizes the newly planted tree, using his role as its cultivator to instantiate his longing and as a kind of pledge of his protection for all time (2.3.43–52). This is where Statius locates the heart of the *aition* ('origin story'): Pan has told the tree to bend down and caress unkind Pholoë's shadowy couch, tipping the water with its leaves and protecting her from the fiery heat of the sun, as well as from cruel hail. Explaining its upward turn involves a further change of focalization: Pan's desire animates the tree, which in turn bends into the pool and then resurfaces, transformed into a wholly different tree.[53]

This plane presents a direct phenomenological link between first-century-CE reality, the landscapes of Athenian philosophy, complex Hellenistic literary sensibility, and the mythic qualities of Rome's origins in a pre-urban world. Pan's laborious cultivation of the plane tree reminds the reader of the essence of what a villa estate should be about (production, fertility) but, because Pan's crop is a plane, the only produce he can expect is related to *otium*: intellectual (like Socrates), or personal (shade in which to recline), or literary (Pan's role as subject and inspiration for composition). From Plato to Statius, this chapter has suggested some ways in which aesthetic qualities can highlight a tension between fruitfulness and sterility, *labor* and *otium*, and this is where we will start in Chapter III.

[53] Stat. *Silv.* 2.3.53–61. There are some oddities, but the overall meaning seems clear.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000392 Published online by Cambridge University Press