

Roman gardens, imagination, and cognitive structure

ROMAN GARDENS, IMAGINATION, AND COGNITIVE STRUCTURE¹

Abstract: The article deals with the Roman garden and sets it in the context of identity, imagination, and cognitive development. Although the implications of the argument are empire-wide, the focus here is primarily on the the urban gardens of the city of Rome ca.60 B.C. – A.D. 60.

The person experiencing one garden sees through it other gardens, real, historical, or poetic. ‘The garden’ and representations of the garden become places for thinking about literature, history, and identity. Our evidence for this ‘thinking’ is a lateral or synchronic layer in the sense that the thinking for which we have textual evidence is all done by fully developed adults. However, there is another, vertical or diachronic, aspect to the process which involves the cognitive development from childhood of the garden-user and the role of the garden in structuring the prospective citizen’s understanding of the world. The garden is a central feature of the urban residence, where the Roman citizen lives and moves through the course of his cognitive development. It is inside the house, and the house is inside the city, which is inside Italy. The concluding part of the article investigates how the core notion of the garden as enclosed space maps on to larger sets of inside-outside dyads in the Roman world: the garden is a secluded interior, but on a larger scale Rome is a safe interior surrounded by more perilous environment; again, Italy is a civilised interior surrounded by a more dangerous outer world. The garden is experienced by the child largely through play, and this also feeds into the garden-related imaginative acts described in the first part of the paper.

From the time of the late Republic, Rome was ringed by huge gardens.² Inside the city, within this necklace of large gardens, there was a varied multiplicity of other gardens: gardens at baths,³ gardened walkways, window boxes, temple groves, roof gardens, gardens in taverns and small inns, and the courtyard gardens of houses.⁴ Outside the city, there were also funerary gardens.⁵ Everyone in Rome, even the poorer inhabitants of *insulae*, had access to gardens of various kinds, and many (not excluding all of the comparatively less well-off), had their own gardens, facilitated by the Augustan urban water programme of c. 30 BC onwards.⁶ Nor were there only the physical gardens themselves, for these were

¹ This paper develops ideas put forward in Jones (2011) and at the Colloquium in honour of Niall Rudd; Themes In Latin Literature and Its Reception, Liverpool, Monday, 13 June 2011. I am grateful to Prof. B. Gibson, Dr K. Hammond, Dr. Graham Oliver, Dr. Phil Freeman Dr. Claire Holleran, Dr M. Sommer, Dr. Luke Houghton, and the anonymous referee for help and comments on earlier drafts.

² See Hartswick (2004); Kuttner (1999); Kaster (1974). For the appearance of horticultural treatises in Rome in the Augustan period, see Reeder (2001: 12). Maecenas was the dedicatee of one by Sabinus Tiro (Pliny *NH*.177). On Roman gardens generally see: Carroll (2003); Conan (1986); Farrar (1998); Gleason (1994); Hartswick (2007); Hunt (1991); (1997); Jashemski (1979, 1994); (2002) (2007); Kaster (1974); Purcell (1987); (1996); (2001); Hales (2003: 153-62); von Stackelberg (2009); Spencer 2010: 139-141, 161-85. The corpus of Roman gardens begun by Jashemski is expected from Cambridge University Press under the executive editorship of K. Gleason.

³ Jashemski (1979: 163-5)

⁴ On the range of type and the amount of urban space, see Jashemski (1979: 24); (2002: 6-28); Carroll (2003: 34-5. On temple groves, see Jashemski (1979: 155-60); Carroll (2003: 69-71. For roof-gardens, see Cic. *Hortensius* frag. 78 ap. Nonius 216.14; Sen. *Contr.* 5.5; Sen. *Ep.* 122.8; *de Ira* 1.21.1; *Thyestes* 464.

⁵ Jashemski (1979: 141-53); Bodel (1986); Purcell (1996: 123-6); Carroll (2003: 76-9); von Stackelberg (2009: 24).

⁶ Pliny (*NH* 19.51-2) recalls that in early Rome all citizens had their own gardens. Umbricius, the speaker in Juvenal’s third *Satire*, makes getting a small *hortus* of one’s own a reason for leaving Rome (Juv. *Sat.* 3.223-231). On the water supply, see Purcell (1996b), esp. 122 on Roman self-image and horticulture; cf. also Frontinus *Aq.* 11.

replicated on another level by references to them in the poetry of the time.⁷ Pompey's garden, for example, appears in passing as a feature of the everyday life of the city in Catullus 55 and reappears in Propertius (2.32.7-16) and Ovid (AA 3.387). Caesar's appears likewise at Horace *Satires* 1.9.18, and Maecenas' new Esquiline Gardens is the setting for Horace *Satires* 1.8.⁸ Gardens were everywhere in the material fabric of the city and in the city of the mind.

In this paper, I am concerned with the Roman citizen's experience of this pervasive phenomenon; in particular, I am concerned with the role of the garden⁹ in the consolidation and expression of the individual's social, civic, and cultural identity (examples 1-3); the way the imagination uses the garden as a medium through which something other than literal reality is seen (examples 4-8), so that it becomes a fostering environment for role-play and self-impersonation (therefore also contributing to the expression of identity); and, finally, its structuring influence on Roman cognitive development. It will be seen that this last aspect has a contributory role in preparing for the kinds of imaginative acts dealt with in the earlier parts of the paper, and that in turn these imaginative acts tend to continue the process of cognitive development. In all three aspects, the repetition (often the frequent or daily repetition) of garden experience is a major reinforcing element. The bulk of my evidence comes from Rome of the late Republic and early Empire and relates to the aristocratic citizen, but the implications of the overall picture extend much further.

The garden, public and private, was a place designed for, amongst other things, the play of the imagination. It was, as von Stackelberg puts it (2009: 2), 'not just a place, it was an idea of a place, experienced on both a societal and an individual level.' The garden and the replication of the garden in poetry have a role in the social and cultural identity of the owners and subjects; there is a complex interaction with their sense of belonging to the Roman élite and taking part in the Roman cultural life, and sometimes also with a sense of historical identity as Romans. I begin with two apparently slight and fleeting references:

- 1) ast ubi me fessum sol acrior ire lavatum
admonuit, fugio Campum lusumque trigonem.
(Horace *Satires* 1.6.126)

⁷ Pagán (2006); Myers (forthcoming)

⁸ On Hor. *Sat.* 1.8, see Wiseman (1998: 13-22); Edmunds (2009). On Caesar's garden across the Tiber, see D'Arms (1998: 33-44).

⁹ The window box may seem very different from the temple grove; the functionality of the market garden is different from the cultural resonance of Cicero's Tusculan garden, with its Greek works of art and statue of Plato (Cic. *ad Att.* 1.4; 1.6; 1.8-11); the real Roman garden might seem very remote from the garden of the Hesperides. However, as we shall see, the imaginative aspect of the garden whereby the subject sees through the present garden other gardens, landscapes, and types of garden blurs many of the possible distinctions. In general, we could usefully think of the garden as an enclosed green space, different from its surrounding, and as a culturally recognisable part of urban life. Within this outline, there is room for a very wide continuum between extremes of utility and aesthetic autonomy. We should also be prepared to accept fairly radical deviations from, and variations in, the core features.

But when I'm tired and the fiercening sun tells me to go to the baths, I flee the Campus and my game of Triangle.

- 2) Luserat in Campo: 'Fortunae filius!' omnes.
(Horace *Satires* 2.6.49)

Suppose he [Maecenas] had been playing with me in the Campus: 'Lucky man!' say all.

In the first extract, in a generalised account of a day in the life of the poet, Horace says, when it's time for the baths, 'I finish my game of triangle and leave the Park' (Niall Rudd's translation). In the second extract, Horace modestly and almost inadvertently reveals that sometimes Maecenas does things like playing with Horace in the Park. On both of these occasions, Horace uses the word *campus*, referring to the Campus Martius, the immense garden-like complex containing (amongst other things) the water gardens of Agrippa and the gardens of Pompey.¹⁰ By entering the Campus Martius (or the gardens once owned by Pompey or Caesar), the subject partakes of the myth of Roman power and shares in Augustus' 'new political stability' (von Stackelberg, 2009:78). Although increasingly filled during the republic with temples, porticoes, and other monuments, the Campus Martius was still in the Augustan period used for the equestrian exercises which figure occasionally in major Augustan poets (Hor. *Odes* 1.8.3; Prop. 2.16.33). But Romans who read the poetry of Horace, by taking part in these exercises, or just by entering the Campus Martius in general social activity, could become in their own minds part of an imaginary Horatian poem. In turn, Horace's poem becomes a poem about these very readers. In a recursive effect, those who read the poem are also in the poem; they might have just left it (like Maecenas with the pluperfect tense of *luserat* in line 49) or will shortly be in it.¹¹ They are doing what ordinary aristocratic Romans do but, in addition, they get an imaginary role in a poem by one of Rome's major poets, which multiplies and reinforces their urban cultural identity.

There are other literary associations present in the Campus, too. The Augustan resonance of the equestrian activities in the Campus Martius is very clear in the seventh book of Virgil's *Aeneid*. The whole of the *Aeneid* is a poetic embodiment of a Roman foundation myth, but in the seventh book this is particularly focused, because there Aeneas reaches the site of the future Rome. He establishes a camp and sends ambassadors to King Latinus (*Aeneid* 7.159ff). Meanwhile, he sees equestrian exercises being performed on the

¹⁰ For the Campus Martius, see Coarelli (2007:261-304); Favro 1996: 252-70; Strabo 5.3.8. For Campus Martius and the public gardens as arenas in which memories, narratives, and resonances revolve, cf. von Stackelberg (2009: 63-6); Spencer (2010: 161-24). On the Ara Pacis, see Zanker (1988: 120-3, 203-4).

¹¹ Of course, this is also true of any location mentioned in Horace (such as the Via Sacra at *Sat.* 1.9.1), and indeed of any location mentioned by one of the poets, but to the extent that the public gardens and the Campus were focal points for social activity this effect is multiplied. On recursion, see Dällenbach (1989); Deremetz (1995); Jones (2011: 116-7).

'*campus*' outside the city (160-5), exercises which clearly foreshadow those of Virgil's contemporaries in the Campus Martius. Thus, Virgil's Roman listeners, as they engage in this practice, can see their forerunners in their mind's eye. In their imagination they become united with their origins.¹² At the same time, they themselves become 'part of' the major modern poem, the *Aeneid*. This sort of cross-media intertextuality, moreover, is happening everywhere in Rome, as when the citizen passes the statue of Aeneas, in the Forum Augusti,¹³ or the other statues in the Forum's colonnades (Beard and Henderson 2001: 168-9). As the citizen is day after day seeing varied combinations of these sights, the messages are constantly replenished.

The intertextuality of the Campus Martius and the allusions in the poets is only one part of the role of gardens in identity and imagination. In the subject's experience of the city, myths of Romanness are constantly being refreshed and reinforced. Augustus, as Kellum (1994: 211) writes, built on old traditions and memories to interweave an arboreal mythology about his city.¹⁴ Walking about Rome, one would see the oak tree under which Romulus founded the Temple of Jupiter Feretrius (Livy 1.10; Nepos *Atticus* 20.3), or the plebeian and patrician myrtles of the Temple of Quirinus, the palm tree placed by Augustus at the Palatine Temple of Apollo (Suet. *Aug.* 92.1-2), or the pair of laurel trees in front of Augustus' door (Dio 53.16.4). 'The purifying, healing laurel of Apollo became one of the quintessential symbols of the Augustan era of clemency and peace, and as such appeared in at least ten other key locations in the city' (Kellum 1994: 213). As the citizen passes any of these sites, he enters the arboreal mythology of Rome and enacts his Romanness.¹⁵ Of course, a tree is not a garden on its own (although example 5 will through a different perspective on this), but in a city in which gardens are a feature, the accumulation of other individual trees (and gardens in which there are often architectural features) there is an element of the impressions of the one bleeding into the other.

A passage from Ovid demonstrates the importance of gardens as part of both the image of the city and of that image as part of the individual self-image.

¹² For the garden as 'a potential locus for historical memory', see Kuttner (1999: 9). One should observe here also that Virgil's Elysian Fields, a haven of Romanness (*Aen.* 6), are imagined with garden-like attributes.

¹³ Cf. Zanker (1988: 201-10); Beard and Henderson (2001: 168). Aeneases were widespread; we see an Aeneas and a Romulus on the doorposts of the Fullery of Ululutremulus at Pompeii which are thought to reflect statues in the Forum Augusti (Beard and Henderson 2001: 174). There is another flight of Aeneas as a panel on the Sebasteion porticoes ('an elaborate processional arcade') at Aphrodisias (Beard and Henderson 2001: 190). On the reception of Aeneas, see Erskine (2001). On 'multiples' see Gazda (1995); Bergmann (1995).

¹⁴ Cf. Kellum (1994: 218-9); von Stackelberg (2009: 89-93). See Kuttner (1999: 10, 32 n.32) for antecedents.

¹⁵ The city embodied and displayed their Romanness for its citizens (Pliny *NH* 36.101-2 on Rome's embodiment of 800 years of conquest; on the Forum Augustus, see Ov. *Fast.* 5.545-98; cf. Zanker 1988:201-5, 209-15; Beard and Henderson 2001: 164-75; on art, architecture, and the politics of urban design, cf. Beard and Henderson 2001: 147-202). However, the Augustan city is a dynamic and pluralistic entity with a capacity to include the visions of many individuals as well as 'to incorporate and represent the unfolding saga' of Roman identity (Beard and Henderson 2001: 175). In this sense, the many thousands of statues of Augustus commissioned and erected voluntarily by individuals across the Roman world may allow us to think of 'Augustus' as a collective concept (Stewart 2008: 112), but one which contains its own tensions too. In his celebration of the New Rome (*AA* 3.113-128), Ovid uses perhaps embarrassingly similar terms to those of Augustus, who, according to Suetonius (*Divi Augusti Vita* 28) believed that he had found a brick city and left a marble one.

- 3) Tempus erat nec me peregrinum ducere caelum,
nec siccam Getico fonte levare sitim,
Sed modo, quos habui, vacuos secedere in hortos,
nunc hominum visu rursus et urbe frui.
Sic animo quondam non divinante futura
optabam placide vivere posse senex. (Ovid *Tristia* 4.8.25-8)

It was not the time for me to breath a foreign sky, nor lighten parched thirst with a Getic spring, but to retire now into the empty gardens I once had, now to enjoy the sight of humans and the city – That is how once I prayed to live a peaceful old age, but my mind was not aware of the future.

Here, in one of his exile poems, Ovid – on the margins of the Black Sea – conjures up an imaginary Rome whose salient features are his own gardens, the sight of the urban inhabitants, and the visual impact of the city itself. His audience, meanwhile, back in Rome itself, conjures up from reading these same lines an imaginary picture of the wastes where Ovid is actually writing. In a sort of conceptual chiasmus, the real Rome with its gardens contains the both reader and the mental model of Tomis which the reader makes from the exile poems, while Tomis itself contains both Ovid and his poetic construction of Rome with its gardens and people. The city, the life of the city, and the city's gardens are part of Ovid's picture of what his life ought to be, and his own gardens are specifically aligned with the city which contains them. We may think that the reader (in Rome) corresponds to Ovid (in Tomis), and that the poems have some sort of reality in both places, linking reader and poet, but the gardens are 'empty' because Ovid is not there, but in Tomis and this emphasises the imbalance embodied in Ovid's translocation. In the poem, Ovid uses these gardens to embody the gulf between his sense of identity and Romanness, on the one hand, and his physical location in an alien setting on the other. Given the dangers and discomfort Ovid repeatedly attributes to Tomis, his gardens are implicated in a contrast between safe home and dangerous foreign parts, and this contrast has a close connection with the architecture of the garden and the house to which I shall return later in this paper.

In the lines from Ovid's *Tristia*, the garden in the poem is a lens through which Ovid sees his former life in Rome.¹⁶ Indeed, in all the material adduced so far, the subject sees through the literal garden other more metaphorical possibilities. This theme is more explicitly present in the examples I now turn to (examples 4-8).

The garden experienced by the subject is always a particular garden in a particular place, enclosed by a clear boundary and thereby separated from a qualitatively

¹⁶ Purcell (1996c: 125) cites an inscription in which the tomb-lot becomes, as well as their monument, the eternal home, farm, and gardens of Hostius Pamphilus and his wife (*CIL* 6.9583). Here, somewhat as with Ovid, the home and garden unite to embody the couple's former life.

differentiated outside world, but its situation is nonetheless ambiguous. A garden, as well as being a physical artefact is a palimpsest of possibly multiple other dimensions. Two passages, one from the Elder Pliny and the other from the Elder Seneca, illustrate this further in a quite direct way. (We may also see in them an echo of the way in which some of the passages quoted earlier show how the subject's experience of a garden contributes to his construction of his identity.)

- 4) iam in fenestris suis plebs urbana imagine hortorum cotidiana oculis rura praebebant, antequam praefigi prospectus omnes coegit multitudinis innumerae saeva latrocinatio. (Pliny *NH* 19.59)

Indeed the urban plebs used to serve the countryside up for their eyes each day in their windows with imitation gardens before the atrocious brigandage in huge numbers forced all the prospects to be shut up.

- 5) sub hac arbuscula imaginabar divitum silvas
(Seneca *Controversiae* 5.5.24 [Rich Man has burned Poor Man's tree – and house])

Beneath this little tree I used to imagine the forests of the rich.

In the first passage, the urban window box is for its plebeian owner an imaginary garden.¹⁷ In the other, the stereotypical declamatory poor man imagines the woods or forests (*silvae*) of the rich while under his single tree. For him, his domestic tree has become a garden through which he sees other bigger gardens – those of the rich.¹⁸ These, in turn, by being called *silvae* imagine that they are forests, part of a huge and non-urban world of nature.¹⁹ We may be reminded of how Ovid in exile imagines his gardens in Rome, especially if we emphasise the rhetorical context of the passage in Seneca, since the poor man is here actually remembering the single tree which was his garden and mourning its loss and the loss of his former way of life.

This passage can be pressed a little further to reveal another imaginary dimension, a literary one. The elite declaimer presents plays the part of the poor man whose one tree provided him with a whole imaginary garden as performing an imaginative act under this tree (*imaginabar*) so that we can see either the declaimer or the poor man (or both) as

¹⁷ On this passage, see Linderski (2001); Pliny is talking about window boxes, and not paintings. But the issue of theft must be an exaggeration. It would impact less on the upper floors of *insulae*, and lower floors relatively rarely had windows. Purcell (1996: 123) takes the sense quite differently, as seeing the countryside out of the window as an image of gardens). On window boxes, cf. also Martial 11.18, a whimsical and conceited play on the window box as an imaginary garden (see Spencer 2010: 142).

¹⁸ The garden as a sign of aspiration is reflected in 'some property owners' disproportionate investment of space in gardens, rather than in 'useful' rooms' in Pompeii (Stewart 2008: 51).

¹⁹ Pliny (*NH* 19.50-1) reports country villas inside the city. See Zanker (1998) for 'a rural idyll within the city' at Pompeii.

indulging in a bucolic posture. In Virgil's *Eclogues*, the herdsman sitting under the shade of a tree composing song is a programmatic and recurrent assemblage. We are not told that Seneca's poor man is sitting, but, given the bucolic archetype and his location 'under' the tree, we surely visualise him so.

We will see another bucolic garden posture shortly, but before proceeding to it, a passage in Cicero provides us with another case of one garden being a lens through which the subject sees another.²⁰ Whereas the declaimer's poor man sees in his one-tree garden an image of richer gardens, one of the elements present in the extract from Cicero is that for a moment he sees an affluent villa-garden as a trading market-garden. Again, there is an additional literary element. Perhaps in Cicero's case the imaginative play is subtler, but one complication present in the declamatory passage no longer applies, for here there is no question about whose imagination is the primary home of the literary resonance.

- 6) quamquam ea villa quae nunc est tamquam philosopha videtur esse quae obiurget ceterarum villarum insaniam; verum tamen illud additum delectabit. topiarium laudavi; ita omnia convestivit hedera, qua basim villae, qua intercolumnia ambulationis, ut denique illi palliati topiarium facere videantur et hederam vendere. (Cicero *ad Quintum fratrem* 3.1.5)

Although the villa as it now is seems to have a philosophical character, which might rebuke the madness of the other villas. And yet that addition will be pleasing. I praised your landscape gardener: he has so clothed everything with ivy, the foundation-wall of the villa and the spaces between the columns of the walk, that those Greek statues seemed to be engaged in landscape gardening, and to be selling ivy.

Cicero imagines the statues in a garden as metamorphosed into humans by the nature of the setting. The ivy covered statues seem to be landscape gardeners offering their ivy for sale. We can see here an inverse of the typical metamorphoses found in Greco-Latin poetry.²¹ In those metamorphic tales, a human protagonist is set in an artificial poetic representation of nature and is turned into a plant or stone, say; in the passage from Cicero's letter, the stone in the garden's artificial version of nature becomes human. A rather complex play of the mind arises from this, in which two other 'gardens' are superimposed on the aristocratic villa-garden which contains the statues. In the mind's eye, this villa-garden can be seen as doubly metamorphosed, into both a market-garden and, at the same time, into the kind of mythic landscape which is the natural home of poetic

²⁰ People are never *just* 'viewers' and I use the term 'subject' (i.e. the individual locus of subjective experience) to represent the person who in some capacity or other has some engagement with a garden. Dixon Hunt (2004) uses the category of 'implied viewer'.

²¹ Topiary is a valued metamorphic feature of Roman gardens. Pliny (*NH* 12.13) attributes its invention to an equestrian friend of Augustus, C. Matius. See also Pliny *NH* 12.22; 16.76; 16.140; Pliny *Ep.* 5.6.35-6; Hartswick (2004: 15).

metamorphosis. Indeed, in the replacement of gods and lovers with clients and salespeople there is perhaps something culturally akin to the kind of humour that humanises epic by taking the monster out of the Cyclops and turning him into a moping unrequited lover (Theocr. *Id.* 11 and thence *V. Ecl.* 2).

We can see the effect of an imaginary garden visible through a real one as analogous to the *trompe l'oeil* garden paintings which are a feature of Roman art and domestic architecture (and to which I shall return further below). In the garden room at the villa of Livia at Prima Porta,²² for example, the guest enters a room upon whose four walls a continuous garden scene is painted, unbroken except by the door of entry. As he enters he becomes someone entering not a walled room, but a pergola open on all four sides to a garden; this garden is imaginary (because it is a painting), but it is also transformed. Not only is it full of mythological resonances,²³ but also, at whatever time of year the guest enters, the inclusion of flowers which do not belong to one season makes this painted garden share the timelessness and winter-free benevolence of the Golden Age and bestow it, for a while, upon the guests who are present.

In all of these examples the garden – even the window box – is a medium through which something other than superficial reality is seen as well as that reality. The corollary to the imaginative transformation of the visible garden is that the subject himself undergoes a sort of transformation and becomes part of the imagined scene. In example 6 above, Cicero is a witness of a metamorphosis and is therefore a part of the imaginary metamorphosis narrative (just as the partridge is, who witnesses the fall and transformation of Perdix; *Ov. Met.* 8.236-59). We see here a touch of the very Roman element of role play,²⁴ which I will now further exemplify with some lines from an anonymous elegy on the death of Maecenas. In these lines the element of role play is much more explicit and in them the garden is more consciously used as a setting for the enactment of the urban citizen's literary and cultural identity.

7) maluit umbrosam quercum lymphasque cadentes
paucaque pomosi iugera certa soli:
Pieridas Phoebumque colens in mollibus hortis
sederat argutas garrulus inter avis (*Elegiae in Maecenatem* 1.33-6)

²² On this room and its painting, see further at p.000 below.

²³ See further Gabriel (1955); Kellum (1994). There is also a concentration of Augustan symbolism (see Kellum: 1994 and Reeder: 2001).

²⁴ Role play is endemic in Roman society (see Jones 2007: 133-6). We find it in the seminal arena of the declamation hall, in the stagification of much house - decoration, in the persona of the besotted lover of elegy, and at another level in the literary allusion of the *persona* in love elegy, as – say – when Propertius and Cynthia are respectively Penelope and Odysseus in *Elegies* 4.7; again Horace is a Homeric hero in *Sat.* 1.9 and *Odes* 2.7. We find Romans playing the roles assigned by social level (Seneca *thanks* Nero after being dismissed, 'the end of all conversations with the emperor'; Tac. *Ann.* 14.53-6); we find all sorts of mythological role play more or less ineptly taken on by almost everybody in Petronius' *Satyrical*.

He preferred the shady oak and falling waters, and a few sure acres of fruit-bearing ground: cultivating the Muses and Apollo in soft gardens, he sat loquacious among the clear-voiced birds.

In these lines from an elegy praising the dead Maecenas, the vocabulary is distinctively bucolic. In Virgil's *Eclogues* the recurrent setting of the archetypally bucolic song exchange is shade from trees by a stream and all these elements are present here. In addition, the oak is one of the regular eclogical trees; fruit trees make frequent appearances, and sitting is a typical posture for the bucolic herdsman. There are not very many birds in Theocritus' pastoral *Idylls* or Virgil's *Eclogues*, but they are present in the idea of the bucolic landscape because of Lucretian bucolic (*DRN* 5.1379-1411).²⁵ The herdsmen in the *Eclogues* meet and sing.²⁶ Here, Maecenas is cultivating the Muses and Apollo and he has a clear musical voice (*garrulus*). He must be singing. If this were real life he would be scribbling verse on wax tablets, as Catullus does in *Carm.* 50, but that is easily represented in poetry as singing.²⁷ Given the setting of shady oak and falling water, Maecenas must be read as using the garden setting as the stage for his playing of a bucolic role and, at the same time, transforming his own Esquiline Gardens (we readily infer that these gardens are alluded to) into a bucolic landscape.²⁸ Naively, we might wonder how many times Maecenas had to pose like this for it to become part of his image, but he need never actually have sung, or composed poetry, in his gardens. The point of the lines in the posthumous elegy is to hand the reader an imaginative and memorable icon. What is important for present purposes is that they consolidate the idea that the garden is a natural setting for self-dramatisation and depend on the plausibility of the garden setting allowing this kind of metaphorical film to be superimposed on it.

The garden, enclosed by wall and separated from the outside world of *negotium*, provides a nurturing setting for the self-impersonations and role-plays of its owners and guests.²⁹ In the next example we see a republican aristocrat engaging in a yet more explicitly realised and elaborate literary role-play.

8) Apros quidem posse haberi in leporario nec magno negotio ibi et captivos et cicuris, qui ibi nati sint, pingues solere fieri scis, inquit, Axi. Nam quem fundum in Tusculano

²⁵ On Lucretian 'bucolic', cf. Jones (2011: 19-22). For birds in the *Eclogues*, see Jones (2011: 40).

²⁶ On nature as a place for poetic inspiration, see Hor. *Epp.* 2.2.77; Pliny *Ep.* 9.10.2; Tac. *Dial.* 9.6, 12.1; Juv. 7.58-9; cp. also Cic. *ad Fam.* 6.18.5; Myers (forthcoming: '23-34'). The opening of Plato's *Phaedrus* shows a quasi-bucolic setting with stream and plane-tree as a place for poetic memory, imagination, and discussion. See also Spencer (2010: 26-30) and Newlands (2011) *ad loc.* on Statius *Silvae* 2.3 and Atedius Melior's plane tree.

²⁷ Maecenas did, of course, write poetry – fragments indicate a post-Catullan mode, although here he is a Tityrus or Meliboeus.

²⁸ Roman and bucolic characters within Virgil's *Eclogues* also behave like the Maecenas at *Elegiae in Maecenatem* 1.33-6: Virgil assumes the role of Menalcas (*Ecl.* 5; 9) and has Gallus play the Dying Daphnis (*Ecl.* 10), and Remmius Palaemon (Suet. *Gramm.* 23) read himself into the song-judge in the third *Eclogue*. On bucolic charades, see Jones 2011: 103-111.

²⁹ For the garden as self-display, cf. Beard (1998: 32).

emit hic Varro a M. Pupio Pisone, vidisti ad bucinam inflatam certo tempore apros et capreas convenire ad pabulum, cum ex superiore loco e palaestra apris effunderetur glans, capreis victa aut quid aliud. Ego vero, inquit ille, apud Q. Hortensium cum in agro Laurenti essem. Ibi istuc magis thraikikos fieri vidi. Nam silva erat, ut dicebat, supra quinquaginta iugerum maceria saepta, quod non leporarium, sed therotrophium appellabat. Ibi erat locus excelsus, ubi triclinio posito cenabamus, quo Orphea vocari iussit. Qui cum eo venisset cum stola et cithara cantare esset iussus, bucina inflavit, ut tanta circumfluxerit nos cervorum aprorum et ceterarum quadripedum multitudo, ut non minus formosum mihi visum sit spectaculum, quam in Circo Maximo aedilium sine Africanis bestiis cum fiunt venationes.

(Varro, *de Re Rustica* 3.13)

'You know, Axius,' Appius continued, 'that boars can be kept in the warren with no great trouble; and that both those that have been caught and the tame ones which are born there commonly grow fat in them. For on the place that our friend Varro here bought from Marcus Pupius Piso near Tusculum, you saw wild boars and roes gather for food at the blowing of a horn at a regular time, when mast was thrown from a platform above to the boars, and vetch or the like to the roes.' "Why," said he, "I saw it carried out more in the Thracian fashion at Quintus Hortensius's place near Laurentum when I was there. For there was a forest which covered, he said, more than fifty iugera; it was enclosed with a wall and he called it, not a warren, but a game-preserve. In it was a high spot where was spread the table at which we were dining, to which he bade Orpheus be called. When he appeared with his robe and harp, and was bidden to sing, he blew a horn; whereupon there poured around us such a crowd of stags, boars, and other animals that it seemed to me to be no less attractive a sight than when the hunts of the aediles take place in the Circus Maximus without the African beasts.'

In this anecdote about a dinner held by Q. Hortensius' in his Laurentan park we see an interactive Orpheus-performance.³⁰ The Orpheus role itself is taken by a slave (we might wonder whether the slave was always called Orpheus, or just for this particular occasion), but in that role he gathers food for Hortensius and his guests, so that they too are part of the drama. It is true that Orpheus is not a hunter or food-gatherer in the mythological repertoire, but it is a standard feature that when he sings animals and even trees gather around him (as at *Ov. Met.* 10.86-105). Moreover, the evidence of the amphitheatre shows that the Romans were fully capable of re-imagining mythological narratives in radical transformations.³¹ It might seem impractical that the animals gathered by our Orpheus'

³⁰ On this passage, see also Spencer (2010: 82-3). Von Stackelberg (2009: 83) discusses the same passage in the context of the garden as 'stage' (2009: 80-6).

³¹ See generally Coleman (1990), and for other kinds of revision of the Orpheus myth itself, Coleman (1990: 62-63).

horn-blowing were then caught, prepared, and eaten at the dinner described by Appius. However, the dinner was indeed prepared and eaten, and it is surely part of the drama of the occasion that that the guests imagine that they are eating the very beasts that Orpheus' legendary musical power has summoned for them, and in doing so they take part in a scene from virtual mythology for which the garden is the setting. Given the non-urban context of the Orpheus myth, the park is not just the place where Hortensius' piece of performance art occurs: it is an appropriate context which enables the performance to work at both a literal and theatrical level.³²

The range of material garden and garden-like types is very large. However, as we have seen, the typology is not stable: the subject can see through one garden another imaginary garden of a different type,³³ or a mythological scene.³⁴ The imaginary layers can also include the gardens of memory and mythology. In the Elder Pliny (*NH* 19.49-51), in a brief history of Roman gardens, the garden of the Greek philosopher Epicurus appears in the same context as the gardens of Alcinous, Adonis, and the Hesperides, together with the Hanging Gardens of Babylon. For the Romans, these had all become part of the garden of the mind.³⁵ These other gardens behind the material ones visible to the subject become building blocks for the construction of the identity projected by the individual. Cicero's Tusculan garden contained Greek works of art and a statue of Plato (*ad Att.* 1.4; 1.6; 1.8-11). This philosophical decoration recalled not only Epicurus' garden itself, but also Cicero's own walk, via the garden of Epicurus, to the groves of the Academy in Athens (along with M. Piso, Atticus, and his brother Quintus). In addition, it recalled his account of this walk in *De finibus bonorum et malorum* 5.1.1-3. The more or less permanent installation of the Tusculan Garden, the ephemeral event of the walk, and the literary embodiment of the same walk aim at various partially overlapping audiences and reinforce each other in solidifying Cicero's presentation of himself as belonging to the succession of philosophers.³⁶

Cicero's Tusculan garden is a piece of organised self-impersonation as a man of importance in a significant strand of Roman cultural life.³⁷ In the same period, gardens can be seen to perform analogous functions in military and political self-presentations. 'Lucullus, Pompey, and Caesar all used their gardens to further their own political agenda, either as a symbol of personal power, evidence of military success, or a vehicle of communication' (von

³² Pliny records a dinner held for himself and 18 guests in a hollow tree by Licinius Mucianus, and a dinner held by Caligula in an arboreal dining room capacious enough for 15 guests and their servants (*NH* 12.3.9).

³³ Hunt (1997).

³⁴ Bergmann (1998).

³⁵ Pliny connects luxury gardens within the city (Rome) with the garden of Epicurus, who is called the instigator of the practice (*NH* 19.50-1). Cf. Hartswick (2004), 16. On the garden of Epicurus see Clay (2009); Spencer 2010: 109. On the complex relation between the real and the imaginary garden cf. Hunt (1997); Pagán (2006), 1-2. For an echo of Alcinous in the garden of Manlius Vopiscus, see Stat. *Silv.* 1.3.81.

³⁶ See further Carroll (2003: 52-4). Atticus had a statue of Aristotle in his gardens; Cic. *ad Att.* 4.10.1, Hartswick (2004), 18. On the philosophical garden, see Myers (forthcoming) '13-16'. On Cicero's walk in *De finibus bonorum et malorum* 5, and on philosophical strolling, see O'Sullivan (2006).

³⁷ On such sculpture collections see Stewart 2008 43 citing also Cicero *Orator* 110; Seneca *Epistles* 64.9-10.

Stackelberg, 2009: 78).³⁸ Pompey's gardens provided a 'strategic display of political as well as military power' (Gleason 1994:13). The large gardens which performed these functions were not only present as a physical reality in the fabric of Rome, but took on an additional existence in another dimension in the references made by poets. This cross-media interplay with politics tends to acquire a more specific focus as the Augustan period proceeds.

There is a process at work in all these cases which is like that of producing a metaphor, of seeing one thing as another, and this is a cognitive process.³⁹ So far I have been dealing with pieces of evidence as snapshots of the mentality of the adult subject, and the imaginary transformations of the garden that we have seen so far are of a sophistication that belongs to the adult mind. However, there are dynamic and developmental issues involved in the experience of the garden as well. At any point, the garden (which has its own history and development) is part of the raw data of experience for the child of the latest generation, and this child is a growing thing. The nature of his experience and his mentality change with him. The relative importance of physical and cultural constituents changes as the child's mind acquires knowledge and undergoes acculturation. As the garden is a strong part of the child's environment and experience, we can look at the physical and social architecture of the garden as the context for the cognitive development that leads to the kind of adult perceptions illustrated so far, and thereby also broaden our picture of the consequences. In what follows, I am chiefly concerned with the male Roman aristocratic child, although the basic principles of the argument could be applied more widely.

The garden, as already observed, is multifarious in form and size. The public garden is bigger than the private urban domestic garden, but in the course of his growing up the subject's experience of the domestic garden fits into and begins both to fill, and be expanded by, his experience of the public garden. In this sense the domestic garden is seminal. Even among the villa-owning class, more Romans had a closer, more regular and more intimate, experience of the urban domestic garden than with villa parks and the large public gardens, since the courtyard garden is part of the residence, and the *domus* was close to the heart of the dweller.⁴⁰ This experience not only had an organic and multisensory wholeness, but had a temporal extension and continuity reaching back into infancy.⁴¹ The garden, the house, and the family are in intimate connection with each other from the very earliest moments of the citizen's life. This subjective experience must, therefore, be a strong

³⁸ Cf. Spencer 2010, 155-6. The gardens of Lucullus, as imperial property would have had restricted access, but Pompey's and Caesar's gardens were publically accessible. Kuttner (1999) connects Pompey's park with the iconography of world conquest (on which see also Nicolet (1991), 1-56), and sketches how it figures in contemporary and later poetry. See further Spencer (2010), 167-71. On the element of political display from the late republic into the Augustan period, see von Stackelberg (2009), 74-80. On the imperialistic significance of imported plants see Pollard 2009 and cf. Pliny *NH* 12.111 and Sen. *Contr.* 5.5; Meiggs 1982 276-8

³⁹ See further, n.51 below.

⁴⁰ The emotional centrality of the house as the physical symbol of the family is reflected in Cicero's treatment of the separation of family from its home at *Philippics* 12.14.8-10. On the house as a marker of identity for its owner, see Stewart (2008 41-53); Hales (2003).

⁴¹ On children and childhood in the Roman world, see Mantle (2002); Rawson (2003); Huntley (2011).

factor in the citizen's cognitive development. This will allow us to consider his experience of the architecture of the house and garden as evidence for the shape of the mind.

The perceived physical patterns of the places in which the infant Roman aristocrat lived are fundamental formative influences. It is not the garden alone that matters; all domestic space (and the awareness of the outside) does.⁴² Domestic space embodies domestic values, and it is always there as the child is growing, always repeating its lessons. However, a number of features had the potential to give the child's garden-experience a special emphasis. The multisensory nature of the garden-experience is a strong cognitive catalyst;⁴³ the child is likely to have been in the garden more than in the *triclinium* (for example), and while the child was not always in the garden, the relative freedoms allowed to play, activity, and behaviour that are possible there are likely to have given the place itself a special quality. The location of the peristyle within the *domus* is a continuous non-verbal indication that it is central and safe, and thus potentially marked out as important and relatively free from constriction.⁴⁴ The citizen's cognitive map of the larger Roman world is based on foundations laid in infancy and expands from there, and the garden has a seminal influence in this process.

Before we proceed any further, some observations about cognitive processes and development are necessary. Before we speak or write, the world is already taking shape for us. Before we speak we are already the sentient locations of subjective experience. We see, hear, smell, taste, and feel; we are spoken to, fed, warmed, moved from room to room, crawl and so forth. All the while, we are building up pre-verbal cognitive patterns which underpin our understanding of the environment. An illustration of this kind of pattern which is used in cognitive psychology is the 'figure on a ground' model: when 'two areas share a common boundary, the *figure* has a distinct shape with clearly defined edges. In contrast the *ground* is the region that is left over, forming the background ... The figure also seems closer to us and more dominant than the ground' (Matlin 2005: 36).⁴⁵ The object on the table is (generally) more interesting at first sight than the table. It can be picked up; perhaps it can be used or eaten ... Matlin goes on to observe that even young infants show such 'Gestalt principles of organisation' (2005: 36). The abstractness of the figure on a ground motif indicates how widely transferable it is in real experience, and points us towards

⁴² Domestic space is gendered and temporal: it provides a different experience when the home-owner is out and about doing masculine things, while the women, slaves and children are left, from when the homeowner is present. On temporal space, see Laurence (1994: 122-32). On the garden as gendered space, cf. von Stackelberg (2009: 70-72). For space syntax analysis, see von Stackelberg (2009: 49-60).

⁴³ See further, n. 61 below.

⁴⁴ The *domus*-peristyle begins to appear in *atrium* plan of the *domus* from the third century BC. It seems to be drawn from Greek culture in the form of public buildings rather than from private gardens and can be seen as part of the 'theatrical' tendency of Roman architecture; see Carroll (2003: 31-2); von Stackelberg (2009: 21, 23). For the historicisation of the peristyle to deep antiquity, see Kuttner (1999: 10) and cf. Purcell (1996c: 121-2). See further, Dickmann (1997).

⁴⁵ See further Matlin (2005: 31-66); Kelly and Grossberg (2000); Palmer (1999); Quinn et al. (2002). This pattern-creation facility underpins the perception, understanding, and use of language; cf. Osgood and Bock (1977); Jones (1991: 26); Fauconnier (1994); Hofstadter (2001); Matlin (2005: 58-66); Turner (2006).

understanding how physical structure becomes part of cognitive structure.⁴⁶ At a less abstract level, for the infant and child, experience says that inside is safe and warm, and outside is unpredictable, unknown: the one pair of concepts becomes aligned with the other. How do we reach this point from the experimental model of the figure on a ground?

Concept formation and acquisition is a much debated area in cognitive psychology,⁴⁷ but it is broadly true to say that the development of concepts and conceptualisation is the product of an interplay between new information from the outside world which 'is taken into your cognitive system and is somehow influenced by your general knowledge. This knowledge allows you to go beyond the information in the stimulus in a useful productive fashion' (Matlin 2005 247).⁴⁸ Somewhat more specifically, Hofstadter (2001) argues that the transferability and development of concepts depends on analogy, which he sees as central to cognition (and which starts operating before the development of the more peripheral process of reasoning). The infant chunks infant-scaled quanta of experience into infant-concepts, and in the course of development these concepts grow in size and number by analogy and a recursive process of being amalgamated in larger and larger concepts. For the more developed subject, analogy-making is an intuitive and often inexplicit 'mental mapping onto each other of two entities – one old and sound asleep in the recesses of long-term memory, the other new and gaily dancing on the mind's center stage' (Hofstadter 2001). The resemblance of analogy and 'mapping onto' to metaphor and seeing one thing through another, which were important motifs earlier in this paper, is clear, and we should remember as well that the Romans were receptive to the idea of the architecture of the house being explicitly applicable to a meta-level of intellectual content (this lies behind the use of the house as a mnemonic structure recommended by Cicero and Quintilian; Quintilian 11.2.20-4; cf. *ad Herennium* 3.29; Cic. *de Oratore* 2.350-60).⁴⁹

We may not be able to track the cognitive development of the Roman child in detail, but we know the beginning and end points (infancy and adulthood) and can place some of the intervening points on a sequential timescale well enough for present purposes.⁵⁰ As observed above, in the course of cognitive development, there is an interplay between new information from external reality and already existing general knowledge. The subject's experience of external reality, however, is not static: it grows with the child, and so we find

⁴⁶ Cf. Spirn (1998); Hillier and Hanson (1984). There is, necessarily, feedback, as linguistic structures become part of the processing of spatial experience: see Spencer (2010: 49-50).

⁴⁷ For some of the main models for concept formation and acquisition, see Potter and Wetherell, (1987); Pinker (1997); Fodor (1998); Hofstadter (2001); Ratcliff (2006). On recursion, language, and cognition, see van den Hulst (2010). The interaction of emotions and conceptual development is still being integrated into cognitive psychology; see Gray, Braver, and Raichle (2002); Duncan and Barrett (2007).

⁴⁸ See further, Matlin (2005: 245-94).

⁴⁹ Cf. Spencer (2010: 161-2) with bibliography of contemporary approaches to memory; von Stackelberg (2009: 64).

⁵⁰ On cognitive development throughout the lifespan, see Matlin (2005: 451-93). On cognitive maps and mental models see Craik (1975); Cosgrove and Daniels (1988); Agnew and Duncan (1989); Barnes and Duncan (1992); Gould and White (1992); Porteous (1990); Tuan (1993); Tilley (1994); Kitchen (1994); Bryant (1998); Tversky (2000); Tilley (2004); Massey (2004); Matlin (2005: 229-42); Jones (2011: 116, 142, 146). On lived space, cf. von Stackelberg (2009: 52-3), citing Soja (1996).

a roughly concentric set of insides and outsides superimposed on each other over time. What the subject has learned from the smaller circles is successively transferred outwards.⁵¹ At first, the infant lives in a limited world, sheltered and nurtured in the *domus* and perhaps mainly limited to particular parts of it; outside this is *terra incognita*. The inside expands as the child begins to walk (but the original smaller 'inside' retains a special sense of homeliness, comfort within the new larger 'inside') and the outside is less wholly unknown, but becomes a shadowy region of discomfort and potential danger. Outside the house could be mobs, poor people, complicated streets with cut-throats and thieves (of course, children did get outside the *domus*, but with supervision; Huntley 2011:83-7). Inside the house, on the other hand, are the garden, the family, the family slaves, and immediate access to shelter. Within the house, as the infant becomes a child there is an increase in the differentiation of behaviour according to location, for although the Roman house did not contain special children-only, or specifically children-friendly, areas, the expectations of the child's behaviour varied according to where in the house they were (Wallace-Hadrill 1994: 9-10; Huntley 2011). Since play is an integral part of the child's development (Fromberg and Bergen: 1998; Goldman: 1998), issues of where to play, where not, and what kind of play is allowed all have a strong formative role in the conceptualisation of boundaries.⁵² It should also be noted that the identity of the garden as a place where the child can play and the role-playing element of much child-play have a direct impact on the use of gardens for the adult role-playing already discussed (see examples 6-8 above).⁵³

The young adult citizen lives in the *domus*, but is also at home in the urban environs and used to a greater plurality of domestic interiors, whereas outside the dangers, and the preparations needed for excursions, are more consciously rationalised. The adult still lives in the *domus* (or multiple homes and villas), but outside the home are the choppy seas of politics, business, *negotium*, or indeed military activity.

The adult is at home in the city and perhaps in other Italian towns as well, though care still needs to be exercised in the spaces between the urban centres. Outside the city there are brigands and highwaymen. Even so, an extended homely inside can now incorporate Italy, or perhaps the Roman world (with the *domus* still as the paradigm comfort zone), surrounded by an outside where dangerous foreign tribes and nations, barbarians, threaten war or revolt, and are known to be capable of destroying whole

⁵¹ For the process of cognitive transfer, see Meadows (1993: 81-7). Hofstadter (2001) explains in terms of analogy for this process. Fauconnier and Turner (1994) explain the mechanics using the terms 'blending' and 'projection onto middle spaces.' On spatial cognition, see Meadows (1993: 97-101). On children's use of concepts, see Meadows (1993: 101-118). The progression through a series of concentric circles described here naturally also involves social categorisation, on which cf. Tajfel (1969); Hillier and Hanson (1984); Billig (2002).

⁵² For children's freedom of access to parts of the house, see Huntley (2011: 83). For children playing, see Wallace-Hadrill (1994: 10, citing *Lucr.* 4.401-4; *V. Aen.* 7.379ff); Huntley (2011: 79-81). Of course, the child is also increasingly exposed to adult social and cultural behaviour and discourse and is learning what a garden is from this as well.

⁵³ The adults can be seen as re-enacting and building on an aspect of their childhood. They can also be seen to be consolidating the concept of what a garden is; effectively, they are creating the garden which becomes the locus of the next generation's childhood development.

legions, and where climatic extremes replace the temperate zone of the homeland (praised in the *Georgics*) - frozen hyperboreans, torrid southern zones, the ultimate *Britanni*, and the semimythical Indians.

The successive layers of innerness are concentric. Just as Cicero uses the house as a physical symbol of the family, emphasising its emotional centrality at *Philippics* 12.14.8-10, so the Romans saw the patron-client relationship (essentially based in the *domus* and the *urbs*) as the paradigm for the larger scale relationship between Rome and the provinces.⁵⁴ For each Roman citizen, the innermost of the concentric circles is similar in character to that of any other, although in spatial and other terms there are multiple differences: this infant lives in this house, and not that one. It has a fresco of Aeneas leaving Troy, and not of Polyphemus wooing Galatea. He has two visiting aunts, not three. The *domus* is in Pompeii or Mantua and not Rome or Cremona. However, this innermost circle comes to resemble and overlap with the similar innermost circles of the growing individual's friends and family, and the perception of the outermost outsides, consisting of the furthest semi-mythical places, is very much more uniform across the range of adult Roman citizens.

Returning to the house, we should observe that the whole house is not all equally 'inside'. Many pass the front door without being allowed in.⁵⁵ Some, clients, are allowed in as far as the atrium for the *salutatio*.⁵⁶ Some, more intimate, are allowed in as far as the *tablinum* to discuss matters with the owner, as far as or a *cenaculum* to eat dinner with the host and with other guests. The most intimate part, and to which the closest intimates - or grandest guests (Vitruvius 6.5.2) - are invited, is the garden. The most public part is the *atrium*, not only frequented by the clients who attended the *salutatio*, but also visible – in a glimpse, at least – through the narrow entryway (*fauces*) from the street.⁵⁷ Thus, the inside-outside dyad is relative - there is a gradient of innerness.⁵⁸

In this sense as well as architecturally, the garden is innermost, and only the most privileged guests reach it, although paradoxically it is outside in the sense of being in the

⁵⁴ Cf. Rich (1989).

⁵⁵ Cf. Grahame (2000).

⁵⁶ Cf. Leach (2004: 21-8).

⁵⁷ There were doors (and janitors), but the doors would normally be open; Livy's description of Camillus at Tusculum states that the doors were all open when he entered the city, signifying normality (Livy 6.25.9).; for Pompeian doors, see Adam 1994 292ff. Typically the doorway at the far end of the atrium from the front entrance and *fauces* is wide – wider than the *fauces* itself – and the passer-by could perhaps see right through so long as no doorway curtains were in place; however, the strip of visibility would be narrow, and at some distance (on the partial view from the street, see Hales (2003: 107-22)). On public and private in the *domus*, see Grahame (1997); Hales (2003: 132-4, 162-3). On doors and internal boundaries, see Lauritsen (2011); Lauritsen (forthcoming).

⁵⁸ On the gradient of intimacy within the Roman house see Clarke (2003: 222). Stewart (2008: 46, 52-3); cf. Riggsby (1997); Kuttner (1999:10); von Stackelberg (2009: 67-9). Wallace-Hadrill (1994: 10-14) and von Stackelberg (2009: 62) have a double-axised gradience, with humble-grand on one axis, and public-private on the other. Gradience holds good even if room use is not fully stable (see Allison 1993, 2001, 2007; Leach 1997; Hales 2003: 122-34). Evidence from internal doors at Pompeii may reinforce this impression (Lauritsen: forthcoming). For the sake of setting parameters, Jansen (1997) on private toilets at Pompeii is useful.

open air.⁵⁹ However, this open-air quality differentiates the garden and makes it special, and we can pursue this further. The garden has plants, a fountain or fountains,⁶⁰ air-movement, wetness and dryness, and smells. It is subject to seasonal variation both in terms of how it looks and how it feels to be there. Being in the garden is a more fully textured multisensory experience than being indoors, and thereby all the more multiply inscribed in the child's cognitive patterns.⁶¹ 'We should picture the Roman child in the garden as the arena for a complex mix of simultaneous bodily and mental experiences which create a holistic and typologically dense experiential model, packed with meanings' (Jones 2011, 182 n163). Learning the geography of the house-garden dyad is a way of learning the etiquette of the home and *familia*, levels of intimacy and privacy, and degrees of friendship, and it is also a way of learning a set of patterns that can be expanded to fit the larger worlds the developing individual will have to engage with.

There is another architectural paradox in the peristyle. The *domus*-garden pair correspond in an intuitive way to the town-country dyad. However, in the *domus* the plant-life is surrounded by the architectural element, whereas in the *Urbs*, the architectural assemblage is surrounded by the natural element, the countryside. Nevertheless, the *Domus* is still an image or mental model⁶² of the *urbs* and is located within *urbs* itself; here again we see one inside-outside pattern nests inside another inside-outside,⁶³ contributing to the whole set of insides and outsides nesting within each other. The repeatability of the underlying pattern is profoundly reinforcing. So we return yet again to the idea of recursion, known by some as *mise en abyme*, or the 'Droste effect' (after the cocoa package design).⁶⁴ Thinking in terms of the house as a mental model, we should be aware of the ubiquity of mental modelling as a cognitive process and how it always implies some recursive element. The model is an image of part of the world inside the totality of the world. The child may hold the model, but in his imagination he is in the model too; he may be in the garden, but he is also play-acting a role in an outer world. He may already be animating the garden statues like Cicero (example 6). He is both actor and witness of his own acting, like Maecenas in his bucolic posturing (example 7). The *domus*-garden pattern, as a model of a

⁵⁹ Cf. Hales (2003: 131), who draws attention to the fact that the *atrium* is also open to the sky, although in a more limited sense.

⁶⁰ On water features, see von Stackelberg (2009: 39-41).

⁶¹ Multisensory teaching styles are much written about: Dunn and Dunn (1978); Honey and Mumford (1982); Gardner (1983); Kolb (1984); Curry (1990); Sprenger (2003); Pashler et al. (2009). Classroom applications are strongly disputed (see e.g. Hall (2004) and Coffield et al (2004)), although the DfES endorses Learning Style based approaches (cf. www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/thinkingskills/resources), However, irrespective of the educational practices based on the importance of 'learning styles', the power of multisensory reinforcement in cognition and cognitive development is clear: see Matlin (2005).

⁶² For mental models see Matlin (2005: 229-42) and n.50 above. For the *domus* as a re-applicable mental model see above on Quintilian 11.2.20-4.

⁶³ Agrippa's map of the Empire was housed in the Porticus Vipsania (Pliny *NH* 3.17), built by himself and his sister, but completed by Augustus (Dio 55.8.3-4). There was a garden attached, which Martial could imagine as his own when he saw it from his *cenaculum* (Mart. 1.108.3). We are close, here, to having a garden complex, itself an image of the urban centre and the outside, containing another sort of image of the urban centre (Rome) and the outside (Empire).

⁶⁴ On recursion, see nn. 11 and 47 above.

whole set of inners and outers, influences the way the subject's thinking about the world develops, but in addition, as observed above, the element of imagination in child-play prepares for the adult flights of imagination we considered earlier.

The concept of inside-outside entails a boundary. The safe is enclosed within, and protected from, the dangers without. Inside are memories and the emotional narratives binding the past to the present; we may usefully remember Cicero's 'often movingly expressed determination to immortalize his dead daughter, Tullia, in a landscape-park setting' (Spencer 2010: 64). Outside are different possible futures. Of course, the relationships within vary from *domus* to *domus* and for some the home is a place of oppression and distress. Clodia's behaviour is transgressive when she (according to Cicero; *pro Caelio* 36) uses her gardens to watch men swimming and choose lovers, but she too shows how the boundary between inside and outside can be problematic – something to come to terms with or to escape from.⁶⁵ I return to the garden now for some further thought about boundaries. In any account of the garden one of the core elements is enclosedness. The garden is an enclosed space, separated from an outside. Pushing this a little further, since, for example, a room is also an enclosed space, the garden is an urban-cultural enclosed green space (it is urban, because even the villa gardens outside the city belong to aristocratic urban culture). The garden, as Purcell says (1987) 'mediates between ideals associated with rural nature and urban civilisation'. Fundamental to its mediatory role is the fact that its boundary is porous. It is porous in the obvious sense that guests enter and leave, and the owner leaves and returns. In the garden, the owner hosts his guests for a while, and they indulge in social activity (archaeological evidence attests dining equipment permanently installed in many gardens); there are poetry readings, attested in the real world by Juvenal (*Sat.* 1.12), and reflected in world of poetry by the song exchanges in the bucolic verse. The subject in the garden can also look across class boundaries, for the host and guests may watch and be amused by the slaves working (Pliny *Ep.* 2.17.24; 5.6.9), perhaps even while they listen to bucolic accounts of the Arcadians moving sheep and then sitting in the shade. The host and guests may fantasize about metamorphosis, and their dramatisations of themselves as Romans may cross into imaginary worlds of myth.⁶⁶ The *domus*-garden unit has multiple boundaries, and some are potentially difficult to deal with.

Given this background and the replication of boundaries at larger and larger scales in the Roman world, it is no coincidence that at the tangible level, over and again, both in and

⁶⁵ On the sexualisation of the garden in literature, see Myers (forthcoming: '18-22'). On the eroticisation of the garden itself, cf. von Stackelberg (2009: 27-30, 97-9). The sexual excess of Clodia and some notorious imperial women is represented by Latin writers in the context of their use or appropriation of gardens; see Boatwright (1998: 71, 77-8); Beard (1998: 26-8). Mythological scenes of defloration or abduction of innocent women (e.g. Europa at Hor. *Odes* 3.27.29-32; Proserpina at Ov. *Met.* 5.391-401) show that garden-like settings mediate between ideas of innocence and loss of innocence; cf. also Catull. 62.39-47.

⁶⁶ There is also the use of the garden or garden features as erotic background. See von Stackelberg, (2009: 97-9); see also Stewart (2008: 42) on Epicureanism and Dionysus/Bacchus, satyrs, nymphs, and Maenads in Roman Villa art.

outside gardens we find that the Romans show a delight in the sense of boundaries being played with.⁶⁷ I have two examples here, one of Pliny's gardens and Livia's garden room.

- 9) est et alium cubiculum a proxima platano viride et umbrosum, marmore excultum podio tenus, nec cedit gratiae marmoris ramos insidentesque ramis aves imitata pictura.

There is another bedroom, green and shady from the nearest plane tree, which has walls decorated with marble up to the dado and a fresco of birds perched on the branches of trees, which does not yield to the grace of the marble.

In this passage (*Ep.* 5.6.20-2), Pliny describes a bedroom into which the shade from the real tree outside enters – as though the bedroom is in a bucolic setting – and in which there is a fresco on the wall on which birds perch on the branches of trees as though they were also – like the real shade – part of the real outside. The room is arranged with a delight in playing with boundaries, the representation of boundaries, and levels of representation, a phenomenon we see over again in Roman art and architecture.⁶⁸ The garden room of Livia's villa at Prima Porta is an especially complex and noteworthy example.⁶⁹ The room is in a building, but when in the room the guest sees on all four walls the continuously unbroken painted garden. The walls are themselves a primary and physical boundary, but they are disguised with the painted gardenscape. However, in the painting there is actually a boundary, parallel to the real, but painted-over wall, in the form of the parapet. The parapet is low, and beyond it is another painted boundary, parallel to the parapet, and this is the fairly dense plantlife which comes up to the parapet and also recedes into some depth. Further behind this again, there is another boundary, this time only visible to the imagination, the ultimate garden wall of the painted garden, a wall which must coincide roughly – in the imagination – with the ultimate garden wall of the garden which actually surrounds the room we are in. The whole installation plays elaborately with the key garden notion of enclosure, and with levels of representation and reality.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ On boundaries and the garden, cf. von Stackelberg (2009: 96-100).

⁶⁸ Bergmann (2002).

⁶⁹ See further Gabriel (1955); Jashemski (1979), 79-80; Conan (1986); Bergmann (1992); Beard and Henderson (2001: 54-7); Kellum (1994); Leach (2004), 124-7; Giesecke (2007), 123-5; Zarmakoupi (2008). On Garden rooms see Kuttner (1999); Settis (2002); Leach (2004: 124-32); Spencer (2010: 155-61). On garden painting in general see Jashemski (1979: 55-87); Ling (1991: 149-52).

⁷⁰ The *trompe l'oeil* elements in Roman architectural and garden are relevant here (see Jones 2011: 118-21 130-2). Anecdotes in Pliny attest a widespread interest in – and esteem for – successfully illusionistic visual art; *NH* 35.155; 35.65; 35.23. Nobody is really fooled by these paintings, so we cannot understand this as Roman house-owners pretending to have grander homes than they actually did. According to Wallace Hadrill (1994: 25-8) such paintings 'allude' to greater wealth than the owner really possesses. However, the word seems to want to retain at least some of the flavour of 'illusion'. We should see this rather as the house owner enjoying sharing with his guests the aesthetic pleasure of allowing oneself to be deceived visually, and the sophisticated amusement of stepping into and out of the illusion.

A rather small section of the Roman aristocracy would see either Pliny's garden or Livia's garden room (though the publication of Pliny's letters is also to be born in mind). However, neither is a unique phenomenon. The kind of thing that Pliny describes is well known, and, while Livia's garden room may have an exceptional scale and quality, its essential features are well attested elsewhere.⁷¹ Both, then, not only exemplify the theme of 'playing with boundaries', but also exemplify a common feature of, or associated with, gardens that contributes to the experience and development of the aristocratic child in the garden. Of course, the garden is not made for children. It works in the child because it is there and because the child's mind is receptive; but it, along with other domestic space, also influences the thought patterns for the adult (cf. the discussion of examples 1-3). For the guests in Livia's garden room and Pliny's guests and typical readers, the nature of the decoration of the *domus* and garden (painting, statuary) and the social activity associated with each assume a higher prominence than for the child. Livia's garden room is a complex work of art which can prompt a multiplicity of thoughts at an explicit level, and Spencer (2010: 153) describes how a Roman citizen walking past the varied landscape-frescoes of a corridor in the Villa Farnesina (or other similar corridors) might, might come to 'a new way of perceiving the world and Rome's place within it.' The citizen may or may not see one or other of these, but will see many other such assemblages, over and over again. Moreover, Roman domestic garden architecture was to some extent the conscious expression of Roman ideas about life (Purcell 1987: 187) and by repeated exposure the adult citizen might well pick up both conscious and unconscious messages.⁷²

We are never just dealing with the subject and his experience of one garden (whether painted or physical), just as the image of the city is not dependant on one route through it (cf. Favro 1996: 24-41, 252-80). The subject's internalised mental model summarises numbers of his journeys through the city. Thus, the experience of one garden can incorporate previous experience of the same garden, and indeed one garden can become all gardens as what we see in one is added to the product of what we have seen in others (including imaginary ones). The garden alters the normal perceptions of space in another sense too: in the house room leads to room in a pattern of usability, and in the city outside streets function as larger scale replicants of domestic corridors. The house and the city are the *locus* of, represent, and embody *negotium* (on the house see Vitruvius 6.5). In the house and in the city (and indeed further afield) one proceeds from place A to place B, but in the garden everything is more synchronous and less goal directed – it embodies *otium*. Like the bucolic landscape, which it resembles, it is a space receptive to undirected reflection and unprompted thoughts and memories.⁷³ The citizen walks around or strolls

⁷¹ For analogous cross-media *trompe l'oeil* effects and the playing with levels of representation and reality, cf. Varro *RR* 3.5.11-12 with Purcell 1996: 144; Bergmann (2002b: 115-118) on the Villa at Oplontis; the facing against each other of real and painted pillars in the Hotel of A. Cossius Libanus (Jashemski 1964: 341-2); the House of Marcus Lucretius, where a picture-window of some 3m opens onto the garden at ground level 'so that the living landscape must have appeared like one more painted panel' (Bergmann 2008: 55-6).

⁷² On the involvement of the owner in design, cf. Purcell (1996c: 144).

⁷³ Cf. n.25 above.

about enjoying views that cross and recross and remember each other⁷⁴ as in an art gallery – as though, indeed, the garden is both the gallery and the art-object itself.⁷⁵ The citizen thus moves around, or just sits, with a temporary freedom from time and responsibilities which must at some level recall the state of childhood, childhood's experience of the garden, and the cognitive developments associated with it. At the same time, he is rehearsing his place in the world, engaging in the drama of individual, social, and cultural identity, and practicing on a scale-model of larger boundaries.⁷⁶

Adam, J.-P., *Roman Building; materials and techniques*; translated by Anthony Mathews (Routledge, London, 1994)

Agnew, J.A., and J.S. Duncan (edd.), *The Power of Place* (Cambridge, Allen and Unwin, 1989)

Allison, P.M., 'How do we identify the use of space in Roman houses?' in Moorman, E.M. (ed.), *Functional and Spatial Analysis of Ancient Wall Painting*, Proceedings of the fifth International Congress on Ancient Wall Painting, Amsterdam, 8-12 September 1992. Proceedings of the Dutch Institute in Rome 3 (Leiden, 1993), 1-8

Allison, P.M., 'Using the Material and Written Sources: Turn of the Millenium approaches to Roman Domestic Space', *AJA* 105 (2001), 181-208

Allison, P.M., 'Domestic Spaces and Activities', in Dobbins, J.J., and Foss, P.W. (edd.), *The World of Pompeii* (London, 2007), 269-278

Barnes, T., and J. Duncan (edd.), *Writing worlds: Discourse, Text and Metaphor in the Representation of Landscape* (London, Routledge, 1992)

Beard, M., 'Imaginary *Horti*: or up the garden path', in Cima, M., and La Rocca, E. (edd.), *Horti romani: Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Roma, 4-6 Maggio 1995* (Rome, 1998) 23-32

Beard, M., and Henderson, J., *Classical Art: from Greece to Rome* (Oxford, 2001)

Bergmann, B., 'Rhythms of Recognition: Mythical Encounters in the Roman Landscape', in de Angelis, F., and Muth, S (edd.), *Im Spiegel des Mythos. Bilderwelt und Lebenswelt* (Wiesbaden, 1998), 81-107

Bergmann, B., 'Painted Perspectives of a Villa visit: Landscape as Status and metaphor', in Gazda, E.K. (ed.), *Roman Art in the Private Sphere: New perspectives on the architecture and decor of the Domus, Villa, and Insula* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1991), 49-70

⁷⁴ Bergmann (1991). On 'the variety of spatial articulation provided by the peristyle', see von Stackelberg (2009: 61-2).

⁷⁵ Varro (*RR* 1.59) puts the words *oporotheca* and *pinacotheca* ('fruit gallery' and 'art gallery') in pointed proximity. Pliny comes close to calling his garden a work of art at *Ep.* 5.6.35-6 with the words *artificis* and *opera*, and the garden is 'signed' by its author in the form of topiary letters. The letters of Pliny's own name were also topiarised, perhaps making the garden into a collaboration between gardener and owner. On the 'creative adaption of natural order' inherent in the garden, see Purcell (1996c: 135-6); as he points out, the landscape architecture of gardening was called 'place-art' – *ars topiaria*.

⁷⁶ On *otium*, the stroll, thinking about things, and philosophy, especially in the context of the villa portico, see O'Sullivan (2006).

- Bergmann, B., 'Exploring the Grove: Pastoral space on Rome walls', in Hunt, J.D. (ed.), *The Pastoral Landscape: Studies in the History of Art 36* (Washington DC National Gallery of Art, 1992), 21-46
- Bergmann, B., 'Greek Masterpieces and Roman Recreative Fictions' *HSCPh* 97 1995 79-120
- Bergmann, B., 'Playing with Boundaries: Painted architecture in Roman interiors', in Anderson, C. (ed.), *The Built Surface, vol. 1, Architecture and the Pictorial Arts from antiquity to the Enlightenment* (Aldershot 2002), 15-46
- Bergmann, B., 'Art and Nature in the villa at Oplontis', in Stein, C., and Humphrey, J.H. (edd.), *Pompeian Brothels, Pompeii's Ancient History, Mirrors and Mysteries, Art and Nature at Oplontis, and the Herculaneum "Basilica"*, *JRA* supp. 47 (Portsmouth, RI, 2002b), 87-120
- Bergmann, B., 'Staging the supernatural: Interior gardens of Pompeian Houses', in Mattusch, C.C. (ed.), *Pompeii and the Roman Villa: Art and culture around the Bay of Naples* (New York, Thames and Hudson, 2008), 53-69
- Billig, M., 'Henri Tajfel's "Cognitive aspects of prejudice" and the psychology of bigotry', *British Journal of Social Psychology* (2002), 171-188
- Boatwright, M.T., 'Luxuriant Gardens and Extravagant Women: the horti of Rome between Republic and Empire', in Cima, M., and La Rocca, E. (edd.), *Horti romani: Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Roma, 4-6 Maggio 1995* (Rome, 1998), 71-82
- Bodel, J., *Graveyards and Groves: a study of the lex Lucerina* (*American Journal of Ancient History* 11, 1986)
- Bryant, D.J., 'Human Spatial Concepts reflect regularities of the physical world and human body', in Olivier, P., and Gapp. (edd.), *Representation and processing of spatial expressions* (Mahwah, NJ, Erlbaum, 1998), 215-230
- Carroll, M., *Earthly Paradises: ancient gardens in history and archaeology* (Los Angeles, 2003)
- Clarke, J.R., *The Houses of Roman Italy 100 BC-AD 230: ritual, space, and decoration* (Los Angeles, 1991)
- Clarke, J.R., *Art in the Lives of Ordinary Romans: visual representation and non-elite viewers in Italy, 100 BC – AD 315* (California 2003)
- Clay, D., 'The Athenian Garden', in Warren, J. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Epicureanism* (Cambridge, 2009), 9-28
- Coarelli, F., *Rome and Environs: an Archaeological Guide* (Berkeley, 2007)
- Coffield, F., Mosely, D., Hall, E., and Ecclestone, K., *Should we be using learning styles? What research has to say to practice* (London, Learning and Skills Research Centre, 2004)
- Coleman, K.M., 'Fatal Charades: Roman executions staged as Mythological enactments', *JRS* 80 (1990), 44-73
- Conan, M., 'Nature into Art: Gardens and landscape in the everyday life of Ancient Rome', *Journal of Garden History* 6 (1986), 348-56
- Cosgrove, D., and S. Daniels, *The Iconography of Landscape* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988)

- Craik, K.H., 'Individual variations in landscape description', in E.H. Zube, R.O. Brush and J. Fabos (edd.), *Landscape Assessment: values, perceptions and resources* (Stroudsburg, Pa: Dowden, Hutchinson and Ross, 1975), 130-150
- Curry, L., 'One critique of the research on learning styles', *Educational Leadership* 48 (1990), 50-56
- Dällenbach, L., *The Mirror in the Text* (Cambridge, 1989)
- D'Arms, J., 'Between public and private: the *epulum publicum* and Caesar's *horti trans Tiberim*', in Cima, M., and La Rocca, E. (edd.), *Horti romani: Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Roma, 4-6 Maggio 1995* (Rome, 1998), 33-44
- Deremetz, A., *Le Miroir des Muses: poétiques de la réflexivité à Rome* (Lille, 1995)
- Dickmann, J.-A., 'The Peristyle and the transformation of domestic space in Hellenistic Pompeii', in Laurence, R., and Wallace-Hadrill, A. (edd.), *Domestic Space in the Roman World: Pompeii and Beyond* (Portsmouth, RI, 1997), 121-36
- Dixon Hunt, J., *The Afterlife of Gardens* (London, 2004)
- Duncan, S., and Barrett, L.F., 'Affect is a form of cognition: A neurobiological analysis', *Cognition and Emotion* 21 (2007), 1184-1211
- Dunn, R., and Dunn, K., *Teaching students through their individual learning styles: A practical approach* (Reston, VA, Reston Publishing Company, 1978)
- Edmunds, L., 'Horace's Priapus: A Life on the Esquiline (*Sat.* 1.8)', *CQ* 59 (2009), 125-31
- Erskine, A., *Troy between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)
- Farrar, L., *Ancient Roman Gardens* (Stroud, 1998)
- Fauconnier, G., *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language. Second edition* (Cambridge, 1994)
- Fauconnier, G., and Turner, M., 'Conceptual Projection and Middle Spaces' (1994) electronic copy available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1290862>; accessed 10.09.11
- Favro, D., *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge 1996)
- Fodor, J.A., *Concepts: Where cognitive science went wrong* (Oxford, 1998)
- Fromberg, D.P., and Bergen, D. (edd.), *Play from Birth to Twelve and Beyond* (London, 1998)
- Gabriel, M.M., *Livia's garden room at Prima Porta* (New York, 1955)
- Gardner, H., *Frames of Mind: the Theory of multiple Intelligences* (New York, Harper and Row, 1983)
- Gazda, E.K., 'Roman sculpture and the ethos of emulation', *HSCPh* 97 (1995), 121-56
- Gleason, K.L., 'Porticus Pompeiana: a new perspective on the first public park of Ancient Rome', *Journal of Garden History* 14 (1994), 13-27
- Goldman, L.R., *Child's play: Myth, Mimesis and Make-Believe* (Oxford, 1998)
- Gould, P., and R. White, *Mental Maps* (Routledge, London, 1992)
- Grahame, M., 'Public and Private in the Roman House: investigating the social order of the Casa del Fauno' in Laurence, R., and Wallace-Hadrill, A. (edd.), *Domestic Space in the Roman World: Pompeii and Beyond* (Portsmouth, RI, 1997), 137-164

- Grahame, M., *Reading Space: Social Interaction and Identity in the Houses of Pompeii. A syntactical approach to the analysis and interpretation of built space* (Oxford, 2000)
- Gray, J.R., Braver, T.S., and Raichle, M.E., 'Integration of emotion and cognition in the lateral prefrontal cortex', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 99 (2002), 4115-4120.
- Hales, S., *The Roman House and Social Identity* (Cambridge, 2003)
- Hall, E., 'Researching Learning Styles', *Teaching Thinking* (Spring 2004), 28-35
- Hartswick, K.J., *The Gardens of Sallust: a changing landscape* (Austin, 2004)
- Hillier, B. and Hanson, J., *The Social Logic of Space* (Cambridge, 1984)
- Hofstadter, D.R., 'Analogy as the Core of Cognition', in Gentner, D., Holyoak, K.J., and Kokinov, B.N. (edd.) *The Analogical Mind: Perspectives from Cognitive Science* (Cambridge, MA, 2001), 499-538.
- Honey, P., and Mumford, A., *The Manual of Learning Styles* (Maidenhead, UK, Peter Honey Publications, 1982)
- Hunt, J.D., 'The Garden as Cultural Object', In Wrede, S., and Adams, W.H. (edd.), *Denatured Visions: Landscape and Culture in the Twentieth Century* (New York, 1991), 19-32
- Hunt, J.D., 'The Garden as Virtual Reality', in M. Kohler (ed.), *Das künstliche Paradies* (Worms am Rhein, 1997), 5-14
- Huntley, K.V., 'Identifying Children's graffiti in Roman Campania', in Baird, J.A., and Taylor, C. (edd.), *Ancient Graffiti in Context* (London, 2011) 69-89
- Jansen, G., 'Private Toilets at Pompeii: appearance and operation', in Bon, S.F., and Jones, R. (edd.), *Sequence and Space in Pompeii* (Oxford, 1997), 121-134
- Jashemski, W.F., 'A Pompeian *Copa*', *CJ* 59 (1964), 337-49
- Jashemski, W.F., *The Gardens of Pompeii* (1979 and 1994)
- Jashemski, W.F., Meyer, F.G. (edd.), *The Natural History of Pompeii* (Cambridge, 2002)
- Jashemski, W.F., 'Gardens', in Dobbins, J.J., and Foss, P.W. (edd.), *The World of Pompeii* (London, 2007), 487-498
- Jones, F., 'Subject, Topic, Given and Salient: sentence-beginnings in Latin', *PCPhS* 37 (1991), 81-105
- Jones, F., *Juvenal and the Satiric Genre* (London 2007)
- Jones, F., *Virgil's Garden: the Nature of bucolic space* (London, 2011)
- Kaster, G., *Die Gärten des Lucullus: Entwicklung und Bedeutung der Bebauung des Pincio-Hügels in Rom* (Munich, 1974)
- Kellum, B.A., 'The Construction of a Landscape in Augustan Rome: the garden room at the *Vila ad Gallinas*', *ABull* 76 (1994), 211-24
- Kelly, F., and Grossberg, S., 'Neural dynamics of 3-D surface perception: Figure-ground separation and lightness perception', *Perception and Psychophysics* 62 (2000), 1596-1618
- Kitchin, R.M., 'Cognitive maps: What are they and why study them?' *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 14 (1994), 1-19
- Klynne, A., 'The laurel Grove of the Caesars: Looking in and looking out', in Santillo Frizell, B., and Klynne, A. (edd.), *Roman Villas around the Urbs: Interaction with Landscape and*

- environment. Proceedings of a conference held at the Swedish Institute in Rome, September 17-18, 2004* (Rome, 2005), 167-75
- Klynne, A. And Liljenstolpe, P., 'Investigating the gardens of the Villa of Livia' *JRA* 13 (2000), 220-33
- Kolb, D., *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1984)
- Kuttner AL, 'Looking outside Inside: Ancient Roman Garden Rooms' in JD Hunt (ed), *The Immediate Garden and the larger Landscape. Special issue of Studies in the history of Gardens and designed landscapes* 1 (1999), 7-35
- Laurence, R., *Roman Pompeii: Space and Society* (London, 1994)
- Lauritsen, M.T., 'Doors in Domestic Space at Pompeii and Herculaneum: A Preliminary Study' in Mladenovic, D., and Russell, B. (edd.), *TRAC 2010: Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference* (Oxbow, 2011), 59-75
- Lauritsen, M.T., '*Fines Domestici*: The Form and Function of Boundaries in the Campanian House', in *Privata Luxuria: Towards an Archaeology of Intimacy*, Munchener Studien zur Alten Welt (Munich, forthcoming)
- Leach, E.W., 'Oecus on Ibycus: investigating the vocabulary of the Roman House' in Bon, S.F., and Jones, R. (edd.), *Sequence and Space in Pompeii* (Oxford, 1997), 50-72
- Leach, E.W., *The Social Life of Painting in Ancient Rome and on the Bay of Naples* CUP, 2004)
- Liljenstolpe, P. And Klynne, A., 'The Imperial Gardens of the Villa of Livia at Prima Porta: a preliminary report on the 1997 campaign', *ORom* 22-3 (1997-8), 127-47
- Linderski, J., '*Imago hortorum*': Pliny the Elder and the gardens of the urban poor', *CPh* 96 (2001), 305-8
- Ling, R., *Roman Painting* (1991)
- Matlin, M.W., *Cognition: sixth edition* (Wiley 2005)
- Mantle, I.C., 'The Roles of Children in Roman Religion', *G&R* 39 (2002), 85-106
- Massey, D., 'Landscape as a Provocation' *Journal of Material Culture* 11 (2004) 33-48
- Meadows, S., *The Child as Thinker* (London 1993)
- Meiggs, R., *Trees and Timber in the Ancient Medieval World* (Oxford, 1982)
- Myers, K.S., 'Representations of Gardens in Roman Literature', in Jashemski, W.F., *Gardens of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge, forthcoming)
- Miller, J.F., *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets* (Cambridge, 2009)
- Newlands, C.E., *Statius' 'Silvae' Book 2* (Cambridge, 2011)
- Osgood, C.E., and Bock, J.K., in Rosenberg, S. (ed), *Sentence Production* (1977), 89-140
- O'Sullivan, T.M., 'The Mind in Motion: Walking and Metaphorical Travel in the Roman Villa', *CPh* 101 (2006), 133-52
- Pagán, V.E., *Rome and the Literature of Gardens* (Duckworth, London, 2006)
- Palmer, S.E., *Vision Science: Photons to phenomenology* (Cambridge MA, MIT Press, 1999)
- Pashler, H., McDaniel, M., Rohrer, D., and Bjork, R., 'Learning styles: Concepts and evidence', *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 9 (2009), 105-119
- Pinker, S. *How the mind works* (London, 1997)

- Pollard, E.A., 'Pliny's Natural History and the Flavian Templum Pacis: Botanical Imperialism in first Century CE Rome', *Journal of World History* 20 (2009), 309-38
- Porteous, J.D., *Landscapes of the Mind: Worlds of Sense and Metaphor* (Toronto, Toronto University Press, 1990)
- Potter, J., and Wetherell, M., *Discourse and social psychology* (London, 1987).
- Purcell, N., 'Town in Country and Country in Town', in MacDougall, E.B. (ed.), *Ancient Roman Villa Gardens* (Washington DC, 1987)
- Purcell, N., 'Rome and the management of water: environment, culture, and power', in Salmon, J., and Shipley, G. (edd.), *Human Landscapes in Classical Antiquity* (Routledge 1996b), 180-212
- Purcell, N., 'The Roman Garden as a Domestic Building', in: I Barton, *Roman Domestic Buildings*, (Exeter, 1996c), 121-51
- Purcell, N., 'Dialectical Gardening' *JRA* 14 (2001), 546-556
- Quinn, P.C., et al., 'Development of form similarity as a Gestalt grouping principle in infancy' *Psychological Science* 13 (2002), 320-328
- Ratcliff, R., 'Comparing Exemplar and Rule-Based Theories of Categorization', *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 15 (2006), 9-13
- Rawson, B., *Children and Childhood in Roman Italy* (Oxford, 2003)
- Reeder, J.C., *The Villa of Livia ad Gallinas Albas. A study in the Augustan Villa and Garden*. *Archaeological Transatlantica* 20 (Providence, RI, Brown University, 2001)
- Rich, J., 'Patronage and Interstate Relations in the Roman Republic', in Wallace-Hadrill, A. (ed.), *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London 1989), 117-35
- Riggsby, A.M., ' "Public" and "private" in Roman culture: the case of the *cubiculum* ', *JRA* 10 (1997), 36-56
- Santillo Frizell, B., and Klynne, A. (edd.), *Roman Villas around the Urbs: Interaction with Landscape and environment. Proceedings of a conference held at the Swedish Institute in Rome, September 17-18, 2004* (Rome, 2005)
- Settis, S., *Le pareti ingannevoli. La villa di Livia e la pittura di giardino* (Milan, 2002)
- Soja, E.W., *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places* (Oxford, 1996)
- Spencer, D., *Roman Landscape: culture and identity*. *Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics* 39 (Cambridge, 2010)
- Spirn, A.W., *The Language of Landscape* (New Haven, 1998)
- Sprenger, M., *Differentiation through learning styles and memory* (Thousand Oaks, CA, Corwin Press, 2003)
- Stewart, P., *The Social History of Roman Art* (Cambridge, 2008)
- Tajfel, H., 'Cognitive aspects of prejudice' *Journal of Biosocial Sciences, Supplement* 1 (1969), 173-191
- Tilley, C., *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments* (Oxford, 1994)
- Tilley, C., 'Introduction: Identity, Place, Landscape and Heritage' *Journal of Material Culture* 11 (2004) 7-31

- Tuan, Yi-Fu, *Passing Strange and Wonderful: Aesthetics, Nature and Culture* (Washington DC, Island Press/Shearwater Books, 1993)
- Turner, M. (ed.), *The Artful Mind: Cognitive Science and the Riddle of Human Creativity* (Oxford, 2006)
- Tversky, B., 'Remembering Spaces,' in Tulving, E., and Craik, F.I.M. (edd.), *The Oxford Handbook of Memory* (New York, Oxford University Press, 2000), 363-78
- Van den Hulst, H. (ed.), *Recursion and Human Language* (Berlin, 2010)
- Von Stackelberg, K.T., *The Roman Garden: Space, sense, and society* (Abingdon, Routledge, 2009)
- Wallace-Hadrill, A., *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* (Princeton, 1994)
- Wiseman, T.P., 'A Stroll on the Rampart', in Cima, M., and La Rocca, E. (edd.), *Horti romani: Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Roma, 4-6 Maggio 1995* (Rome, 1998), 13-22
- Zanker, P., *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, translated by A. Shapiro (Ann Arbor, MI, 1988)
- Zanker, P., *Pompeii: Public and Private Life* (Cambridge, MA, 1998)
- Zarmakoupi, M., 'Designing the landscapes of the Villa of Livia at Prima Porta', in Kurtz, D., Meyer, C., Saunders, D., Tsingarida, A., and Harris, N. (edd.), *Essays in Classical Archaeology for Eleni Hatzivassiliou 1977-2007* (Oxford, Studies in Classical Archaeology, The Beazley Archive Series, 2008), 269-276