Introduction
Reading Roman Violence

Monica R. Gale and J. H. D. Scourfield*

I Violence and Rome

Roman history begins with an act of violence. Even before its walls are completed, the newly founded city is already stained by the blood of Romulus' twin brother Remus. The story is suggestive. In the imaginary of Roman writers, the killing of Remus came to afford a paradigm for other conflicts, civil war above all; and yet there were also other, less negative, ways of construing Romulus' foundational act of murder.[1] For us, the story might, in the first place, seem emblematic of a culture in which violence was widely prevalent; but the availability to the Romans themselves of a positive evaluation of the fratricide reminds us too that this was a culture in which (within certain limits) violence could be claimed as a good.[2]

---

* We should like to thank Catharine Edwards, Duncan Kennedy, and the Cambridge University Press readers for their valuable comments on an earlier draft of this introduction. Translations from Greek and Latin texts are our own.

[1] For the murder of Remus as paradigmatic of civil conflict, see esp. Hor. *Epod.* 7.17–20, Luc. 1.93–5; also Virg. *G.* 2.533 with R. F. Thomas 1988: 262 *ad loc.*, who notes that the apparently innocent phrase *Remus et frater* picks up the earlier references to fraternal strife at 2.496, 510; and *Aen.* 1.292–3, where, conversely, the apparent reconciliation of Remus and Romulus/Quirinus seems to mark the end of civil discord. A more positive construction is placed on the killing by, e.g., Livy 1.7.2, Ov. *Fast.* 4.837–48, the latter attributing the murder not to Romulus but to his subordinate Celer (warning to potential invaders); Prop. 3.9.50, Flor. 1.1.8 (foundation sacrifice). See further Jal 1963: 407–10; Wiseman 1995, esp. 9–17; Bannon 1997: 158–73; also Dench 2005: 20–5, on the similarly polyvalent character of another violent episode associated with the kingship of Romulus, the rape of the Sabine women.

[2] We should note at the outset that the definition and terminology of violence are themselves problematic. As we point out in Section III below (pp. 20–1), and as Gibson argues in more detail in Chapter 9, both the English word and its nearest Latin equivalent, *violentia*, regularly carry a negative charge, which is matched by a tendency to place *approved* acts of 'force' or 'coercion' under other rubrics. The attentive reader will observe that we ourselves have found it impossible to avoid aligning with such ideologically determined usages altogether, particularly in discussing issues of legality.

1

In its historical realities and its representations alike, the body that was Rome could indeed be said to be deeply marked by sanguinary reds and the blue-black of bruises. Our concern in this volume lies specifically with literary representations of violence in the Roman world; and yet these cannot be wholly disentangled either from other forms of representation, such as myth, or from the material and social contexts within which such representations were formulated. The relationship between violence in the text and violence in the world at large is in fact one of the book's central themes, and one of our aspirations is that it should contribute to an enhanced understanding of the place of violence in Roman culture as a whole, as well as sharpening our awareness of some of the problematics of violence and its representations in our own culture.

The book offers a series of explorations of literary violence across a period of six centuries and a wide range of texts and genres. The nature of the violence depicted varies considerably from text to text, and the approaches taken by our contributors naturally show similar variation. But through the series of chapters, united by their common focus, several major thematic strands emerge. In this Introduction, we seek first (Section I) to give an impression of 'real-world' Roman violence, with due regard to its political, social, and cultural contexts and the attitudes which direct, inform, or police it. Following this, we give (Section II) an overview of representations of violence in classical (especially Roman) myth and literature, taking a broad generic approach to the latter, and attempting to identify, in a provisional way, general tendencies in the character of the representations and their modern interpretation. Against this dual background, we then consider (Section III) the central theme of violence and power, in which issues of language are also implicated, proceeding in Section IV to what can be seen in part as a specific instantiation of this, the relationship between violence and gender. In the final part of the Introduction (Section V) we examine at somewhat greater length a question that we take to be fundamental to any ethically serious consideration of the representation of violence in written (as in other) texts, namely, the potential impact of such representations on the individual reader and on society at large. Our discussion thus draws together and seeks to offer a critical analysis of some of the main threads running through the various chapters which follow, elaborating on individual contributions as it does so; in keeping with our vision of the book as (we hope) more than the sum of its parts, we have not provided a sequential summary of the chapters in the manner characteristic of collaborative volumes.

'Rome', wrote Keith Hopkins, famously, 'was a warrior state';[3] and the embedding of violence in Roman culture is attested in the first place by the militarism which informed Roman society and ideology.[4] Many of the original readers of the texts considered in this volume will have had first-hand experience of armed conflict. Under the Republic, seasonal campaigning was the norm; for members of the elite, military service was a traditional preliminary to the holding of public office.[5] Under the Empire, *pax Romana* was, paradoxically, a precarious condition, founded upon and sustained by the threat of retaliatory violence by Roman forces: revolts and border wars were frequent, and the notion that peace was something to be imposed, when necessary, on recalcitrant barbarians appears to have been widely accepted.[6] From an ideological perspective, it seems significant that *virtus*, or 'manly virtue', is a concept particularly at home in the military sphere, while *gloria*, or prestige, is traditionally acquired primarily through military achievement: the capacity to inflict and endure violence on the field of battle is an essential (if sometimes theoretical) component in Roman notions of masculinity and authority in the political arena.

At the same time, less positively evaluated forms of violence were all too familiar for long periods of Roman history. The first century BC was dominated by a series of bloody and brutal civil wars, from the Social War to the Battle of Actium, and civil conflict is scarcely less prominent a feature of the Imperial period: notoriously, only a minority of Roman emperors died of natural causes. Writing in AD 396, Jerome catalogues at some length the often violent deaths of recent rulers, together with other upheavals which, he claims, have characterized contemporary history (*Ep.* 60.15–16): his deceased *laudandus*, Nepotianus, was fortunate to have been freed from the necessity of witnessing such horrors. Strikingly,

---

[3] Hopkins 1983: 1.
[4] On Roman militarism see further O'Rourke, Chapter 4 below, esp. pp. 125–6.
[5] For military service as a standard step in a political career, and on imperialist ideology under the Republic, see Harris 1979, esp. 10–41. The normative status of warfare in the Republican world-view is also underlined by the tradition, referred to in the *Res gestae* (13), that the ritual act of closing the gates of the Temple of Janus – signifying the attainment of a state of peace throughout the empire – had been performed only twice in the entire history of Rome before the birth of Augustus.
[6] On the ideology of *pax Romana* see Woolf 1993, with consideration of revolts and other forms of violence in the provinces during the Imperial period at 185–9. Mattern 1999: 81–122 argues that the threat of retaliatory violence was central to imperial policy under the Principate; see also 162–202 on the importance of military victory and conquest in enhancing both the image of Rome and the prestige of the individual, especially the emperor. The notion that peace must, if necessary, be imposed upon the conquered is most famously articulated by Virgil's Anchises (*Aen.* 6.851–3), whose *parcere subiectis et debellare superbos* ('spare the conquered and crush the proud', 853) might fairly be described as a distillation of Roman imperialist ideology; cf., e.g., Cic. *Off.* 1.35; Aug. *RG* 3.1–2, 26–7; Suet. *Aug.* 21; Plin. *Pan.* 16–17.

the same topos could be plausibly employed with reference to periods as diverse as the early first century BC (Cic. *De or.* 3.8, on the death of L. Licinius Crassus) and the reign of Domitian (Tac. *Agr.* 44.4–45.3).[7] All these passages convey a powerful sense, albeit in rhetorically loaded contexts, of a world in which violence regularly served as a political instrument, whether of the ruling power, in quelling or punishing opposition, or of those who aspired to rule. In this connection we might think, too, of the episodes of rioting and other forms of popular violence that erupted periodically throughout Antiquity, from the mobs incited or organized by P. Clodius Pulcher and others during the power-struggles of the late Republic to the circumcellions of North Africa in the fourth and early fifth centuries AD.[8] Not all such outbreaks, of course, were motivated by political (or religious) considerations: Tacitus, for example, in his brief but memorable account of a riot that broke out at a gladiatorial show in Pompeii in AD 59 (*Ann.* 14.17), offers a snapshot of something akin to modern football hooliganism. The historian records that this incident was sparked off by exchanges of insults between the Pompeians and the inhabitants of the neighbouring town of Nuceria: in this instance, then, the motivating factor appears to have been rivalry between local communities.[9]

There was also a more obviously 'Wild West' aspect, fostered by the lack of systematic policing even in the major cities, and by huge economic inequalities.[10] For travellers, the risk of physical attack or robbery with

---

[7] Cicero writes that Crassus was spared the horrors of the Social War and the bloody power-struggles that followed; Tacitus similarly observes that Agricola was fortunate in not living to witness Domitian's purge of senatorial opponents in the final years of his reign. On the topos, see further Scourfield 1993: 196.

[8] On mob and gang violence in the late Republic, see Nippel 1995: 47–57, 70–84, Lintott 1999: 67–88; for the Imperial period, Africa 1971; on circumcellions, Shaw 2011: 630–720, 828–39; on violence in late Antiquity in general, Drake 2006.

[9] Tacitus reports numerous injuries and casualties, especially among the Nucerians (*ergo deportati sunt in urbem multi e Nucerinis trunco per vulnera corpore, ac plerique liberorum aut parentum mortis deflebant*, 'in consequence, many of the Nucerians were carried to the city, their bodies mutilated by wounds, and many lamented the deaths of children or parents'). Fagan 2011a: 93–6 draws attention to the limitations of the analogy with modern sports-related violence, noting that this is the only instance on record of rioting amongst arena crowds; the incident should be understood rather in terms of social tensions, apparently inflamed in some way by the show. On local rivalries and associated violence, see also Fagan 2011b: 488–9.

[10] On the lack of systematic policing under the Republic in particular, see Nippel 1995, esp. 16–26, 85–112. More recently, Fuhrmann 2012 has argued at length for a greater degree of institutionalization in policing under the Empire than is commonly allowed; he notes, however, that 'policing in the Roman Empire' – which was largely carried out by soldiers – 'was often focused on preserving the interests of the state and cooperative elites' (234) rather than on protecting ordinary people, and it should at all events be borne in mind that the familiar institution of an

violence was particularly acute. Banditry and piracy were endemic to the Roman world.[11] The younger Pliny responds without surprise to a correspondent's report of the recent disappearance of a distinguished *eques* who had journeyed as far as Ocriculum on the Via Flaminia and then simply vanished; a similar fate, says Pliny, befell his own fellow-townsman Metilius Crispus, who, after setting out for Rome, was never heard of again, and is presumed dead (*Ep.* 6.25). Juvenal suggests, through his creation Umbricius (3.278–308), that the streets of Rome itself are unsafe by night, at least for those who cannot afford an escort: the perils of urban life include not only robbery, but the unprovoked violence of the drunken bully, who will not let his victim escape without a beating. Though we will naturally suspect some satiric exaggeration here, references elsewhere to random assaults on the street or, more generally, to the dangers of travelling the city on foot, especially after dark, testify to a widespread perception of interpersonal violence as rife within the urban centre as well as without.[12] While such perceptions cannot be taken as accurate pointers to the actual incidence of muggings or other kinds of violent crime, they plainly have a basis in historical reality.[13] References in literary texts (including outright fictions) thus converge with other forms of evidence[14]

---

independent and specialized police force is a modern phenomenon, emerging in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (cf. Nippel 1995: ix, 1–2, 115–19; also Fagan 2011b: 486–7, with helpful comparative comment on Rome and early modern Europe). On links between poverty and crime, see Grünewald 2004: 25–31, Morley 2006: 33 ('the poor are by far the most likely to become victims of crime as well as its perpetrators'); cf. also D. Braund 1993: 206, who notes that fugitive slaves, as well as discharged soldiers and sailors, might resort to piracy or brigandage.

[11] Shaw 1984: 8–12 (= 2004: 331–5) notes that deaths at the hands of bandits were sufficiently common to have given rise to a formulaic expression found on tombstones, *interfectus a latronibus* ('killed by bandits'), while Roman legal texts list attacks by bandits as common causes of death (along with old age and sickness), and as 'natural disasters' for which no legal action may be taken. See further Grünewald 2004: 14–32, and on the persistent problems of piracy, de Souza 1999, esp. 97–224.

[12] Such assaults by elite youths, individually or in gangs, constitute something of a topos: see, e.g., Cic. *Cael.* 20 (Caelius alleged to have assaulted married women returning from a dinner-party); Tac. *Ann.* 13.25, Suet. *Ner.* 26 (similar behaviour, as well as assaults on male citizens and robbery, attributed to the emperor Nero); Apul. *Met.* 2.18 (Photis warns Lucius to come back early from dinner, to avoid falling foul of a gang of 'most noble' youths that has been terrorizing the neighbourhood). For the dangers of nocturnal travel more generally see, e.g., Prop. 3.16.1–6; Tib. 1.2.25–8; Petron. *Sat.* 82.2–4; Plin. *NH* 8.144; Juv. 10.19–22.

[13] Ancient perceptions regarding the ubiquity of such acts of violence may usefully be thought of as a *tertium quid*, mediating between historical realities and the representation and manipulation of those realities in the literary texts; cf. Fagan 2011b: 469–70: 'ancient anecdotes and fiction can act as mirrors that reflect social attitudes, assumptions, and realities, even if the immediate context is highly dubious or even fantastical' (see also 490, where Fagan argues that the level of interpersonal violence in Roman society cannot be gauged with any degree of certainty). Cf. also pp. 18–19 below, with n. 80.

[14] See n. 11 above.

to reveal a society in which the individual was at considerable (if unquantifiable) risk of a direct encounter with physical violence.

Still more germane to the concerns of this book than such instances of criminal assault is the institutionalization of various forms of violence in Roman culture. We have already mentioned the centrality of military values to Roman masculine (and national) identity: the institutionalized violence of warfare offers a privileged arena for the Roman male to demonstrate both his personal superiority to other citizen males and the ascendancy of Rome's military might over barbarian enemies. At the same time, the Roman army paradoxically required of the ordinary soldier – in the interests of military discipline – what would under other circumstances be construed as a degrading and effeminizing submissiveness to physical violence. With the special exceptions noted below (pp. 8–9), the army was the only context in which a citizen might legitimately be subjected to summary physical chastisement.[15] In the first place, the citizen-soldier might be flogged – a penalty normally associated with slaves – by his superior officers; but the harshness of Roman military discipline is of course most famously embodied in the practice of decimation, which again has analogies with collective penalties prescribed under extreme circumstances for slaves.[16] Here we can see in an arresting way the ambiguity of a soldier's status, and a corresponding duality in the exemplary quality of the violence which a soldier had to be prepared to face. To quote Jonathan Walters, the soldier's battle scars 'are conceptually placed as the polar opposite of scars from a servile beating. They are . . . the signifier, permanently inscribed on his body, of his social status as a full man.'[17] War wounds, then, are the mark of masculine courage and free male status: the warrior-hero is the ultimate *exemplum virtutis*. By a kind of inversion, the corporal and capital punishments peculiar to the military context fulfilled a similarly exemplary, but this time deterrent, function in offering to the fellow-soldiers of the condemned a graphic representation of the consequences of insubordination.[18]

---

[15] See Walters 1997: 37–40; cf. Konstan/Raval, Chapter 1, p. 48 below.
[16] The analogy is made explicit by Cassius Longinus in Tacitus' account of the senatorial debate concerning the punishment of Pedanius Secundus' slaves (*Ann.* 14.44; see below). On decimation, and Roman military discipline in general, see esp. Polyb. 6.37–8; specific instances are recorded at, e.g., Tac. *Ann.* 3.21, *Hist.* 1.37; Plut. *Crass.* 10.4, *Ant.* 39.9; Suet. *Galb.* 12.2; App. *B Civ* 1.118.
[17] Walters 1997: 40.
[18] On the inherent ambiguity of scars, which may be signifiers of (honourable) endurance and courage or of (dishonourable) servility or insubordination, and may be susceptible of different interpretations, see Roller 2004: 12–14; as Roller notes (13 n. 24; cf. Leigh 1995: 196–7, Glancy 2010: 27–37), the ambiguity may sometimes be resolved by appealing to the location of the wound (scars on the front connote military courage, whereas those on the back are indicative of cowardice or servile status). The symbolism of wounds and scars may be related in turn to a more general

Even more than in the case of soldiers, the physical punishments inflicted on slaves possessed a powerfully spectacular quality.[19] The scars left behind by whip or cudgel are invoked in the literary sources as the distinguishing marks of the slave,[20] while it is in the nature of crucifixion – the servile punishment *par excellence*[21] – to expose the body of the victim to the view of the passer-by. After the crushing of the revolt of Spartacus, 6,000 captured rebels are said to have been crucified along the Appian Way:[22] on a rough calculation, and assuming for the sake of illustration that the figure of 6,000 is accurate and that the crosses were erected in facing pairs on either side of the road and at equal distances from each other all the way from Capua to Rome, the traveller would have passed two of these tortured bodies every sixty or seventy metres for two hundred kilometres – a vivid demonstration indeed of the slave's subjection to the authority of free citizens. In an episode from AD 61 recounted by Tacitus (*Ann.* 14.42–5), the punishment meted out to the household slaves of the city prefect L. Pedanius Secundus, who had been murdered by one of them, possesses a similarly spectacular quality, linked to the exemplary nature of the punishment emphasized by C. Cassius Longinus in the senatorial debate which preceded the slaves' execution. Tacitus reports that the fate of the slaves – 400 of them, all of whom were by ancient tradition liable to the death penalty in consequence of the crime – aroused considerable sympathy among the people of the city and some members of the Senate; Cassius, however, argued in favour of the collective punishment, essentially on the ground that the slave population could be kept in check only by the deterrent effect of such harsh measures.[23] Tacitus' account concludes with the memorable image of the slaves led off to execution along a route lined with soldiers, to prevent popular resentment at the senatorial decision from erupting into further violence.

tension in Roman ideology between different ways of conceptualizing (im)passivity, incisively discussed by Bartsch 2006: 174–82; as she points out, *patientia* may be construed either as unmanly 'subjection' to sexual and other demeaning acts or as admirable indifference to bodily suffering and physical pain. For the deterrent effect of decimation and associated punishments in the military context, see Polyb. 6.38; cf. App. *B Civ.* 1.118–19.

[19] On the physical punishments and general abuses to which slaves could be subject, see Bradley 1987: 113–37, esp. 118–23, 131–3; on the use of torture, Bradley 1994: 165–70.

[20] See, e.g., Plaut. *Amph.* 446, (with servile status implicit) Catull. 25.10–11, Hor. *Epod.* 4.3; for discussion, Saller 1991: 153–4, 1994: 137–9; Fitzgerald 2000: 32–41.

[21] See, e.g., Hengel 1977: 51–63; Cantarella 1991: 187–9; Aubert 2002: 110–30, esp. 113–14.

[22] App. *B Civ.* 1.120.

[23] For deterrence as an aim of judicial punishments in general and capital punishment in particular see, e.g., Sen. *Clem.* 1.22.1, *De ira* 1.19.7; [Quint.] *Decl. min.* 274.13; Gell. *NA* 7.14.4; *Dig.* 48.19.28.15 (Callistratus); K. M. Coleman 1990: 48–9; Harries 2007: 37.

In general, then, physical violence in civil contexts may be said to mark a clear line of demarcation between the slave – whose body, as the property of his or her master, could legitimately be subjected to flogging and similar punishments – and the free citizen, whose body was, at least in theory, inviolable.[24] Yet the reinforcement of hegemonic structures in the Roman world through the use of violent treatment goes beyond the distinction between slave and free. In later Antiquity, spectacular penalties such as flogging and crucifixion were extended to lower-class citizens or *humiliores*, reinforcing the social stratification of the citizen body.[25] Already at earlier dates the right to physical inviolability could be held not to apply to certain categories of free person: prostitutes and mime-actresses seem to have received little protection against sexual *vis*,[26] and actors continued to face flogging even after Augustus removed the power of magistrates to impose such punishment without restriction.[27] In the domestic context women and children were, within limits, subject to physical chastisement at the hands of the *paterfamilias*, and even, in the case of children, by social inferiors such as the schoolmaster, notorious in Roman literature for his frequent resort to corporal punishment of his pupils.[28] Notionally, the father's authority over his children – even as adults – was absolute: *patria*

[24] See Saller 1991: 151–7, (with fuller detail) 1994: 134–42.
[25] See, e.g., Walters 1997: 38; Harries 2007: 36; Fagan 2011a: 28, 170; and on the general increase in judicial violence through the period of the Empire, MacMullen 1986. Garnsey 1970 traces in detail the relationship between social status and legal privilege/disadvantage, including the application of differential penalties, from the first century BC to the third century AD and beyond.
[26] See Gardner 1986: 246–7; McGinn 1998: 326–7.
[27] See Suet. *Aug.* 45.3–4; further, C. Edwards 1997: 74–5; Lintott 1999: 94–5.
[28] On women as objects of domestic violence, see esp. P. Clark 1998, J. A. Schroeder 2004, both with late-Antique focus; on the treatment of pupils by schoolmasters, Bonner 1977: 143–5, Fagan 2011b: 475–6. The complexity of the situation within the household is well brought out by Clark, who shows, for example, how the normative slave/free polarity could be inverted through the exercise by older slaves of disciplinary authority over the children of the master and mistress (cf. Fitzgerald 2000: 56–7), while aggression arising from intrafamilial tensions between the women of the house might be displaced on to (female) slaves (cf. Schroeder 2004: 422–3). Clark also notes the ambiguous attitudes attending violence on the part of the *paterfamilias*, who was expected to keep his household in order, and yet at the same time demonstrate self-control and not display irascibility; Harris 2001: 321–36 argues that a similar ideological imperative encouraged the exercise of restraint in the treatment of slaves. For wives subject to violent treatment by their husbands divorce was an option, but 'domestic abuse was seldom acknowledged to exist and could even be praised' (Harries 2007: 86, citing the exemplary tale of Egnatius Mecenius (Val. Max. 6.3.9), who, after beating his wife to death for drinking wine, was agreed to have made a salutary example of the offending woman), and in practice unilateral divorce was not always straightforward (see Treggiari 1991b; P. Clark 1998: 129 n. 21; Schroeder 2004: 416–17). Among children, the evidence for physical punishment of girls as well as boys is slight: see Saller 1994: 152; P. Clark 1998: 129 n. 36.

potestas embraced the right not only to beat children but even to have them put to death.[29]

Here, however, we encounter some uncertainty or complexity in Roman attitudes towards physical violence. The sources strongly suggest a degree of ambivalence around the unfettered exercise of such rights as those associated with *patria potestas*. Even the proverbially stern elder Cato is said to have been critical of husbands who beat their wives and children (Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 20.3: 'he said that the man who beat his wife or child laid hands on the most sacred of holy things'[30]); and Quintilian similarly condemns the practice of beating schoolchildren, on the ground that corporal punishment is not only inappropriate to the status of a freeborn youth but ineffective anyway (*Inst.* 1.3.14).[31] Again, the ambivalence displayed by the elegists in relation to physical abuse of their (non-citizen?) *puellae* no doubt reflects to a certain extent the values of society at large: while the *rixa*, or violent quarrel, is clearly regarded as titillating, and Propertius apparently considers himself fully within his rights to man-handle a girl who refuses to remove her clothes, both he and Tibullus depict the tearing of hair and breaking down of doors as the actions of a *rusticus*.[32] In the public sphere, we have already considered Tacitus' account of the senatorial and popular unease surrounding the collective punishment imposed on the slaves of Pedanius Secundus; and even in the context of war, certain acts of violence might be regarded as excessive.

---

[29] Note, however, that Shaw 2001: 56–77 adduces powerful arguments to question whether the so-called *ius vitae necisque* was ever in fact enshrined in law, let alone widely exercised; cf. Saller 1994: 115–17. On *patria potestas* in general see, e.g., Crook 1967a; Gardner 1993: 52–84; Saller 1994: 102–5, 114–32; Arjava 1998.

[30] τὸν δὲ τύπτοντα γαμετὴν ἢ παῖδα τοῖς ἁγιωτάτοις ἔλεγεν ἱεροῖς προσφέρειν τὰς χεῖρας.

[31] *caedi vero discentis, quamlibet id receptum sit et Chrysippus non improbet, minime velim, primum quia deforme atque servile est et certe (quod convenit si aetatem mutes) iniuria: deinde quod, si cui tam est mens inliberalis ut obiurgatione non corrigatur, is etiam ad plagas ut pessima quaeque mancipia durabitur: postremo quod ne opus erit quidem hac castigatione si adsiduus studiorum exactor adstiterit* ('I am strongly opposed to the beating of pupils, however, although it is common practice and Chrysippus has no objection to it, first because it is base and slavish and certainly insulting (as is agreed in the case of adults); secondly because, if a boy's mind is so ignoble as not to be corrected by reproof, he will merely become hardened to blows like the worst kind of slave; and finally, because there will not even be a need for such a punishment, if the master acts as a constant overseer of the pupil's studies'); cf. [Plut.] *De lib. educ.* 12. Saller 1994: 142–50 (cf. 1991: 157–64) affords a nuanced discussion of differential attitudes to the physical disciplining of free children and slaves.

[32] See Tib. 1.1.73–4, 1.10.61–4, Prop. 3.8, Ov. *Am.* 1.7.11–18 (*rixa* and/or marks of physical violence as titillating); Prop. 2.15.17–20 (refusal to remove clothing invites violence); Tib. 1.10.51–60, Prop. 2.5.21–6 (physical violence associated with *rusticitas*). Cf. also Tib. 1.6.73–4, where the lover both contemplates the possibility of beating his girl and imagines his subsequent regret; Ov. *Ars am.* 2.169–76 (a send-up of elegiac ambivalence). On the dynamics of violence in elegy, see further Cahoon 1988; Fredrick 1997 and 2012: 430–6; Greene 1998: 84–91; James 2003a: 184–97; Kennedy 2012: 189–95; O'Rourke, Chapter 4 below.

Thus Cicero, while implicitly justifying the annihilation of 'cruel' or 'savage' enemies, betrays evident discomfort in regard to the destruction of Corinth,[33] and debate about the end of the *Aeneid* has shown just how difficult it can be to distinguish between what, in Roman thought, constitutes justifiable brutality and what is to be seen as a manifestation of uncontrolled, and thus non-approved, battle-frenzy or *furor*.[34]

In all this, the characteristically Graeco-Roman virtue of self-control (*sophrosune/temperantia*) may be seen as paramount. In many contexts, the judicious application of physical force or corporal punishment is held to be crucial to the maintenance of discipline (whether in the household, the army, or the state), and may be positively valued. Yet an excessive or uncontrolled propensity towards violent action (or the viewing of violent spectacle) typically meets with criticism; in Suetonius' *Lives*, for example, 'bad' emperors are characteristically violent, even towards their wives or other members of the imperial family, and manifest an excessive interest in gladiatorial shows, torture, and execution.[35]

Certain kinds of violent act were of course also regulated, at least in principle, by law.[36] It should be observed, however, that the *leges de vi* promulgated in the late-Republican and Augustan periods were predominantly concerned with violence in the public sphere, and more specifically with the maintenance of public order.[37] The Republican *lex Lutatia* and *lex Pompeia de vi* were passed at times of political crisis (the insurrection of Lepidus in 78 BC and the extended period of rioting following the murder of Clodius in 52), and dealt mainly with acts of sedition; the *lex Plautia* is more controversial, but seems likewise to have been concerned primarily with crimes perceived as directed against

---

[33] Cic. *Off.* 1.35 *parta autem victoria conservandi ii qui non crudeles in bello, non immanes fuerunt, ut maiores nostri Tusculanos Aequos Volscos Sabinos Hernicos in civitatem etiam acceperunt, at Carthaginem et Numantiam funditus sustulerunt; nollem Corinthum, sed credo aliquid secutos . . .* ('when victory is won, those who have not been cruel or savage in war should be spared: thus, our ancestors went so far as to grant citizenship to the Tusculani, Aequi, Volscians, Sabines, and Hernici, but utterly destroyed Carthage and Numantia; I could wish that they had not done so in the case of Corinth, but I believe that they had some end in view . . .').

[34] For a range of views, see Galinsky 1988 and 1994; Putnam 1990; Stahl 1990; M. R. Wright 1997; Tarrant 2012: 16–30.

[35] See, e.g., Suet. *Tib.* 53.2, 61–2, *Calig.* 32–3, *Claud.* 34, *Ner.* 35, *Vit.* 14, *Dom.* 10; according to Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.76), Drusus was said to have been reprimanded by Tiberius for displaying an excessive taste for blood in the arena. For the ideological premium set on the control of anger in classical Antiquity see Harris 2001, with the 'angry ruler' discussed at 229–63.

[36] Harries 2007: 106–17 affords a broad-ranging survey of remedies for violence in the Roman world.

[37] On the *leges de vi*, see Nippel 1995: 54–5; Lintott 1999: 107–24; Harries 2007: 107, 110–11.