

*The caged bird in Roman life and poetry; metaphor, cognition, and value.*

Frederick JONES

This paper considers the domestic caged bird as a cultural artefact in Rome, identifying it as a specifically Roman phenomenon related to Roman habits of acquisition, collection, and display. It further considers the aesthetic aspects of the caged bird and how it impacted on social and mental space both directly and through the media of painting and literature. In this respect the caged bird is considered in relation to accessible metaphoric readings and to the physical and cognitive patterns of the house. Finally, the relationship of the caged bird to art and fashion is considered.<sup>1</sup>

I am here concerned with the caged bird as a cultural artefact in Rome, the ways it manifests itself in Roman life and poetry, and its cognitive value and relationship to the house that contains it.

From the time of the late Republic there was a steep growth in the habit of collection and display among the Roman aristocracy (Beard 2008; Rutledge 2012). Military spoils and the proceeds of provinces supplied luxury goods, crafted items and artworks, encouraged a shift to conspicuous consumption, and in turn fuelled local production. The kinds of things that are collected and displayed ramify. Not only do we hear of such things as Vedius' collection of glassware (Sen. *de Ira* 3.40), but we also hear of the seemingly more outlandish collection and display of the bones of huge sea monsters and the weapons of the heroes collected by Augustus (Suet. *Aug.* 72), and curiosities such as Nero's water organ (Suet. *Nero* 42.1; cf. Dio 63.26.4).<sup>2</sup> There is the development of domestic wall-painting, ubiquitous in the houses of the aristocracy, but spreading far beyond this social milieu. Likewise, though none survive, domestic tapestry was clearly important.<sup>3</sup> The medium is mythologised in the story of Arachne, a story that figured prominently in the Arachne frieze of the Forum Transitorium (d'Ambra 1993). A wide range of gardens and garden-like phenomena begins to appear and develop.<sup>4</sup> The fact that Pliny 'signed' his villa-garden with the names of himself and the gardener in letters of topiary suggests the notion of some kind of artistic collaboration of craft and concept (Pliny *Ep.* 5.6.35-6). The family *imagines* were displayed in the house and also

<sup>1</sup> Versions of this paper were read at the London Latin Seminar, 11 February 2013 and at the Text and Topos Colloquium at Ertegun House, Oxford, 3 May 2013; I am grateful to all those present for questions and comments, and to Dr P.W. Freeman for comments on an earlier draft.

<sup>2</sup> See Townend (1973: 155-6); cf. also Ps.-Acro on Hor. *Sat.* 2.2.47; Dio 67.9 (Domitian); 59.5.5 (Caligula); SHA *Heliog.* 11.2-5; and Juvenal's satiric account of Domitian's display of a huge fish (Juv. 4).

<sup>3</sup> We know from literature (e.g. Horace *Satires* 2.8) of the use of hangings inside the Roman house. We know of representational woven textiles at the theatre (Virg. *Georg.* 3.24-5; cf. Ovid *Met.* 3.111-12). The fine Attalid hangings in Pompey's *porticus* (Propertius 2.32.12) are likely to have been figuratively worked; Alcimenes of Sybaris' elaborately figured robe (Aristotle *Mir.Ausc.* 96) certainly was. In mythological contexts, figured textile work is often referred to in Greek and Roman poetry (Homer, the tragedians, Corinna, Apollonius, Catullus, Virgil, Ovid). The elaborate pictorial work by Arachne and the goddess Minerva (Ovid *Met.* 6.1-145) and the coverlet in Catullus 64 belong to the tradition of imaginary works of art described in poetry (Elsner 2007).

<sup>4</sup> The garden is also considered as a receptacle of memories and narratives (personal, cultural, and national), and a place which unleashes the imagination (cf. von Stackelberg 2009). It is a projection of the citizen's image of the city and of himself as citizen. Both public and private gardens typically contained art (painting and sculpture), and, from the late Republic onwards, increasingly contained art galleries. However, rather than seeing gardens as assemblages of plants, buildings, and statuary, we might consider them as organically unified ensembles (cf. Gazda 1991; Gleason 1994; Spencer 2010), effectively, that is, as complex works of art with the same sorts of complexities of programme and effect as art-works.

paraded in public at funerals, presenting the family as a member of a larger group of similar families. The preparation and consumption of food involved manifest elements of display and performance. Catus is presented by the satirist Horace as regarding this as something like an art-form (Hor. *Sat.* 2.4), and likewise the more grotesque Trimalchio by Petronius in the *Satyrica*. There are also, of course, triumphal displays and the executions dressed up as mythological charades (Coleman 1990). Indeed the city itself comes to be a form of display.<sup>5</sup>

This phenomenon is deeply connected with the creation and performance of individual and group identities. It is, moreover, highly competitive, as so much else is in the Roman context. The arena for much of this competitive display is the *domus* and the caged bird is part of this complex phenomenon.

### THE DOMESTIC CAGED BIRD

The sociology of animals in general and the bird, caged and uncaged, in particular is comparatively understudied in Roman art and life,<sup>6</sup> and yet the appearance of the domestic caged bird in Roman domestic culture is very striking. It is not a feature of Mesopotamian or Egyptian domestic interiors; the frequent birds in Egyptian art are all in other contexts.<sup>7</sup> Nor is the domestic caged bird a feature of the Greek interior, even though birds were used or displayed in a variety of ways inside and outside of the house.<sup>8</sup> By contrast, from the late Republic on, there is Roman evidence for the caged-bird as a feature of domestic interior ornament in both prose and verse, in a diversity of genres, and there is also a limited amount of evidence from Roman art. This phenomenon is something new and distinctively Roman, as was the toga, the genre of verse satire (Quint. *Inst.Or.* 10.1.93), and the *tria nomina*.



Fig. 1; Mosaic, late antique, Carthage Area; held in Bardo Museum, Tunis

<sup>5</sup> Favro (1996); Zanker (1988); Rutledge 2012.

<sup>6</sup> Though see Matteucig (1974) and Tammisto (1997); Jennison (1937); Lazenby (1949); Toynbee (1973). Kalof (2007) has only three references to birds as pets, none illuminating.

<sup>7</sup> Houlihan (1986).

<sup>8</sup> Otherwise can see many uncaged birds about the house in vase paintings, Penelope's geese (*Od.* 19.536-7), Socrates' pigeon aviary (*Theaet.* 197c), and the birds given to kings and potentates (Aelian 13.25, cf. 13.18; ps.-Callisthenes *Alexander* 3.18) or featuring in royal parades (Athen. 387d). See also Lazenby (1949); Ashmead (1978).

Passages that include specific reference to the domestic bird-cage are admittedly few,<sup>9</sup> and depictions in Classical Roman art are very rare,<sup>10</sup> but it is clear that the phenomenon was not at all uncommon. In addition to the disparately provenanced evidence just referred to, there are very many Roman references to birds as pets, to talking birds, and to expensive birds – all of which taken together very strongly suggest that the domestic bird-cage was well-known.<sup>11</sup> Pliny specifies types of birds good for training to talk or good as songbirds and supplies various anecdotes involving royal personages and talking or singing birds.<sup>12</sup> Manilius, moreover, decries the fashion for, and expense of, talking and otherwise performing birds (5.378-87). Martial's *apophoreta* include a parrot (14.73) a nightingale (14.75) and a talking magpie (14.76), which are likely to be meant to be understood as intended to be pet birds (probably also the crow at 14.74).<sup>13</sup> Martial also mocks the practice of giving pet birds funerals (7.87).<sup>14</sup>

I want to consider, what the caged bird meant to the Romans, and in doing so I will consider it under the headings of craft, metaphoric content, the cognitive aspects of mental modelling and drama, and (finally) the societal aspects of value and fashion.

### Craft

There are no published examples of the physical remains of Roman bird-cages, but the elements of craft and craftsmanship were clearly important. There are, firstly, both aesthetic and practical considerations in the choice of material. We hear of gold (for a magpie at Petronius 28.9), ivory (e.g. for a sparrow at Martial 14.77), a construction of silver, ivory, and either gold or tortoiseshell<sup>15</sup> (for a parrot at Statius *Silvae* 2.4.11-15), and a somewhat

<sup>9</sup> Statius *Silvae* 2.4.11-15; Petronius 28.9; Mart. 14.77; Crinagoras *AP* 9.562; Pliny *Ep.* 9.25.3. References in Plautus and Cicero are not domestic examples: Plaut. *Cist.* 4.2.66; *Curc.* 3.1.79; *Capt.* 1.2.15; Cic. *Div.* 2.73; *Natura Deorum* 2.3.7.

<sup>10</sup> The caged nightingale in Livia's Garden room painting, for which see below (and fig. 2) is unique for its period; a caged bird mosaic held in the Bardo Museum, Tunis (fig. 1) dates from c.third/fourth century AD. Google searches show up a tiny handful of Roman mosaics from the Near East from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century and later, and occasional early Christian examples.

<sup>11</sup> Catullus 2-3 (cf. Juv. 6 init), *passer* – on what bird this is, see Fordyce and Arnott 2007); Ovid *Am.* 2.6, Corinna's dead parrot (on parrots see also Varro *RR* 3.9.17); Petronius 46.4, the boy mad on birds (*in aves morbosus*) has three *cardeles* (normally *cardueles*), goldfinches (it is not quite clear where they were kept: the father says that he killed them and claimed that a *mustella* (weasel) killed them, but weasels could be pets; see Smith on Petr. 46.4 citing Pliny *NH* 29.60); Statius *Silv.* 2.4, Atedius' dead parrot; Martial 1.7.3, Stella's pet dove *vicit passerem Catulli*; Martial 7.87.6-8, a *salutatix pica* and nightingale. For the attractiveness of *cardueles* as pets, see Pliny *NH* 10.116; for nightingales and blackbirds kept for their song, cf. Pliny *NH* 10.81ff; Pliny *Ep.* 4.2.3. Cf. parrots, magpies, thrushes, starlings, nightingales, and a raven at Pliny *NH* 10.120-1. Other less usual cases: *corvus*, *cornix* (Pliny *NH* 10.120-4). At *Ap. Met.* 8.15, children, women and household animals are looked after in a sudden removal (*pullos, passeres, haedos, catillos*). See Balsdon (1969) 91, 151f.

<sup>12</sup> A *corvus* had learned to salute the three Caesars and was considered sacred and given a funeral process and pyre on the Appian way (Pliny *NH* 10.121-3); a nightingale was sold for 600,000 sesterces and given to Agrippina (Pliny *NH* 10.84); Agrippina's talking thrush (Pliny *NH* 10.120); Britannicus' and Nero's talking starling and nightingales (Pliny *NH* 10.120).

<sup>13</sup> For crows, cf. Mart. 3.95.1-2; 14.72. It should, of course, be remembered that even talking birds could be eaten: Clodius Aesop the tragic actor and his dish of talking birds appear in Pliny; 10.141-2.

<sup>14</sup> Herrlinger (1930) 14-51 on animal epitaphs, real and literary. Herrlinger dates the origin of both to the third century BC. See also Van Dam on Statius *Silvae* 2.4, pp.336-7. Amongst the various domestic and non-domestic animals which receive sepulchral epigrams in *A.P.* 7.197-215 are locusts, the cicada, the *elaeus* (unknown), partridges, the swallow (and a horse, dog dolphins, an ant ...). Some are clearly not pets.

<sup>15</sup> *Testudine* (*Silv.* 2.4.11) could mean tortoiseshell or dome; see van Dam (1984) *ad loc.* Newlands (2011) sees no need for this reading, but if it is accepted *rutila* may mean that it is made of gold.

implausible wicker (for a parrot in Crinagoras, *AP* 9.562); Muriel Gabriel(1955) interprets the cage in the wall paintings of Livia's 'Garden Room' at Prima Porta as gold wire.<sup>16</sup>



Fig. 2; Livia's 'Garden Room', Prima Porta

There are also aesthetic elements in construction, shape and design. In a passage from one of the two dead parrot poems in Classical Latin,<sup>17</sup> Statius gives a fairly elaborate description, in which we see more than just the issue of material. The complexity of construction is clearly artful in its combination of materials and features, the contrast of colours and textures, and in the architectural conceptualisation.

at tibi quanta domus rutila testudine fulgens,  
 conexusque ebori virgarum argenteus ordo,  
 argutumque tuo stridentia limina cornu  
 et querulae iam sponte fores! vacat ille beatus  
 carcer, et augusti nusquam convicia tecti.

<sup>16</sup> The painting has been housed since 1952 in the Museo Nazionale Romano in Palazzo Massimo alle Terme, Rome.

<sup>17</sup> The other is Ovid *Amores* 2.6. For subsequent dead parrot poems, see Van Dam's (1984) commentary, p.340.

What a home you possessed, gleaming with its red cupola,  
 what a fine row of silver rods woven with ivory,  
 the gates sounding shrilly to your beak,  
 and the doors now, making their own lament. That happy  
 prison is empty and your narrow dwelling's clamour is no more.

(Statius *Silvae* 2.4.11-15)

Statius' attention to colour, material, texture, and design echoes the kind of detail used in his account of the villa of Pollius Felix (Stat. *Silv.* 2.2; cf. 1.3).<sup>18</sup> Just as the villa is a medium for self-representation (cf. Bodel 1997), so the parrot's cage contributes to Statius' characterisation of its grandeur, elegance, and beauty. In her commentary (2011), Newlands also sees allusions to music in the description of both the cage and the parrot (especially in *intestudine*, a common metonym for 'lyre', and *cornu*) which might playfully echo each other. She also sees literary resonance in *argutum* and *querulae*, as though the home reflected its dead owner's cultural accomplishments. As with human architecture, so here too craft is seen as expressive.

From the perspective of the poet and the poem's audience, the cage and the bird form a very strong unity (now destroyed by death), but this organic unity is always implicit in the bird-cage and caged bird dyad. For one thing, the bird-cage is useless without an inhabitant, and for another the caged bird may be allowed out of the cage from time to time, but cannot exist without it. The integral combination of living thing and crafted object is a fundamental component of the dyad, but it is not uniquely confined to the bird and cage. There are other forms in which the combination is present in various ways. In drama, for example, actors perform a role in a fabricated setting which combines architecture and painting. The contrived performances in the amphitheatre are less scripted and the technology of the building is more impressive.<sup>19</sup> More obviously apropos because of the domestic context is the garden (Jones, forthcoming 2014). Here too an extracted element of nature (the plant-life) is supported by an architectural complex, but the living component does not stop here. The garden, with its fountains and water features, attracts passing birds – indeed the bird-cage may be carried out into the garden (a point to which I shall return shortly), and in addition we have in the garden a complex artefact in which the contained human activity is integral to the concept.

### Metaphoric content

The post-Roman cultural and iconographical history of the caged bird is rich, long, and complex,<sup>20</sup> but the elements already visible in the Roman context have largely remained important. Already, in Statius' poem, the cage is the home (*domus*) of Melior's parrot.<sup>21</sup> In his description of it, the bird-home is a metaphor for a human villa. Melior's parrot was anthropomorphic in another way too: as a talking bird it could 'speak' like a human. In this

<sup>18</sup> On the materials and the architecture, see Newlands (2011) ad loc. No material is specified at Pliny *Ep.* 9.25.3.

<sup>19</sup> See Coleman (1990).

<sup>20</sup> See e.g. Shefer (1991) on Nineteenth Century art.

<sup>21</sup> On *domus* for bird nests, see van Dam (1984) on Stat. *Silv.* 2.4.11.

way, it could also be seen as symbol of education and civilisation (cf. Ovid *Am.* 2.6). This metaphorical value can be embodied, moreover, in any talking bird. In any case, however, whether a caged bird speaks or not, it still represents the human in a home.

The bird or birds in a cage have a dramatic existence which runs parallel to that of the residents of the house in which it is. Talking birds can more explicitly cross the boundary between the two since they can be both *dramatis personae* in the bird drama which parallels the human house and also characters in direct dramatic interaction with the occupants of the house. In either way they are metaphorically humans. Varro's aviary manifests one side of this metaphor on a much larger scale as it contains a bird theatre (*RR* 3.5.13-15).<sup>22</sup> As a broad context to this, birds have human characteristics and associations widely in the cultural tradition. In the mythological metamorphoses of the poets they may preserve some of the character or emotional state of the person transformed into a bird; in this there is an echo of Pythagorean metempsychosis. In Homeric and post-Homeric bird-similes, there is an equivocal boundary between the human and animal levels.<sup>23</sup> Birds are fully fledged characters in Aristophanes' eponymous play, and have human roles in the Fable. Timon of Phlius (c.325-235 BC) in his *Silloi* describes the scholars at the Library of Alexandria as ceaselessly squabbling in the 'chicken coop of the Muses' (*mouseōn en talarōi*; 786 SH=12D).<sup>24</sup> Indeed, poets are often presented as, or compared to, birds in both Greek and Latin;<sup>25</sup> Horace sees himself as being turned into a swan (Hor. *Odes* 2.10), and the song itself is bird-like (as in the presumed book-title of Heraclitus' *Nightingales*; Callimachus, *Anth.Pal.* 7.80). Birds in 'Lucretian bucolic' (5.1379-1411) figure as part of the account of the origin of music. The frequent use of bird names as terms of endearment (evidenced in Plautus, for example) also fosters the parallelism of birds and those who own birds as pets, and further supports a dramatic reading of the caged-bird by its owners.

Another metaphoric reading of the caged bird also anthropomorphises it. Taking a starting point from Plato's *Phaedrus*,<sup>26</sup> Plutarch makes the bird in a cage an image of the human soul trapped in the body:

ὥς οὖν ἄφθαρτον οὖσαν τὴν ψυχὴν διανοοῦ τὰ τὸ ταῖς ἀλίσκομέναις ὄρνισι πᾶσχειν: ἂν μὲν γὰρ πολλὸν ἐντραφῆ τῷ σώματι χρόνον καὶ γένηται τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ τιθασὸς ὑπὸ πραγμάτων πολλῶν καὶ μακρᾶς συνηθείας, αὐτὴς καταίρουσα πάλιν ἐνδύεται καὶ οὐκ ἀνίσχιν οὐδὲ λήγει τοῖς ἐνταῦθα συμπλεκόμενῃ πάθεσικαὶ τύχαις διὰ τῶν γενέσεων. μὴ γὰρ οἴουλοιδορεῖσθαι καὶ κακῶς ἀκούειν τὸ γῆρας διὰ τὴν ῥυσότητα καὶ τὴν πολὺν καὶ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τοῦ σώματος: ἀλλὰ τοῦτ' αὐτοῦ τὸ χαλεπώτατόν ἐστιν, ὅτι τὴν ψυχὴν ἕωλόν τε ποιεῖ ταῖς μνήμαις τῶν ἐκεῖ

<sup>22</sup> See Green (1997); Kronenberg (2009).

<sup>23</sup> See Thaniel (1971) for Virgil's leaf and bird similes for ghosts. A series of articles categorising the similes in Homer, Apollonius of Rhodes, Virgil, and Ovid gives references and some idea of comparative scale: Gregory Wilkins (1920, 1921a, 1921b, 1932). The boar-tusk helmet goes hand in hand with the idea that the hero becomes a boar on the battlefield, and this in turn animates the animal simile applied to fighting heroes.

<sup>24</sup> On Timon of Phlius see Clayman (2009).

<sup>25</sup> See passages listed at Thompson (1936) 182ff; cf. also Virg. *Ecl.* 9.36; Hor. *Odes* 1.6.2; 4.2.25.

<sup>26</sup> At Plato *Phaedrus* 246c souls are winged and when they shed their wings they come to earth and take on a body.

καὶ λιπαρῇ περὶ ταῦτα καὶ κάμπτει καὶ πιέζει, τὸν σχηματισμὸν, ὄνῃσχεν ὑπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἐν τῷ πεπονθένει, διαφυλάττουσαν.

The soul, being eternal, after death is like a caged bird that has been released. If it has been a long time in the body, and has become tame by many affairs and long habit, the soul will immediately take another body and once again become involved in the troubles of the world. The worst thing about old age is that the soul's memory of the other world grows dim, while at the same time its attachment to things of this world becomes so strong that the soul tends to retain the form that it had in the body.

Plutarch (*Consolation to Wife* 611E *Moralia*)

We can set this passage side by side with two other ‘texts’, firstly a first century B.C. vessel (6x11.7 cms) made of transparent light blue blown-glass in the shape of a bird from the Corning Museum of Glass.<sup>27</sup>



Fig. 3; Glass bird-bottle; Corning Museum of Glass

Some specimens of such items contain residues of white or red powder which may be the remains of cosmetic or perfume. Such bottles were often sealed by the hollow tail being fused and the contents were made accessible for use by breaking the tail. Even so, it seems unlikely that such artefacts were merely disposable containers for cosmetics in transit to some other receptacle. If we take the bird bottle as a container for perfume, and see the perfume in a metaphorical sense as essence, we can see the bird bottle and its contents as an image of the user as well as in a rather more literal sense a secret part of the user's identity.

Was it possible for a perfume-user to think in this way, at whatever degree of self-awareness? Here I bring into play the other ‘intertext’.

cenabis bene, mi Fabulle, apud me  
paucis, si tibi di fauent, diebus,  
si tecum attuleris bonam atque magnam

<sup>27</sup> Corning Museum of Glass, accession no.66.1.223; see Harden, Hellenkemper, Painter, and Whitehouse (1987).

cenam, non sine candida puella  
 et uino et sale et omnibus cachinnis.  
 haec si, inquam, attuleris, uenuste noster,  
 cenabis bene; nam tui Catulli  
 plenus sacculus est aranearum.  
 sed contra accipies meros amores  
 seu quid suauius elegantiusue est:  
 nam unguentum dabo, quod meae puellae  
 donarunt Veneres Cupidinesque,  
 quod tu cum olfacies, deos rogabis,  
 totum ut te faciant, Fabulle, nasum.

Dear Fabullus, you will dine well at mine  
 In a few days, if the gods are on your side,  
 If you bring with you a good and sizeable  
 Feast, not lacking a dazzling girl  
 And wine and salt and every kind of laughter.  
 As I say, if you bring this, my charming fellow,  
 You will dine well; for your Catullus'  
 Purse is full of cobwebs.  
 But in return you will receive pure love  
 Or whatever is sweeter or more refined:  
 Yes, I will give you an unguent, which  
 The Venuses and Cupids have given my girl,  
 And when you smell it, you will ask the gods  
 That they make you, Fabullus, completely nose.

(Catullus 13)

When we start the sentence in line 11 (*nam unguentum dabo*) we believe that Catullus is offering perfume in a literal sense. This is, however, a special perfume: it has been given to Lesbia by Venus herself. Is Lesbia going to be present at the dinner, wearing the perfume? Or is it a sort of aura integral to her? Quinn (1973) cites Propertius 2.29.15-18 to suggest that Catullus means that Lesbia emits a fragrance of her own. In either case, we are left with the feeling that perfume, essence, and person are linked in a strong set of partial identifications.<sup>28</sup> It follows that the perfume container can be seen as somehow analogous to the woman: the bird-bottle containing perfume contains, represents, or, in a metaphorical sense, is a soul.

The idea of the caged-bird as the soul trapped in the body depends on the bird as a metaphor for freedom. It is stereotypically an inhabitant of the air. It is free in ways in which humans are not. When Daedalus and Icarus are imprisoned in a tower in Crete, they are like birds in a cage (the cage of Melior's parrot is called a *carcer* at Stat. *Silv.* 2.4.14-15 – albeit a

<sup>28</sup> More references for the idea that a woman, like a goddess, has her own inherent scent at Quinn (1963) 176. (adding Virg. *Aen.* 1.403-4. See further Kilpatrick (1998).



*beatus carcer*).<sup>29</sup> Daedalus and Icarus escape by transforming themselves into artificial birds (Ovid *Met.* 8.183-95), and in many of the stories in the *Metamorphoses* characters escape death or anguish by transformation into (amongst other things) birds. Even when caged, the bird yearns for freedom (cf. Plautus *Captivi* 1.2.5-15). *Coepimus carcere animalia coercere, quibus rerum natura caelum adsignaverat*, writes Pliny ('We have started to confine in prison the animals to which nature had allotted the sky,' *NH* 10.141). The bird, even when caged, remains a symbol of freedom and a stimulus for thinking about the relationship between freedom and human society. Birds, after all, says Aristophanes, have different laws from us.

Whether we see the bird as the soul or as freedom, we are making a partial identification with it. The domestic caged-bird is looked at, but it is also an image of the owner. In the garden-painting which surrounded the guests in the 'Garden Room' in Livia's Prima Porta Villa,<sup>30</sup> there is a caged nightingale. The garden in the painting goes beyond nature in combining flora and fauna that do not belong in any one time and in both this synchronicity and in the selection of flora it is suggestive of the Golden Age and of the landscape of Virgilian bucolic. The caged nightingale, then, almost certainly reminds at least some of its viewers of the caged cricket on a carved cup in Virgil's model, Theocritus *Idyll* 1 (crickets are not strongly distinguished from birds in animal sepulchral epigrams or in Virgil's *Eclogues*). Theocritus' artfully contrived cage, together with the cricket it contains, is a symbol of poetry and there is a clear implication that the composite entity demonstrates some level of artistic intent. The same programmatic intent is perhaps visible in Livia's painted caged bird. In addition to this, however, the nightingale singing in its cage is an image of the guests in the 'Garden Room' performing their socially given roles.

This nightingale cage has a ring at the top. It could have been taken into the garden, or brought back into the house. It is very clearly a piece of moveable domestic setting. But free birds as well as caged ones frequented the Roman garden. Fountains and water features may well have been partly intended to attract passing birds (they often feature in garden paintings on the lips of such features). The bird – caged or free - as a piece of setting allows the human to see himself in a bucolic role. It is like this that we see Maecenas composing poetry in his Esquiline gardens among the trees and birds and described with the trappings of a Tityrus. In this sense, the caged bird can be a metaphor for a life-style.

maluit umbrosam quercum lymphasque cadentes  
 paucaque pomosi iugera certa soli:  
 Pieridas Phoebumque colens in mollibus hortis  
 sederat argutas garrulus inter avis.

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.

(*Elegiae in Maecenatem* 1.33-6)

<sup>29</sup> *Carcer* is used of the cages used for woodland beasts at Lucan 4.237.

<sup>30</sup> See fig. 2 above; on the garden room, see further: Gabriel (1955); Kellum (1994); Reeder (2001); Jones (forthcoming 2013).

### **Cognition, mental modelling and drama:**

As I move to mental modelling and pick up again the theme of drama, I am not wholly leaving metaphor behind. Mental modelling and metaphor are both key elements of cognition and cognitive development. So I take a step back and consider the pervasive presence of the bird and the caged bird in the life-story of the Roman citizen.

The possession and enjoyment of caged birds is surrounded by all the subjectivities and contingent circumstances of life, but the continuity of the presence of domestic caged birds and garden-birds in the citizen's life from infancy upwards allows subliminal resonances with other experience and with art and literature to accumulate and interact at a profound level.

The garden bird (any bird passing through or resting in the garden) and the caged bird are both features of the *domus* and contribute to its formative influence on the cognitive development of the growing citizen (and in this respect, the special connection between children and pet birds is worth noting; cf. e.g. Petr. 46.4; Pliny *Ep.* 4.2; Fronto 181N). Though mobile, birds are fixtures, as it were, of the garden, which lies at the heart of the Roman childhood experience and remains a core and special feature of the Roman adult experience of life (Jones, forthcoming 2014).

The bird in its cage is always there for the Roman both as child and as adult. What does it do to his mind? The caged bird evokes an emotional response, and while the role of the emotions in cognition and the interaction of emotions and conceptual development is still being integrated into cognitive psychology, it is clearly important.<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, it is well established that cognitive development proceeds by playing with analogies<sup>32</sup> and the caged bird easily picks up human analogies. The bird in its cage, as we have seen, is a scale model of a human home; it is a recursive 'house within a house.'<sup>33</sup> When Trimalchio's magpie in a golden cage greets Trimalchio's guests, (28.9) it welcomes them both to Trimalchio's house and to its own. The house-inhabitant analogy with the bird-cage and bird presents itself as a platform for the proto-thought that is embedded in play, pretending, acting out, and the various modes of interaction between the child and the bird-cage.

In short, the bird-cage is a scale model of the house (and the relationships it contains), and the child's mind works with models and builds on them.<sup>34</sup> The house is sheltered and surrounded by a dangerous outside which the unaccompanied child is not allowed access to. There are cut-throats and robbers there, just as the bird outside its cage can be attacked by predators or fly off and become lost. This inside-outside polarity still has force for the adult –

---

<sup>31</sup> See Gray, Braver, and Raichle (2002); Duncan and Barrett (2007). Virgil's very striking simile of the bird passing through a villa (*Aen.* 12.473–8) illustrates how the image of the bird in the garden and house can be imbued with emotive value (cf. also the much later illustration of life as like a sparrow passing through a hall in Bede (*HE* 2.13).

<sup>32</sup> The bibliography is very large; some is cited in subsequent notes and more is presented in Jones (forthcoming 2014). Two items which present key issues very clearly are Hofstadter (2001) and Matlin (2005).

<sup>33</sup> For recursion as a key tool in cognitive development see Hofstadter (2001); for recursion more generally see Deremetz (1995) and Dällenbach (1989); van den Hulst (2010)

<sup>34</sup> See further Jones (forthcoming 2014). On mental modelling see Matlin (2005) 229-42; Porteous (1990); Kitchin (1994); Spirn (1998); Hillier and Hanson (1984); Tilley (2004). For concept formation and acquisition see Potter and Wetherell (1987); Pinker (1997); Fodor (1998); Hofstadter (2001).

inside the house, it is peaceful and familial, but outside are the choppy seas of politics and business. As the child grows, this model goes on to explain the relationship between the city and its larger outside, again a polarity of comparative safety and external danger – brigands in real life and nymphs etc in mythology. With expanding horizons and maturation, the same pattern is replicated again and at a broader level; the Roman world represents the safe area of civilization which is surrounded by barbarian tribes and extremes of climate. The recursive pattern of this concentric set of insides and outsides reinforces the messages at all stages.

Play, as when the child imagines the bird in a cage as a family member in its house, is characteristic of the child and fundamentally important in its cognitive development,<sup>35</sup> but, although transformed, the various kinds of behaviour that come under the heading of play remain in adult life. I want now to look briefly at this in the context of the adult world of the emotions as reflected in two poems by Catullus.

Lesbia's behaviour with her pet sparrow (Catull. 2)<sup>36</sup> is a sort of game (and, of course, so too is Catullus' poem). Despite numerous and major problems of local interpretation, it is clear that Lesbia plays out a quasi-human relationship with the bird. Her behaviour is a performance and whether Catullus is the intended audience or accidental witness we may feel (we are, of course, only given his version) that he is the target. In this game (the ludic element is emphasised: *iocari, ludere*) Catullus feels that there is too little room for him, and too much quasi-sexual excitement for Lesbia. In Catullus' game (which is this poem and the next in the corpus as we have it)<sup>37</sup> the inconvenient sparrow is soon going on that dark journey to that place from which they say no-one returns. Unlike the dead Heraclitus' nightingales (*Anth. Pal.* 7.80), Lesbia's sparrow rather than herself is snatched away by the underworld. Like a pet slave (cf. *ipsam*, 3.7), it has escaped this vale of tears, and left tears for the surviving Lesbia. Do we let Catullus convince us that Lesbia is over-sentimental? That her emotions are volatile and too easily given? That she is using the sparrow as a prop with which to play emotions? Catullus' first response is a comic prayer which he then caps with a spoof dirge. However, whichever side we may take in this psychodrama presented by Catullus, it is clear that both he and Lesbia are working out their feelings by role-plays which are centred on the bird and in which the bird is given the role (by at least one of the other *dramatis personae*) of a protagonist.

Passer, deliciae meae puellae,  
 quicum ludere, quem in sinu tenere,  
 cui primum digitum dare appetenti  
 et acris solet incitare morsus,  
 cum desiderio meo nitenti  
 carum nescio quid lubet iocari  
 et solaciolum sui doloris,  
 credo ut tum gravis acquiescat ardor:

<sup>35</sup> Fromberg and Bergen (1998); Goldman (1998).

<sup>36</sup> On the identification of the bird, see n. 11 above.

<sup>37</sup> We cannot tell what Catullus' little book was like in any detail, but Catull. 2 and 3 clearly make a pair and demand to be read together even if they were separated by other poems (as 5 and 7, and 11 and 51 are in the extant assemblage).

tecum ludere sicut ipsa possem  
et tristis animi levare curas!

Sparrow, my girl's darling,  
With whom she is used to playing, holding in her lap,  
Giving her fingertip for you to go for,  
And provoking sharp pecks,  
When it pleases the shining object of my desire  
To enjoy some frivolity and a little solace for her grief,  
So that – I believe – her burdensome passion may grow tame,  
If only I could play with you just as she does  
And alleviate the sad cares of my mind!

(Catullus 2)

LVGETE, o Veneres Cupidinesque,  
et quantum est hominum uenustiorum:  
passer mortuus est meae puellae,  
passer, deliciae meae puellae,  
quem plus illa oculis suis amabat.  
nam mellitus erat suamque norat  
ipsam tam bene quam puella matrem,  
nec sese a gremio illius mouebat,  
sed circumsiliens modo huc modo illuc  
ad solam dominam usque pipiabat.  
qui nunc it per iter tenebricosum  
illuc, unde negant redire quemquam.  
at uobis male sit, malae tenebrae  
Orci, quae omnia bella deuoratis:  
tam bellum mihi passerem abstulistis  
o factum male! o miselle passer!  
tua nunc opera meae puellae  
flendo turgiduli rubent ocelli.

Mourn, O Venuses and Cupids  
and however many there are of charming people:  
my girl's sparrow is dead—  
the sparrow, delight of my girl,  
whom that girl loved more than her own eyes.  
For he was honey-sweet and had known  
the lady better than a girl [knows] her mother herself,  
nor did he move himself from that girl's lap,  
but hopping around now here now there  
he chirped constantly to his mistress alone,

he who now goes through the shadowy journey  
 thither, whence they deny that anyone returns.  
 But may it go badly for you evil shadows  
 of hell, who devour all beautiful things.  
 You have taken from me so beautiful a sparrow.  
 Oh evil deed! Oh wretched little sparrow!  
 Now through your deeds the eyes of my girl,  
 swollen with weeping, are red.

(Catullus 3)

### **Social context: collectability, value, and fashion**

The growth of the luxury item trade and the interest in art-objects, decried by Sallust and the moralists, but pursued eagerly in the late Republic onwards brings with it a notion of fashion. The late republic is characterised as a period of endemic competition among the aristocracy in every sphere, including personal expenditure. This is the period when we begin to hear of big houses, villas jutting into the sea, the notorious fishponds (e.g. Cic. *ad Att.* 2.1.7; Pliny 9.81.171), aviaries (Pliny 10.141),<sup>38</sup> the display of performing birds (Manilius 5.385-6),<sup>39</sup> and the great gardens.<sup>40</sup> Catullus' pair of pictures of Lesbia and the sparrow is later used by Juvenal to typify the sophistication and moral flimsiness of modern (= post-Golden Age) women (Juv. 6 *init.*). The sparrow-mourning Lesbia is there paired with the central figure of Propertian elegy. The impression is given that the sparrow poems characterise an age. Lesbia, possibly one of the three Clodia sisters, had a newly fashionable pet sparrow; Catullus, the modernising poet of celebration and aristocratic fashions,<sup>41</sup> celebrates her as fashion-leader by writing the sparrow into his corpus.

This growth in collection, display, and fashionability points towards two issues that are in some tension with each other. On the one hand, the habit of collection creates the category of collectibles and imparts value; and, on the other, the elements of display and especially fashion suggest an atmosphere of something like urban modernism.

Firstly, the issue of value. The bird-cage is, as we have seen, a crafted artefact, often involving precious materials. The bird itself also has a value. Furthermore, in an age of collection and display, what is collected can thereby acquire additional value. Now, it seems

<sup>38</sup> See Van Dam (1984) on Stat. *Silv.* 2.4, p. 341.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Toynbee (1973) on bird-circuses.

<sup>40</sup> See Kaster (1974); Hartswick (2004); Gleason (1994); Jashemski (1979, 1994); von Stackelberg (2009); Jones (forthcoming 2014). The fishpond, the aviary, and the garden may, indeed, seem related phenomena in that they all extract elements of nature and give them a new residential setting. We may, furthermore, note that just as the small garden (and even window box) replicate on a different scale the great aristocratic gardens, so the bird-cage can be seen as a scale-model of an aristocratic aviary. Smallness does not entail cheapness, but certainly allows it, and we may speculate that (as with the garden) an aristocratic fashion could spread down the social scale by this route. It is, indeed, possible to wonder whether the origin of the caged-bird as a cultural item was the Roman courtyard garden: the cage was a convenient way of controlling, owning, and displaying what was already a feature of the garden, as well as contributing the display element of its own construction.

<sup>41</sup> Key words in the short poems, ((*il*)*lepidus*, (*in*)*venustus*, (*in*)*elegans*, *iocosus*, *beatus*, *ineptia*, *facetus*), recurrent turns of phrase, and games with the same semantic items used across different forms (verb, noun, adjective (positive, negatively prefixed, and comparative)) all contribute to this characterisation.

implausible in the extreme that individuals collected domestic caged-birds, but the spirit of acquisition and display itself creates the category of ‘collectible’ and a collection of collectibles does not have to concentrate on any single type of item. Not only does the bird in its cage have a place among the glassware, silverware, exotic furniture and furnishings, statuary, mosaics, and wall paintings of the house, but in addition it has a number of characteristics which we might think of in the context of art, itself another value adding concept. In this respect, I recall especially from the discussion above the elements of craft and metaphorical content.

While it is not clear that the Romans recognised a particular category to which the term ‘art’ applied they certainly recognised craft, aesthetic content, and value.<sup>42</sup> They also applied the concept of *ars* metaphorically to a suggestive range of activities including the shaping of souls in education (Persius 5.40), to rule (Virgil *Aen.* 6.852). There is also extensive evidence for knowledge and connoisseurship among the Roman buyers of art objects, and the high value put on quality items.<sup>43</sup> There are clearly also aesthetic values at work in sculpture and painting that are more or less equivalent to those at work among the poets. Competitive imitation and intertextuality are clearly important, and much of the subject matter draws on the same mythological repertoire. It would be hard to imagine that one bird-cage successfully alluded to another, but the composite entity bird-in-cage can certainly be taken by the viewer as alluding to metamorphic myths. Statius makes intertextuality out of his response to Melior’s caged parrot. The caged nightingale in Livia’s ‘Garden Room’, arguably, alludes to Theocritus’ caged cricket. It would be hard to convince many that the caged bird is an art form, but we need to be aware that the art-field is a *mêlée* in which candidates compete. There is no universally agreed definition of art even within a narrowly defined period: rather, the definition of art is a *process* in which many voices pull in different directions and partial congruences form and reform. There has to be some element of validation, but, given the classical tradition of writing about works of art, we could see Statius’ poem on Melior’s caged bird as his validation of that particular caged bird as a lost work of art. There are, in addition, enough metaphorical readings of the bird in its cage available in the literature for us to believe that a response to a caged bird in which interpretation was significant was possible at any time.

Secondly, there is the issue of fashion. It will not take us irretrievably out of this ambiguous territory, but it is worth pursuing. Clarke (2005) suggests that Roman interior decoration is fashion *rather than* art, but art and poetry have their fashions too, and this instability hints at an atmosphere of urban modernism. Fashion is a major contributor to a feeling of modernity. We can find much corroborating evidence for change together with a sense of newness in the late Republic and the early Augustan period. In the late Republic, we hear of the neoterics and the new poets, and one of Virgil’s bucolic herdsmen tells us that Pollio made new poetry (Virg. *Ecl.* 3.86). A little later, Horace, who mocked the archaizing backlash, claimed to be the first to introduce iambic and lyric into Latin, and this sort of claim is repeated by other Augustan poets. In the same period, painting styles change (though old paintings do not automatically disappear) and we see that Augustus restored/rebuilt

---

<sup>42</sup> Jordanova (2000), 89; Burke (2001) 16.

<sup>43</sup> See further, Stewart (2008), 2-3.

Rome, altered its axes, districts and water supply, and was proud of leaving a marble city where he had found a brick one (Suet. *Aug.* 28). Ovid praises the newness of Rome as a result (in terms that might have been embarrassing for Augustus; *AA* 3.113-28). Although Augustus uses the language of restoration, there was such an amount of change in such a range of media that the language of newness taken up by the poets may be an indicator of a more widespread sense of modernity, and this is certainly how Ovid sees the Augustan urban programme.<sup>44</sup>

The caged bird is just one of the many new features of the texture of life beginning in the late Republic. There is most certainly an element of fashionability inherent in its appearance (and in its celebration by Catullus), but this in itself allows us to see it as part of the complex currents and counter-currents in Rome's aesthetic space, toing and froing at the edges of art and contributing to Rome's ambivalent modernity.

---

<sup>44</sup> The picture is complicated because we can also find this sense outside these boundaries as well in yet another 'renaissance', the Neronian; see Mayer (1983). Nero introduced a new style of architecture in Rome (Suet. *Nero* 16) and sang, attempting to give music a hitherto undreamed of claim to respectability (Suet. *Nero* 20-25). Later still, Pliny 'signs' his garden with topiary (Pliny *Ep.* 5.6.35-6). Domitian refurbishes Rome again (D'Ambra 1993). Under Hadrian poetry is radically transformed. In fact, Rome's fabric and texture as well as its cultural identity were continually in a state of rebuilding and change.

## WORKS CITED

- Arnott, G., *Birds in the Ancient World from A-Z* (Routledge, 2007)
- Ashmead, A., 'Exotic Pets kept by Rich Youths in fifth Century Athens, as portrayed on Greek Vases', *Expedition* 20 (1978), 38-47
- Balsdon, J.P.V.D., *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome* (London, 1969)
- Beard, M., 'Art collections on the Bay of Naples' in Mattusch, C.C. (ed.), *Pompeii and the Roman Villa: Art and culture around the Bay of Naples* (New York, Thames and Hudson, 2008), 71-83
- Bodel, J., 'Monumental Villas and Villa Monuments', *JRA* 10 (1997), 5-35
- Burke, P., *Eyewitnessing: the uses of images as Historical evidence* (London, 2001)
- Clarke, J.R. 'Augustan Domestic Interiors: Propaganda or fashion', in K. Galinsky (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus* (Cambridge, 2005), 264-78
- Clayman, D.L., *Timon of Phlius: Pyrrhonism into Poetry* (Berlin, 2009)
- Coleman, K.M., 'Fatal Charades: Roman executions staged as mythological enactments', *JRS* 80 (1990), 44-73
- Dällenbach, L., *The Mirror in the Text* (Cambridge, 1989)
- D'Ambra, E., *Private Lives, Imperial Virtues: the frieze of the Forum Transitorium in Rome* (Princeton, 1993)
- Deremetz, A., *Le Miroir des Muses: poétiques de la réflexivité à Rome* (Lille, 1995)
- Duncan, S., and Barrett, L.F., 'Affect is a form of cognition: A neurobiological analysis', *Cognition and Emotion* 21 (2007), 1184-1211
- Elsner, J., 'From Ekphrasis to Wall Painting in the Roman World', *CPh* 102 (2007), 20-44
- 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)
- 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, 1991)
- 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)
- 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
- Green, C.M.C., 'Free as a Bird: Varro de re Rustica' *American Journal of Philology*, 118 (1997), 427-448
- Gregory Wilkins, E., 'A Classification of the Similes of Homer (Concluded)', *Classical Weekly*, 13 (1920), 154-159
- Gregory Wilkins, E., 'A Classification of the Similes in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius', *Classical Weekly* 14 (1921a), 162-166
- Gregory Wilkins, E., 'A Classification of the Similes in Vergil's *Aeneid* and *Georgics*', *Classical Weekly* 14 (1921b), 170-174



- Gregory Wilkins, E., 'A Classification of the Similes of Ovid (Concluded)', *Classical Weekly* 25 (1932), 81-86
- Harden, D.B., H. Hellenkemper, K. Painter, and D. Whitehouse, *Glass of the Caesars* (Milan 1987).
- Hartswick, K.J., *The Gardens of Sallust: a changing landscape* (Austin, 2004)
- Herrlinger, G., *Totenklage um Tiere in dere antiken Dichtung* (Stuttgart 1930)
- 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
- Houlihan, P.F., *The Birds of Ancient Egypt* (Aris and Phillips 1986)
- Jashemski, W.F., *The Gardens of Pompeii* (1979 and 1994)
- Jennison, G., *Animals for show and pleasure in Ancient Rome* (Manchester 1937)
- Jones, F.M.A., 'Drama, Boundaries, Imagination, and Columns in the Garden Room at Prima Porta', *Latomus* (forthcoming 2013)
- Jones, F.M.A., 'Roman Gardens, Imagination, and Cognitive Structure', *Mn* (forthcoming 2014)
- Jordanova, *History in Practice* (London, 2000)
- Kaster, G., *Die Gärten des Lucullus: Entwicklung und Bedeutung der Bebauung des Pincio-Hügels in Rom* (Munich, 1974)
- Kalof, L. (ed.), *A cultural history of animals in antiquity* (Oxford, 2007)
- Kellum, B., 'The Construction of Landscape in Augustan Rome: The Garden Room at the Villa ad Gallinas', *The Art Bulletin* 7 (1994), 211-224
- Kilpatrick, R.O., 'Nam unguentum dabo: Catullus 13 and Servius' Note on Phaon (*Aeneid* 3.279)' *The Classical Quarterly*, 48 (1998), 303-305
- Kitchin, R.M., 'Cognitive maps: What are they and why study them?' *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 14 (1994), 1-19
- Kronenberg, L., *Allegories of Farming from Greece and Rome: Philosophical satire in Xenophon, Varro, and Virgil* (Cambridge, 2009)
- Lazenby, F.D., 'Greek and Roman Household Pets' *Classical Journal*, 44 (1949), 245-252 and 299-307
- Matlin, M.W., *Cognition: sixth edition* (Wiley 2005)
- Matteucig, G., 'Lo studio naturalistic zoologico del portale di Eumachia ne Foro Pompeiano' *Bollettino della societa dei naturalisti in Napoli* 83 (1974), 213-42
- Mayer, R.G., 'Neronian Classicism' *AJP* 103 (1983) 305-18
- Newlands, C.E., *Statius Silvae Book II* (Cambridge, 2011)
- Pinker, S. *How the mind works* ( London, 1997)
- 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)
- Quinn, K., *Latin Explorations: critical studies in Roman literature* (London, 1963)
- Quinn, K., *Catullus: the Poems; edited with introduction, revised text and commentary* (London, 1973<sup>2</sup>)

- Reeder, J.C., *The Villa of Livia ad Gallinas Albas: A study in the Augustan villa and garden* (Providence, Rhode Island, 2001)
- Rutledge, S.H., *Ancient Rome as a Museum: Power, identity, and the culture of collecting* (Oxford, 2012)
- Shefer, E., 'The "Bird in the Cage" in the History of Sexuality: Sir John Everett Millais and William Holman Hunt', *Journal of Sexuality* 1 (1991), 446-80
- Smith, R.R.R., 'The Use of Images: visual history and ancient history', in T.P. Wiseman (ed.), *Classics in Progress: Essays on ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford, 2002), 59-102
- 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)
- Stewart, P., *The Social History of Roman Art* (Cambridge, 2008)
- Tammisto, A., 'Birds in Mosaics: a study on the representation of birds in Hellenistic and Romano-Campanian Tessellated Mosaics to the early Augustan age', *Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae* 18 (1997)
- Thaniel, G., 'Vergil's Leaf- and Bird-Similes of Ghosts', *Phoenix* 25 (1971), 237-245
- Thompson, D.W., *Glossary of Greek Birds* (Oxford, 1936)
- Tilley, C., 'Introduction: Identity, Place, Landscape and Heritage' *Journal of Material Culture* 11 (2004) 7-31
- Townend, G.B., 'The Literary Substrata to Juvenal's Satires', *JRS* 63 (1973), 148-60
- Toynbee, J.M.C., *Animals in Roman Life and Art* (1973)
- Van Dam, H.-J., *P. Papinius Statius, Silvae Book II; a commentary* (Leiden, 1984)
- Van den Hulst, H. (ed.), *Recursion and Human Language* (Berlin, 2010)
- Von Stackelberg, K.T., *The Roman Garden: Space, sense, and society* (Abingdon, 2009)
- Zanker, P., *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*; translated by A. Shapiro (Ann Arbor, 1988)