I INTRODUCTION: SURVEYING THE SCENE

Landscape…contains a multitude of meanings, all of which revolve around human experience, perception and modification of the world.[1]

What is landscape? Was there a concept of landscape in ancient Rome? Analysing the cityscape is now an established trend in the study of Rome and, since the 1990s, scholarship has explored the idea that thinking about the topography of the city of Rome encourages a more wide-ranging exploration of what being Roman was all about.[2] Taking a broader approach, this *Survey* tackles the **semiotics**[3] of a set of described, depicted, and three-dimensional landscapes where the emphasis is on a collaboration between nature and humankind. The timeframe is the late Roman Republic and early Principate, an era of change and reconstitution, when defining what being Roman meant was high on many agendas. This is also an era that offers the best possible scope for exploring a fascinating and diverse range of emblematic natural and manmade environments, taking in some of the most famous (but also some more unexpected) scenes in Roman literature, art, and architecture, closing with Hadrian's out-of-town landscaped villa near Tibur.

'Landscape' means something different from 'environment' or 'space': it foregrounds cultural context and emphasizes the relationship between humankind, nature, and the inhabited world. It also prioritizes **aesthetics** and the relationship between observer and observed (**the Gaze**).[4] To investigate 'landscape' in ancient Rome means recognizing the diverse palette of ideas, traditions, and cultural assumptions that 'landscape' trails now.[5] For this reason, this *Survey*'s Preface presents

[1] Alcock 2002: 30. See also La Rocca 2008: 7–13.

[2] See e.g. C. Edwards 1996, developed recently by Royo and Gruet 2008: 377.

[3] Chandler 2007 is a good introduction. Eco 1984 is readable, and still influential.

[4] Wylie 2007 (check 'Index' *s.v.* 'gaze') briefly introduces a range of applications relevant to landscape study.

[5] Sampling key trends in landscape study from the last thirty years: Meinig 1979b; Daniels and Cosgrove 1988; Hunt 1991; Bender 1993; Ingerson 1994; Mitchell 1994b; Tilley 1994; Hirsch and O'Hanlon 1995; A. Miller 1995 (survey article); Schama 1995; Olwig 1996; Cosgrove 1998; Spirn 1998; Birksted 2000; Fritter 2002. Wylie 2007 efficiently sums up, whilst Elkins and DeLue 2008 collect up most of the key current thinking on 'landscape' in a broad

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000380 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a tool-kit of key terms that will crop up as we analyse the building blocks of what makes a Roman space into 'landscape'. As we proceed, you will also encounter samples of a range of **methodologies**, selected to show different ways of exploring how landscape and identity came together in the late Republic to form a key **discourse** in Roman culture and society.[6] Over the course of six chapters, this *Survey* suggests that studying what 'landscape' means now and might have meant then sheds light on some of the most urgent issues confronting wealthy, educated, ambitious, and politically minded citizens during this era – for example, historical destiny, citizen identity in a time of rapid cultural change, and the relationship between ***labor***, ***otium***, luxury, and the search for the best of all possible worlds. Testing these approaches on a wider range of sites and **texts**, and following up on the different and often **interdisciplinary** methodologies in more depth, will be up to you.

Broadly speaking, Western usage makes 'landscape' a term for defining interest in a space, and this convention gained popularity in England via a vogue for sixteenth-century Flemish and Dutch art.[7] The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries also saw northern European artists travel to Rome to study new masterpieces funded by wealthy patrons, often visually referencing the scenery of classical myth and the increasingly available physical traces of ancient Roman civilization. 'Landscape' painting in this era was radical in bringing to centre stage what had previously featured only as background noise for medieval art's religious main events: hills, trees, streams, meadows, buildings (see cover picture), scenes from daily life. Studying and working amid classical ruins (and the archaeological finds that were emerging) and new buildings whose structure and form drew heavily on classical models, artists reinvented antiquity as a panoramic pattern book for reflecting on and delighting in human progress. Renaissance humanism had helped to fix classical antiquity more generally in the Western consciousness, and Grand Tourists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries made direct connections between intellectual development, sightseeing, ancient ruins, and an aesthetics or ethos of place (see

sense. The journals *Landscape Research* (from 1968) and *Studies in the History of Gardens and Designed Landscapes* provide snapshots of changing approaches.

[6] Huskinson 2000a presents the back story concisely. Hodos 2010 sums up strategies for understanding ancient identity.

[7] Big names include Paul Bril (1553/4–1626), Pieter Bruegel the Elder (*c.*1525–69), and Joachim Patinir (*c.*1485–1524). Andrews 1999 is the best introduction to how landscape features in Western art. Cf. Cosgrove 1998: 1, 16 (on the terminology).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000380 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Figures 6 and 7).[8] The Romantic movement's fascination with the unknowability and awesome power of nature (the Sublime) took this a stage further.[9] Romanticism's enthusiasm for landscapes stripped of human figures, but occasionally populated with ruinous symbols of antiquity's decline, helped to display nature's triumph as the ultimate landscape artist. This back story inevitably colours our attempts to relate modern and ancient understandings of 'landscape'.[10]

The material remains of what we might term 'real' ancient Roman landscapes often present only a fragmentary and even unintelligible story, and interpretation involves us in the processing of data – inevitably a subjective activity.[11] Archaeological techniques including geophysical surveying and aerial photography can help map plantings and hard- and soft-landscaping, but to interpret the resulting stratigraphy, post holes, pollen, and organic remains meaningfully, and to work out how and why particular landscapes mattered, we need to turn to surviving designed 'texts' – literary, material, and visual – which communicate Roman understanding of what makes a space interesting enough to be tagged as 'landscape'.[12]

This chapter's opening quote cues up some core approaches, including Lefebvre's influential definition of space as the product of what we perceive (our understanding), what is represented (what we are shown), and how we experience our environment.[13] Chapters II, III, and IV tackle Roman ideas of landscape thematically as a product of aesthetics, of hard work, and of time. Chapters V and VI propose chronologically organized literary and material cultural case studies as starting points for relating symbolic and real-life landscapes. Fortunately, Classical texts are well served with online resources. For texts (and translations), the Webography points you to *Lacus Curtius*

[8] Chard 1999 is the major study.

[9] Andrews 1999: 129–49 sums up on landscape and the artistic Sublime.

[10] We return to landscape art in Chapter VI. Consult Warnock and Brown 1998, or Azara 2008 for different (more totalizing) takes on 'landscape'.

[11] Renfrew 2005 sets out the problems of identification of original meaning for sites and objects.

[12] Bahn 1996 introduces what archaeology does; for impressive coverage, see Renfrew and Bahn 2008. Anschuetz, Wilshusen, and Scheick 2001 introduce key approaches for landscape archaeology. The approaches to studying classical archaeology outlined in Alcock and Osborne 2007 are particularly useful – see J. L. Davis 2007 and Hurst 2007 for the practicalities. More generally, Barker and Lloyd 1991 collect up case studies. Von Stackelberg 2009 demonstrates just how hard it is to draw all the elements together. Useful online fora are provided by *Archaeolog* and *Archaeology News* (see Webography). Harvey 2009 introduces important issues for studying material culture.

[13] Lefebvre 1991: 1–67.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000380 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and the *Perseus Digital Library*, and, for Latinists, *The Latin Library*. Chapter VI flags up additional resources for tackling material and visual cultural sites.

Approaches: ethnology, aesthetics, and the language of space and place

We can start by investigating some of the ways in which Romans understood the relationship between human authority, provident, eternal ***natura***, and wilderness. By the end of this chapter we will have a sense of how and why 'landscape' works as what Soja terms a 'realandimagined' space within which to dig deeply into Roman identity.[14] Barthes, for example, suggests that conservative mythologization of 'Nature' has often made an ideal alibi for explaining and justifying the status quo – a position we will see prefigured in elite Roman interest in the land and its use.[15] Schama, too, sees myth-making at work, although we might question his certainty that 'Landscapes are culture *before* they are nature; constructs of the imagination projected onto wood and water and rock.'[16]

Schama makes landscape an end-product of culture, but exploring ancient models of landscape shows that it is rarely this straightforward. Whether or not their identity is an imaginary construct, Romans conceptualize it at least partly as a response to topographic referents (the Seven Hills, Troy, the Tiber, Italy) identified as significant or meaningful for some reason.[17] Putting these ideas together, we have a model whereby claiming a space as 'landscape' immediately changes both the space and those who attach symbolic meaning to it. One task of this *Survey* is therefore to tackle the **hermeneutics** of landscape. Looking at hermeneutics pushes us to investigate how landscape produces and is also a product of culture, and to identify how and why defining space as 'landscape' poses perennially and cross-culturally interesting questions.

Harris's definition of landscape is useful here: 'a wide range of outdoor forms and spaces including, but not limited to, parks, urban

[14] Soja 1996: 11.
[15] Barthes 1993: 53, 142.
[16] Schama 1995: 61, emphasis added. For a more gardenist perspective (and an introduction to one of garden history's big names, Geoffrey Jellicoe), see Jellicoe, Waymark, and Jellicoe 1995.
[17] Snyder 1990 exemplifies how a contemporary spin on this might work.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000380 Published online by Cambridge University Press

open space, cemeteries, monument sites, estates, and gardens of all sizes and types'.[18] What these spaces have in common is that they are all composed of places, typically identified by toponyms, demarcated by walls or boundaries, and semiotically framed. They affect those who visit or inhabit them in ways more or less determined by culture and design. There is 'art' in their construction, and further artfulness comes into play in describing and representing them. What none of these landscapes suggest is raw, unmediated, or unconsidered space, and Andrews takes the artfulness a stage further when he observes that 'a "landscape", cultivated or wild, is already artifice *before it has become the subject of a work of art*'.[19] This is important for our purposes: works of art rather than direct experience are our primary way into the subject of ancient landscape.

If we view landscape as a set of places, we need to decide what 'place' means. Augé's **ethnological** approach adds value at this point. He proposes that a 'place' is somewhere occupied by a group of people who

> defend it, mark its strong points and keep its frontiers under surveillance, but who also detect in it the traces of chthonian or celestial powers, ancestors or spirits which populate and animate its private geography…
>
> The ethnologist…sets out to decipher, from the way the place is organized (the frontier always postulated and marked out between wild nature and cultivated nature, the permanent or temporary allotment of cultivable land or fishing grounds, the layout of villages…in short, the group's social, political and religious geography), an order which is all the more restrictive – in any case, the more obvious – because its transcription in space gives it the appearance of a second nature… Foundation narratives are…narratives that bring the spirits of the place together with the first inhabitants in the common adventure… The social demarcation of the soil is the more necessary for not always being original…
>
> The indigenous fantasy is that of a closed world founded once and for all long ago... Everything there is to know about it is already known: land, forest, springs, notable features, religious places, medicinal plants, not forgetting the temporal dimension of these places whose legitimacy is postulated, and whose stability is supposed to be assured, by narratives about origin and by the ritual calendar. All the inhabitants have to do is *recognize* themselves in it when the occasion arises.[20]

In effect, Augé is describing an **ethnoscape**: a space where memory and imagination join forces in visualizing a shared, communal

[18] Harris 1999: 434; this useful survey offers concise access to issues treated in more detail by big names such as Conan, Hunt, Mitchell, and Soja.

[19] Andrews 1999: 1, emphasis added.

[20] Augé 1995: 42–4, emphasis original. Ingold 2000 (parts 1 and 2) takes a similar approach for a spin.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000380 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interpretation of the world.[21] Augé's reading sharpens our understanding of a recognizably Roman mindset, as sketched for example by Varro in the later first century BCE. The dedicatory opening to book 3 of his 'handbook' *De re rustica* (*On Country Matters*) observes that, by tradition, two modes of life are available: rural or urban. There is, moreover, 'no doubt but that these are separate not just in terms of *space* [*locus*], but also as a function of the different *chronological* [*tempus*] origins of each'.[22] Country life – a pre-urban landscape – is, he says, the most ancient; there never was a time when fields (*agri*) ripe for cultivation (*colo*) were not immanent within the landscape (*terra*). Varro's vision of an archaic countryside suggests that Roman agribusiness in its purest form is in effect tracing a natural blueprint. From time immemorial, he hints, a Roman's *raison d'être* was to perform a set of practices bound up in a **nexus** including habitation, cultivation, and worship.[23] Neither Varro nor Augé appears to be talking about aesthetic approaches to the environment, nor describing and responding to its 'natural' beauty. This is not landscape as art, or in the Romantic tradition, but an ethical, practical, and political relationship between humankind and the spaces that we inhabit – our ethnoscapes.[24]

As recent philosophical inquiry into the aesthetics of nature has made increasingly clear, however, addressing aesthetics can improve our methodological focus:

> the mistaken search for a model of the correct or appropriate aesthetic appreciation of nature reflects a lack of recognition of the freedom that is integral to the aesthetic appreciation of nature, a freedom which means that much more is up to the aesthetic observer of nature than of art, a freedom which is one aspect of nature's distinctive aesthetic appeal.[25]

Berger's influential study of *Ways of Seeing* explained how all observation is conditioned in some sense, but Budd's focus on nature suggests that

[21] A. D. Smith 1999: 150–2. This also ties in with Lefebvre 1991, where space is defined and analysed as a social construct. B. Anderson 2006 provides a lucid and comprehensive overview of key issues.

[22] Varro, *Rust.* 3.1.1.

[23] Ibid., 3.1.3, 4. The verb '*colo*' draws together these meanings and more. See the lengthy *OLD* entry, which also includes 'embellish', 'practise', and 'inhabit as a god'. Roman thought on nature filters through Beagon 1992. Peterson 2001: 51–61 sums up trends in defining how 'the human story' relates to 'the earth community' (60).

[24] See also Casey 1993: 188.

[25] Budd 2002: 147–8, see also 19–23 (the extent of our knowledge of nature affects our experience and judgement) and 110–48 (a lively survey of contemporary approaches).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000380 Published online by Cambridge University Press



Figure 4 Tivoli, Grand Cascade. As we know from the Younger Pliny (*Ep*. 8.17), the River Anio (Aniene) was accustomed to wreak periodic havoc upon the estates of Tibur. Pope Gregory XVI's rerouting of the river (in 1835, after particularly disastrous floods in 1826, which washed away part of the town), forming this new 'grand' cascade, dramatically changed the aural and visual qualities of the relationship between the citadel and its most characteristic feature: water. It provided viewers with a dramatic new 'natural' water feature, whose flow and impact was in fact configured by hydraulic engineering (via a tunnel); this view presents the waterfall as a natural phenomenon. Cf. Figures 6 and 7, which appear more 'staged', and make a feature of human intervention in the landscape.

one way in which we enjoy 'natural' scenery is because we *imagine* it to offer raw material for expressing our individuality, free from the constraints of an author's, painter's, or designer's vision (compare Figures 4, 6, and 7).[26] In terms of cultural geography, changing the focus from 'seen' to 'seeing' (passive to active) turns 'nature' from art to raw material, downplaying the idea that 'nature' means the same

[26] Berger 1972.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000380 Published online by Cambridge University Press

thing to everyone. By prioritizing interpretation, this approach creates what Wylie terms 'the landscape way of seeing'.[27] Looking at 'nature' makes artists of everyone. Even a primarily utilitarian landscape still offers scope for this kind of aesthetics because we enrich these spaces, too, with our own prior experience, our visual or **iconographic** memories, needs, and desires. In this way, Budd (2002) and Cooper (2006) develop a **phenomenological** approach also exemplified in Meinig (1979a), recognizing that the eye of the beholder is what unlocks the meaning of three-dimensional landscapes. This process of interpretation rooted in a shared semiotic system is what gives real and symbolic substance to how we perceive the natural world.

Semiotics are also important for Spirn, who argues that 'the meanings landscapes hold are not just metaphorical and metaphysical, but real… Landscape has all the features of language. It contains the equivalent of words and parts of speech'.[28] The complex semantic background to Spirn's position is described by Fauconnier, a major figure in **cognitive linguistics**:

> Understanding the linguistic organization involved [in metaphor, metonymy, and other rhetorical devices] leads to the study of domains that we set up as we talk or listen, and that we structure with elements, roles, strategies, and relations. These domains – or interconnected *mental spaces*, as I shall call them – are not part of the language itself, or of its grammars; they are not hidden levels of linguistic representation, but language does not come without them.[29]

Fauconnier's 'mental spaces' are hugely useful for tackling textual landscapes and, as we shall see, three-dimensional space has its own grammars and vocabularies. Cognitive linguistic terminology intersects here with another recently burgeoning theoretical approach: analysis of **space syntax**. Hillier is a key player in this field, and his interest in deconstructing (or parsing) the rhetoric(s) of space offers significant strategies for understanding what landscape means for Rome. Hillier and Hanson's '**fat space**' model encourages us to think harder about the assumptions and connections that we make when we read about or move through culturally and intellectually resonant spaces, rich

[27] Wylie 2007: 92, 93 (55–93 provides a detailed overview).

[28] Spirn 1998: 11, 15. See Wylie 2007: 80–1 (summary discussion).

[29] Fauconnier 1994: 1, emphasis original. Dennett 1991 and Varela, Thompson, and Rosch 1991 address cognition more generally. V. Evans and Green 2006 provide an excellent introduction to cognitive linguistics. See also Harnad 1987; Gärdenfors 2000. Looking at Rome, see Leach 1988: 74–8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000380 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with semiotic meaning.[30] A final way into this field is through the terminology of cultural memory.[31]

Like all discourse, memory relies upon and is generated by the manipulation of symbols: we perceive a 'thing', compare it relationally to other 'things' in our mental library, and define or 'tag' it accordingly.[32] Individual or personal memory weaves together our personal tags and our individual experiences. Communal memory might be expressed as operating at the intersections *between* personal memories; this kind of memory is consensual, and assumes groups of people with shared or agreed responses to (or memories of) particular events, images, ideas, or entities (**epistemes**). Cultural memory, for the purposes of this book, is concentrated specifically in the collaborative production of memory and identity within a society or group: shared ideas and practices are explained and memorialized when recast as stories, and, in repeatedly telling the stories, their formulaic (and often highly conservative) qualities tend to dominate.[33] For ancient Rome, this is especially useful when thinking about shared values such as ancestral custom (*mos maiorum*) and its connection of citizen identity with the landscapes of Rome and Italy.[34] Through shared values and associations, we see how spaces become places and how monuments of all kinds take on semiotic weight, in a manner explored (for France) in Nora's ***lieux de mémoire***.[35] Using this approach encourages us to place emphasis on the hermeneutic and **epistemological** relationship between the topographic entity (tree, tomb, road, temple) and its *agreed* meaning, value, and significance. Again, Lorrain's sketch of Aeneas and the Sibyl (cover illustration) offers an excellent example. We must always remember, however, that ascribing meaning and staking a claim to

[30] Set out in Hillier and Hanson 1984. Hillier and Penn 2004 address problems with the model. For its application to antiquity, see Grahame 2000. On the implications for archaeology, see Lock 2009. Drawing these strands together, see the introductions to Barnes and Duncan 1992, and Duncan and Ley 1993.

[31] Developed by the Egyptologist Jan Assmann (usefully summarized in Assmann 1995; explored in more detail in Assmann 2006), this approach draws on the formulation 'collective memory', for which see Halbwachs 1992. A connected idea, 'social memory', is introduced by J. Fentress and Wickham 1992.

[32] Small 1997 provides an authoritative overview focusing on ancient memory, drawing on Yates 1966. See also (e.g.) Bergmann 1994; Farrell 1997; and Walter 2004: 155–79. Flower 1996, 2006 discusses specific instances of how memory and culture intersect.

[33] See Wachtel 1990 (on the Holocaust); Zerubavel 2003 (on the patterns that structure the creation of 'history').

[34] See Treggiari 2003, on Cicero.

[35] See Nora 2001 and (for a practical example) Roncayolo 2006.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000380 Published online by Cambridge University Press

landscape and imbuing sites with cultural significance is never value-neutral.[36]

The politics of charm

Gardens and landscapes (parks, rustic imagery, and *trompe-l'oeil* vistas, often with a mythological or fantastic theme) become central to elite cultural production and consumption at Rome during a time of great change (the late Republic and early Principate).[37] Varro represents a turning point in a tradition whereby Rome's natural environment overwhelmingly signifies productivity, ethnicity, political and social identity, and power. These themes often have aesthetic implications, but there is yet another kind of landscape, one where (the right sort of) sensory gratification and relaxed pleasure is the priority. The key term for this kind of landscape is ***locus amoenus***. An example from Cicero clarifies its meaning, showing how cultural context and hermeneutics coloured Roman perception:

quibus quaeris, idque etiam me ipsum nescire arbitraris, utrum magis tumulis prospectuque an ambulatione ἀλιτενεῖ delecter. Est mehercule, ut dicis, utriusque loci tanta amoenitas ut dubitem utra anteponenda sit. Cic. *Att.* 14.13.1 (Puteoli, April 44 BCE)

[in your letter] you ask (thinking I won't know the answer) whether there's more pleasure in the hills and the view, or in the *maritime* promenade. It's just as you say: there is so much damn charm in both places that I am in doubt as to which should rate higher.

Writing from delightful seaside Puteoli (see Figure 1), Cicero seems at first to engage straightforwardly with his friend Atticus' evaluation of the relative attractions and merits of particular places. Caesar's assassination, however, overshadows the letter – Tatum (2006) sums up the political background effectively. Cicero is in a tricky political position: struggling to reach an accommodation with Mark Antony (then consul), when his inclination is towards Brutus' faction. Reading context in makes Cicero's aesthetic deliberation, with its Greek loan-word hinting at a wider Mediterranean perspective, seem less

[36] S. Jones 1997 is an excellent introduction to the politics of ownership of the material past.

[37] For a working proposition of the relationship between the garden and the broader idea of landscape, see Hunt 1999 (or 2000: 2–29). On out-of-town villa landscapes, see Littlewood 1987 and Purcell 1987b. Jashemski 1981 summarizes key features of peristyle gardens.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000380 Published online by Cambridge University Press

straightforwardly descriptive and appreciative. As he goes on to say, in the world after Caesar, choosing one's position has become a matter of urgency.[38] *Amoenitas* evokes a particular kind of phenomenological charm linked to physical and sensory comfort (so Cicero is also conjuring up a sensory environment and embodied practice), while also calling to mind a highly literary, Hellenistic panorama focused on the scenes of pastoral verse.[39] Literary pastoral, newly fashionable at Rome, deploys a **scenography** where playing with ideas of rusticity equals sophistication; paradigmatic landscape **tropes**, drawn most famously from Theocritus, offer Romans a new way of thinking about their relationship with the land, mapping it onto a specifically Greek topographic imagination, and giving a Hellenic flavour to the Gaze between Rome and Italy.[40] A *locus amoenus* is not, then, awe-inspiring or terror-inducing in the way that a 'sublime' place is, but it does conjure up a range of cultural anxieties that add ethical chiaroscuro to the light and shade of pastoral's typical landscapes.[41]

Suburban landscape parks form a backdrop to this trope, and became particularly significant in the characteristic late Republican culture of display.[42] In Rome's Campus Martius (see Figure 3), new monumental and decorative spaces included Pompey's carefully planned entertainment complex. Later designed landscapes that were open to the public included Agrippa's leisure centre (baths, gardens, exercise spaces) and the landscaped environs of Augustus' Mausoleum. Rather than adding self-promoting elements piecemeal to the cluttered Campus, Pompey (and then more comprehensively Augustus) completely remodelled a vast chunk of it as a kind of theme park, telling a story (as we will see in Chapter VI) about personal power and

[38] Cic. *Att*. 14.13.2.

[39] On landscape as a function of human existence, see Ingold 2000: 55.

[40] See Chapter II. Theocritus, from Syracuse, was writing in the early third century BCE. Hellenistic literature was hugely significant in the development of Roman culture; Gutzwiller 2007 introduces the key figures and Gruen 1992 sets out how Roman culture responded. On what's often termed the 'imperial gaze', Wylie 2007: 126–36 sets out key issues.

[41] *On the Sublime*, attributed to Longinus (dating to perhaps as early as the first century CE), makes sublimity primarily a rhetorical quality. McEvilley 2001: 60–77 summarizes the Sublime from Romanticism onwards; Stafford 2001 offers a quirky modern example. Giesecke 2007: 49–51 outlines the danger, mystery, and human helplessness lurking in classical Greek representations of nature. Cf. the first-century-BCE Roman poet-philosopher Lucretius' pragmatic division of the world into three, out of which the 'wilderness' is useless to humankind (5.200–17); see Schiesaro 2007, and Porter 2007.

[42] See Chapter VI. Grimal 1984:110–36 usefully surveys likely locations for the main late Republican *horti* (estates). What is 'culture'? Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 3–37 sums up.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000380 Published online by Cambridge University Press

magnificence.[43] In concrete terms, the cosmocratic and imperializing motifs that saturated Pompey's theatre and garden complex would also make clear that stepping in was to enter a different version of Roman space.[44] Purpose-designed public landscapes were paralleled by an alternative gesture: throwing open one's private gardens (as Caesar did, in his will). Horace's use of Caesar's Gardens as a topographic signpost ('"I want to look up someone you don't know / he's ill, flat out, way across the Tiber, near Caesar's Gardens"') suggests that they quickly became a landmark fixture in the city, but, like Pompey's, they remained a place distinct, offering something different from what had traditionally characterized everyday urban experience.[45] Horace uses them conceptually to distance the speaker's destination (within the poem) from the city centre.

Far from offering a natural or idyllic contrast to the city, designed landscape in this sense tells an explicitly civic and political story, closely tied up in the political and social changes of the late Republic and early Principate. Urban development of the Campus Martius in particular seems to have presented a fresh way of constructing Roman identity as a function of a developing dialogue between landscape, architecture, and monuments. This newly developing identity prioritized a union of nature and artifice in the service of the changing political landscape, one which was not exclusively focused on the nostalgia-tinted patriotism that coloured Rome's ancient political heart (the Capitoline Hill and the Forum).[46] Elite villas and landscape parks also aggressively colonized the suburbs, transforming potential farmland into a zone for the cultivation of meaning. Famous estates (*horti*) nestling barely outside the city of Rome in the mid-first century BCE included those of Maecenas, Lucullus, and Sallust (see Figure 3).[47] Traces of the kinds of debate that their luxury may have provoked filter through the criticism and mockery that the

[43] On theme-park landscapes, see Young and Riley 2002. Favro 1996: 24–41, 252–80 imaginatively describes two strolls through ancient Rome.

[44] See Kuttner 1999a; we examine Pompey's Porticus garden in Chapter VI.5.

[45] Hor. *Sat*. 1.9.17–18. On Caesar's gardens, see Coarelli 1996; Papi 1996; D'Arms 1998; Haselberger, Romano, and Dumser 2002: 142–3. On Horace's satire, see Welch 2001.

[46] Zanker 1988: 73–6, 141–4; Favro 1996: 40, 144–216. Spirn 1998: 240–65 discusses the polemic qualities of landscape, ranging widely through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. One aspect of the Augustan Campus that has cast a long shadow is the sundial (*horologium*). On its original form, see e.g. Heslin 2007; see also online resources, e.g. Webography: *Museo dell'Ara Pacis*; Neilson (contemporary comparison); *Solarium/Horologium Augusti* (University of Oregon).

[47] The Horti Sallustiani feature in Chapter VI.5. On the *horti* of Lucullus, see Broise and Jolivet 1987, 1996, 1999; on the *horti* of Maecenas, see Häuber 1996, 1998. For both, consult Haselberger, Romano, and Dumser 2002: 144–5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000380 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ostentatiously private, secluded luxury parks and villas of Campania could sometimes inspire. Moving forwards a century or so, we can see how these kinds of criticism feed into and colour the senatorial vitriol and disgust that greeted Nero's decision not to rebuild his home in the form of a traditional townhouse (*domus*) after the great fire of 64 CE but instead to redevelop a whole city-centre zone as a new urban form, part imperial residence, part villa – his Domus Aurea (Golden House).[48]

The anxieties associated with luxury estates and their impact on traditional morals feed into and upon a stereotype: Roman **self-fashioning** as a community of farmer-citizens whose identity was rooted in working the land.[49] Sallust eloquently sums up in nostalgic reactionary terms how this relates to cultural fracture in the first century BCE: imperial expansion from the mid-Republic onwards had led to Romans losing touch with the countryside. A weakened relationship with the land, however imaginary, threatened the **autochthonic** qualities of Rome's historical imagination and impaired access to a collective historical memory.[50]

Picking up on Nora's terminology again, we can read landscape as a 'site of memory' giving access to *priscae uirtutes*, ancient and fundamental qualities of the ideal Roman.[51] Roman origin myths traditionally fixate on teasing out the relationship between citizenship and the pastoral quality of the pre-urban city-site. Wachtel comments on this kind of topographic yearning to map identity to place: 'it is… possible to search for the original world by looking there where it authentically was, by returning to those places where the ancestors

[48] See Favro 1996: 39, 176–80. For detail, see Grimal 1984: 109–66; and for analysis, see Wallace-Hadrill 1998b. Examples of ancient criticism of luxury estates can be found in Cic. *Leg.* 2.2, *Q Fr.* 3.1.5; Hor. *Carm.* 2.15, 18 (cf. Sen. *Ep.* 89.21); Mart. 12.50, 57, 66; Ov. *Fast.* 6.639–48; Sall. *Cat.* 12.3; Sen. *Controv.* 2.1.13; Suet. *Calig.* 37, *Ner.* 31; Tac. *Ann.* 3.55, 15.42; Varro, *Rust.* 3.3.6–4.3. A Second Sophistic perspective is found in Plut. *Vit. Luc.* 39.2–3. On Nero, see Elsner 1994. Nevertheless, Roman authors blow hot and cold on this topic, praising luxury estates when it suits (C. Edwards 1993: 137–72), e.g. Vitr. *De arch.* 6.5.1–2. For images of excavated rooms from Nero's Domus Aurea today, see Webography: Curran; recent discoveries (September 2009) online via the Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali.

[49] E.g. Varro, *Rust.* 2, *Praef.* 1–2; cf. Cato, *Agr.*, *Praef.*

[50] Sall. *Cat.* 2–3, 10–13. Discussing Varro, *Rust.*, Green 1997: 432–3 suggests that elite anxiety configured such shifts as relocating political power from Rome to the culturally supercharged estates, making urban life hard to justify (see also Howe 2004). Dench 2005: 37–92 provides a detailed summary discussion.

[51] Nora's *lieux de mémoire* interrogate the relationship between place, ethnicity, and politics; his project undertook 'to achieve a close link between a *general* problematic of memory with the particular thematic of "places"' (2001a: xx, emphasis original). See also Farrell 1997, and Gowing 2005 passim.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000380 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lived'.[52] Viewed retrospectively in terms of mythic history, inhabiting and contemplating this site by the Tiber where Rome would be built is always a process of colonizing a landscape of ancestral exile. Telling stories about the authentic ancestral city-site brings into sharp focus the loss of the new settlers' *ur*-city (Troy): only as a result of Troy's destruction and Aeneas' exile, in mythic terms, can Roman landscapes come into being. This is set out most clearly in Virgil's *Aeneid* (as we investigate in Chapter IV): Rome – Troy refounded – is what Aeneas and the Trojans have in their sights even as they gaze across the countryside of Latium and Campania.

This tension informs the sometimes paradoxical connections between cultivated landscapes and historical process in late Republican authors as seemingly disparate as Catullus and Varro. An idealizing traditionalist such as Cato might, writing in the early second century BCE, still imagine an ideal Rome whose primary function was to be the tactical headquarters of an agrarian people, providing infrastructure and coherence for its primarily agricultural citizenry, but he seems to have been swimming against the tide even then. Rome's success as a city and imperial centre inevitably made it impossible for *every* citizen to count a farm in Latium or even Campania (core 'Roman' agricultural territory) as their own 'home'. Moreover, an increasing body of 'Romans' in the new provinces might never experience Italian landscapes (or the myth-saturated topography of Rome) at all.

Perceptions of this shift are very much in evidence in Virgil's *Eclogues*, where nostalgia-soaked rural aesthetics gain political bite and a public edge, setting city and countryside on a collision course.[53] These poems **focalize** urbane, Roman, and political poetics through an Arcadian perspective, using shepherds with artfully Greek names and Hellenic landscape backdrops to discuss some of the most urgent issues facing Rome in the wake of decades of civil war. They work, intermittently, within an environment that fuses real-life changes in land use with a highly intellectual sensibility. Their speakers communicate stripped-down Roman problems using self-consciously literary language, and re-imagine pastoral concerns and activities through a Hellenistic filter. In this way, landscape in the *Eclogues* showcases how 'Greek culture leaves its mark on Rome at every moment we can document'.[54]

[52] Wachtel 1990: 124.
[53] See Leach 1974. Skoie 2006 explores Virgil's city/country clash in depth.
[54] Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 25.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000380 Published online by Cambridge University Press

When Spirn comments that 'to call some landscapes natural and others artificial or cultural misses the truth that landscapes are never wholly one or the other', the *Eclogues*' tightly scripted blend of reality and artifice has got there first.[55] Their oppositional foci (*labor* plus ***negotium*** versus *otium*) are ideally united in the concept of landscape – a space that combines aesthetic and sensory pleasure in the essential beneficence of 'nature', with strategies for investigating human mastery of nature's unknowability. As Gowers observes (of gardening): 'there is always a tension between control and runaway fertility'.[56] As we shall see, controlling nature – whether physically, or conceptually as an object of study or a visual field, or artistically – is central to what landscape means in ancient Rome, and underpins its significance as an area for study. Hence the search for a Roman sense of landscape illuminates and enriches understanding of their world and its differences from and similarities to (y)ours. We may not feel fully comfortable with Fairclough's early twentieth-century observation that 'the ancient Greeks and Romans did not differ essentially from modern people in their appreciation of the world of nature', but we will see how contemporary experience of landscape and the environment continues to echo tropes and archetypes that were already in play two thousand years ago.[57]

[55] Spirn 1998: 24.
[56] Gowers 2000: 141.
[57] Fairclough 1930: 251.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383510000380 Published online by Cambridge University Press