LUCRETIUS, HIS COPYISTS AND THE HORRORS OF THE UNDERWORLD

(DE RERUM NATURA 3.978–1023)
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Epicurus denied that the underworld depicted by poets and painters existed and gave an allegorical interpretation of the particular punishments said to be suffered there. What men feared in the afterlife took place according to him in this life. The idea came to Epicurus from the writings of Democritus. It turned up in various forms in the teachings of other philosophical schools. Lucretius no doubt would have taken the general substance of his criticism of conventional beliefs about the afterlife from Epicurus. Some details, however, reflect the life of Republican Rome rather than that of fourth century Athens.

Most modern discussion has revolved slowly and uselessly around the question of how widespread belief in an afterlife was among Lucretius' readers. Only a few scholars have tried to grapple with the problem of the origin of the details of Lucretius' argument. Something, I believe, remains to be said about these details. The text itself presents a number of problems. At five points our two witnesses of the direct tradition, codd. Leiden, Bibl. d. Rijksuniv. Voss. Lat. F. 30 (O) and Q. 94 (Q), vary; at one of these most editors seem to me to err about what lay in the archetype. At thirteen points O and Q agree in manifest nonsense too great even for the most conservative of editors to stomach; at two further points at least I find it difficult to believe that Lucretius wrote what is transmitted. O and Q are also united in making no reference to the punishment of Ixion. We know that in allegorising the underworld, Epicurus included Ixion among the sinners punished. Furthermore an ancient commentator on Virgil's Aeneid appears to have had access to a text of the De rerum natura containing a number of verses about Ixion absent from the minuscule ancestor of O and Q. The integrity of the direct tradition is thus open to challenge where Ixion is concerned. The five problems are interconnected and may usefully be treated together.

I. The Roman Details of Lucretius’ Underworld

The victims of underworld punishment listed in the directly transmitted text of the De rerum natura — Tantalus, Tityos, Sisyphus and the Danaids — would have come from a passage of Epicurus’ writings. Likewise the bogey Cerberus. This need not, however, be the case with ‘Tartarus’ or with the ‘Furiæ’. For the
Greek poets ὁ Τάρταρος was normally a place very deep in the earth, below the kingdom of Hades. So too ‘Tartarus’ for Virgil and subsequent Latin poets. Here in Lucretius, however, ‘Tartarus’ is a fire-breathing monster, a denizen perhaps of a peculiarly Roman Hell. The etymologically obscure Ἐρινύες of Greek heroic story usually received the name ‘Furiae’ from the Latin poets as the result, no doubt, of the way they made their victims go mad. They were sometimes put in the underworld by Greek poets but did not figure regularly in descriptions of this region. ‘Furiae’, on the other hand, appear almost every time a Latin poet mentions it. They carry equipment never given to the Ἐρινύες and perform a much wider range of functions. The use by Roman politicians of the singular ‘Furia’ in abuse of political enemies suggests that, unlike Ἐρινύες, the Latin term carried no inherent idea of re-establishing order and justice. Lucretius’ ‘Furiae’ may reflect nothing at all in Epicurus’ writings but rather some purely Roman conception of the afterlife.

The moral faults singled out by Lucretius — fear of the gods of heaven in the case of Tantalus, lechery in that of Tityos, political ambition in that of Sisyphus, discontent with what one has in that of the Danaids — were all objects of criticism for Greek philosophers, and for Epicurus in particular. There is no good reason to suppose that Lucretius turned an account of general irrational fears into one of a specific fear of the gods at vv. 982 – 3. The reference to the elm-rods and axes in v. 996, on the other hand, and the use of the term ‘imperium’ in v. 998 gave a Roman flavour to his account of political ambition.

Lucretius’ allegorisation of ‘Cerberus et Furiae... et lucis egestas, Tartarus horriiferos eructans faucibus aestus’ differs as a whole from anything which could be imagined in Epicurus. It falls into two parts; the terrifying aspects of ‘Acherouns’ are interpreted in vv. 1014 – 17 as the external penalties for crime imposed by a man’s community; in vv. 1018 – 22, on the other hand, they are interpreted as the internal torments of his guilty conscience. Where the latter allegory is concerned, we may accept the parallel found in a fragment of Democritus — ἐνοι ὑπητῆς φύσεως διάλυσον ὁδ θαμνοὺς άνθρωποι, συνειδήσει δὲ τῆς ἐν τῷ βίῳ κακοπραγμοφύτης, τὸν τῆς ζωῆς χρόνον ἐν ταραχαῖς καὶ φόβοις ταλαμωρέσου, γειδέα περὶ τοῦ μετὰ τὴν τελευτήν μυθοπλαστέοντες χρόνου — but reject the one found in the way in which the attacks of the Ἐρινύες on Orestes and Alcmeon were rationalised at Athenian assemblies and even in the theatre. It was in the upper world that the Ἐρινύες beset the matricidal heroes. Epicurus would have expressed himself more in the manner of the fifth century atomist. Lucretius followed him. We must not be misled by the reference to ‘Furiae’. Where the former allegory is concerned, no Greek text identifies the underworld depicted by the poets and painters as a real upper-world locale of capital punishment. It is conceivable therefore that the substance of vv. 1014 – 17 came from the imagination of Lucretius.

The details of vv. 1014 – 17 reflect clearly the Latin poet’s own milieu. One might contrast Aeschylus, Eum. 186 – 90:

οὐ καρανιστήρες ὀφθαλμοφόρους
The Attic tragedian seems to have gone outside Greece for his picture of horror, probably to the Orient.

The words ‘carcer et horribilis de saxo iactus’ have to do with the throwing of a criminal from a height. Commentators often refer ‘uerbera carnifices / -is robur pix’ to tortures used in a process of criminal investigation. The phrases ‘metus in uita’ and ‘sceleris . . . luella’ indicate, however, that a method of execution is being described. The use of the term ‘carnifex’ confirms this. The method in question would be suffocation by smoke preceded by a number of non-lethal fiery torments. The Athens of Epicurus’ time had a prison and witnessed regularly the flogging and execution of public malefactors. Nevertheless a fairly extensive historical record fails to mention either of the methods alluded to by Lucretius. Both must be Roman methods.

Bearers of false witness and traitors of various kinds could be hurled from the ‘saxum Tarpeium’. This has been pointed out regularly by commentators since the time of G.B. Pio. It seems, however, to have escaped notice that a condemned person was often, if not usually, held for a time in the ‘carcer Mamertinus’ before being marched to the top of the nearby ‘saxum’. Lucretius provides an unusually detailed picture.

Incendiaries and malefactors of apparently related type could be burnt alive. The use for the pyre of pine branches, good producers of suffocating smoke, is attested by Juvenal. A thrashing preceded this form of execution, as it did others. The application of other torments was never regular at Rome or in Roman provinces but seems to have been more common than it was in fourth century Athens. Hot resin was a torment employed in many parts of the Mediterranean area, but heated metal plates were perhaps a Roman speciality. Again, Lucretius’ picture possesses an unusual vividness.

The account of the pangs of conscience in vv. 1018–1022 has, as I have argued, a Greek background. Lucretius draws the imagery of ‘mens . . . adhibet stimulos torretque flagellis’, however, from Rome. Athenians used the κέντρον only on animals. Not so the Romans. The old Latin versions of comedy frequently presented an old man lying in wait for a miscreant slave ‘cum stimulis aut flagris.’ Behind the apparently similar Aeschylus, Eum. 155–161 — ἐμοὶ δ’ ἄνειδος ξ ὀνειράτων molōν | ἐπισωμῦ δίκαν διφηλίτατον | μεσολαβεῖ κέντρον | ὑπὸ φρένας, ὑπὸ λοβὸν | πάρεστι μαστίκτορος δάιμον δαμίου | βαρὺ περίβαρο κρῶς ἔχειν — lie two quite distinct activities, one the flagellation of human beings, the other the stimulation of animals.

What I hope to have demonstrated concerning the substance and presentation of 3. 987–1023 ought not to be thought to support the notion that the prime concern of the De rerum natura was to rescue Memmius and readers like him from
the spiritual ills of late Republican Rome. A well-off citizen did not at this period have to fear any form of flagellation or capital punishment if brought before a properly constituted court. The Rome which from time to time gave specific colours to Lucretius’ very general philosophical argument was the city of the past, the past as presented by the annalists and more particularly by the poet Ennius in his *Annales*.

II. The ‘robur’ of v. 1017

The Italian humanist manuscripts used for the early printed editions of Lucretius all descended from Q. This read v. 1017 as

‘uerbera carnifices robur pix iam mina taeda’.

‘Iam mina’ was easily corrected. Editors kept ‘uerbera carnifices robur’, interpreting ‘robur’ as a cell of the ‘carcer’. Without knowing of the reading of Q, G. Wakefield declared ‘carnifices’ in this position to be ‘omnino otiosum . . . et suspectae fidei’ and suggested, although he did not print in his text,

‘uerbera carnificis, robur, pix, lammina, taeda’.

Of the many subsequent editors of Lucretius, only H. Diels, K. Büchner and K. Müller have printed Wakefield’s suggestion. W.E. Leonard and S.B. Smith print ‘carnificis’ but treat it as a nominative plural. Wakefield’s objection to the personal ‘carnifices’ standing in an otherwise impersonal series seems to me a valid one. The phrase ‘uerbera carnificis’ is not, however plausible. The Roman ‘carnifex’ was concerned with execution. Thrashing preceded most, if not all, forms of execution. This preliminary was performed, however, in another place and by other personnel, perhaps normally termed ‘uerberatores’. A passage of an inscription from Puteoli relating to crucifixion is instructive on the latter point: ‘. . . qui supplic(ium) de ser(uo) seruaue priuatim sumer(e) uolet, uti is qui sumi uolet ita supplic(ium) sumet: si in cruc(em) patibul(atum) agere uolet, redempt(or) asser(es) uincul(a) restes uerberatorib(us) et uerb erator(es) praeb(ere) d(ebet) et quiaq(uis) supplic(ium) sumet pro oper(is) sing(ulis) quae patibul(um) ferunt uerberatorib(us)q(ue) item carnif(ici) HS IIII d(are) d(ebet).’ The use of flagellation in investigatory torture is a different matter. The genitive ‘carnificis’ therefore has to be taken with ‘robur’.

The allusion to the ‘carcer’ in the previous verse makes it unlikely that ‘robur’ has anything to do with this place. Wakefield cited three suggestions, the first identifying it with ‘eculeus’, the second with ‘igneum’/ξυλον, the third with ‘crux’.

The word denoted properly the wood of the red oak and had a wide metaphorical spread. Our record may not have retained all its more technical uses. The fact that we have to do with an execution rather than with investigatory torture excludes Wakefield’s first suggestion. It would make good sense, however, to take ‘carnificis robur’ as the wooden apparatus to which the ‘carnifex’ attached the person to be burnt. Another passage of the Puteoli inscription relating to ‘crematio’ describes the procedure as follows: ‘quot supplic(ium) magistrat(us) public(e) sumet ita imperat quotiescumq(ue) imperat(um) er(it) praestu esse
supplicium sumer(e) cruces statuere clauos pecem candel(as) quaeq(ue) ad eas res opus erunt reo gratis praest(are) debeto’ (II 11–13). In describing Carthaginian behaviour Silius used ‘robur’ as a synonym of ‘crux’.

III. The ‘uolucres’ of v. 993

O and Q present the story of Tityos as follows:

\begin{verbatim}
neceq Tityon uolucres ineunt Acherunte iacentem
neceq quid sub magno scrutentur pectore quicquam
perpetuam aetatem possunt reperire profecto
quamlibet immanni proiecto corporis extet
qui non sola nouem dispersis iugera membris
obtineat sed qui terrai totius orbem
non tamen aeternum poterit perferre dolorem
nec praebere cibum proprio de corpore semper
sed Tityos nobis hic es in amore iacentem
quem uolucres lacerant atque exest anxius angor
aut alia quausi scindunt curpedine curae
\end{verbatim}

The Italian humanists mended ‘quid’ in v. 985, ‘es’ in v. 992 and ‘curpedine’ in v. 994; De Tournebu ‘dispersis’ in v. 988. Wakefield seems to have been the first to challenge ‘uolucres lacerant’ in v. 993, suggesting in his note ‘quem uolucris lacerat, atque exest, anxius angor’.

A. Brieger wondered what vultures were doing in an account of the pangs of love and postulated a large lacuna after ‘lacerant’.

Succeeding editors have kept the transmitted text, most of them explaining it in the manner of H.A.J. Munro as a paratactic comparison. The translation of ‘quem uolucres lacerant atque exest anxius angor’ as ‘whom . . . the vultures mangle, that is aching anguish devours him’ (C. Bailey) is not justified by Cicero, Verr. 5. 184 ‘donum dignum Capitolio atque ista arce omnium nationum’ or by any use of ‘atque’ found in Lucretius’ poem. In any case, there was no need to mention again at this point the vultures of the myth. The allegorical explanations of the sufferings of Tantalus, Sisyphus and the Danaids do not import mythical details. E.J. Kenney argues that the ‘uolucres’ are the winged Επόνες of Hellenistic verse. The verb ‘lacerare’, as Kenney is almost driven to admit, hardly fits any act attributed or attributable to the Επόνες. It is, in any case, not credible that, after denouncing a myth of one age, the poet should refer, even sarcastically, in his explanation to one of another age. Instead of ‘uolucres lacerant’ we should expect some reference to current reality corresponding with ‘uolucres ineunt’ of v. 984, just as ‘in amore iacentem’ corresponds with ‘Acherunte iacentem’. A careless scribe has let his mind wander back to 3. 880.

What Lucretius actually wrote lies, however, beyond the power of conjectural criticism to restore.

IV. The ‘saxum’ of ‘Acheruns’

O and Q begin the account of the underworld bogies as follows:
Cerberus et funae iam uero et lucis egestas
Tartarus horriferos eructans faucibus aestus
qui neque sunt usquam nec possunt esse profecto
sed metus in uita poenarum pro male factis
est insignibus insignis scelerisque luella
carecer et horribilis de saxo iactus eorum
uerbera carnifices/carnificis robur pix iam mina taedae.

The Italian humanists were worried by an apparent lack of syntax in the first three verses. With some justice. It is noteworthy that the four preceding allegories have an elegant grammatical structure. One humanist altered 'egestas' to 'egenus'; another 'qui' to 'haec'. Sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth century editors usually printed the verses with these two alterations. In the nineteenth century Lachmann accepted 'egenus' and suggested 'quid' rather than 'haec', Munro, on the other hand, proposed a lacuna after v. 1011 (containing a reference to Ixion), and Giussani lacunae before and after this verse. In this century, C. Bailey proposed and withdrew a lacuna after v. 1012. Where other editors are concerned, some have accepted the idea of a lacuna; the rest, like the aging Bailey, print the paradox. The idea of the loss of a reference to Ixion after v. 1011 or v. 1012 is easily refuted, but the syntax of the passage, or lack thereof, remains unparalleled.

Consideration of the shape of the arguments of vv. 1011–23 suggests even more strongly that O and Q do not give us everything the poet wrote. The uneasy mental states of the superstitious, the lecherous, the politically ambitious and the insatiately parallel the physical sufferings of Tantalus, Tityos, Sisyphus and the Danaids. To the mention of the 'Furiae', imagined as equipped with whips rather than torches, answer the upper-world 'uerbera'. To 'Tartarus', belching fire, answers the 'carnifex' with his fiery equipment. To the 'lucis egestas' answers the ill-lit prison. 'Cerberus', however, has no correspondents in the OQ account of the terrors of the upper-world. Of the two modes of execution mentioned by the Latin poet, one is anticipated in the OQ account of 'Acheruns', the other, the 'horribilis de saxo iactus', is not.

It is easier to suggest lacunae than to fill them. What equivalents Lucretius found for Cerberus in the upper world I cannot think. The geography of the 'saxum Tarpeium' does, on the other hand, have a counterpart in at least two Latin descriptions of 'Acheruns'. A ghost arriving therefrom on a second century B.C. stage told of rocky precipices as well as of darkness:

\[
\text{adsum atque aduenio Acherunte uix uia alta atque ardua,}
\text{per speluncas saxis structas asperis pendentibus}
\text{maxumis, ubi rigida constat crassa caligo inferum.}
\]

Virgil was to have Vulcan depict on Aeneas' shield a Roman villain caught on a Tartarean crag:

\[
\text{hinc procul addit}
\text{Tartareas etiam sedes, alta ostia Ditis,}
\text{et scelerum poenas, et te Catilina minaci}
\]
pendentem scopulo Furiarumque ora trementem, 
secretosque pios, his dantem iura Catonem. 79

I should accordingly suggest that O and Q omit a similar feature from Lucretius’ account of ‘Acherons’.

V. Ixion

Behind one of the details of Virgil’s description of Tityos at Aen. 6. 595–600 the late fourth century commentator Servius found a hint of allegory and defended his doctrine by reference to Lucretius’ account of those punished in the underworld. It will be helpful to cite the whole scholium, a scholium not always read carefully by those who refer to it:

PER TOTA NOVEM CVI IVGERA CORPVS PORRIGITVR quantum ad publicam faciem, magnitudinem ostendit corporis; sed illud significat, quia de amatore loquitur, libidinem late patere, ut ait supra ‘nee procul hinc partem fusi monstrantur in omnem lugentes campi.’ sane de his omnibus rebus mire reddit rationem Lucretius et confirmat in nostra uita esse omnia quae finguntur de inferis. dicit namque Tityon amorem esse, hoc est libidinem, quae secundum physicos et medicos in iecore est, sicut risus in splene, iracundia in felle: unde etiam exesum a uulture dicitur in poenam renasci: etenim libidini non sat is fit re semel peracta, sed recrudescit semper, unde ait Horatius ‘incontinentis aut Tityi iecur’. ipse etiam Lucretius dicit per eos, super quos iamiam casurus inminet lapis, superstitiosos significari, qui inaniter semper uerentur et de diis et caelo superioribus male opinantur: nam religiosi sunt qui per reuerentiam timent. per eos autem qui saxum voluunt ambitum uult et repulsam significari, quia semel repulsı petitores ambire non desinunt. per rotam autem ostendit negotiatores, qui semper tempestatibus turbinibusque voluuntur.

Difficult to avoid is the deduction that Servius or his source had a text of the De rerum natura with an allegorisation of Ixion’s wheel following immediately upon that of Sisyphus’ rolling stone. The lack of a reference to the Danaids’ leaky jar has no significance. H.C.A. Eichstadt seems to have been the first to think about the relationship between the scholium and the direct tradition of Lucretius. He opined simply that Servius read a different text from the one we do. A. Forbiger suggested that the former was an interpolated text. H. Purmann argued that Servius had misremembered the details of the Lucretian passage, J. Bernays that he was referring to Virgil’s ‘radiisque rotarum districti pendent’ (Aen. 6. 616–17) rather than to anything in Lucretius. Munro derailed discussion by using what Servius says about Ixion to fill the lacuna he proposed after v. 1011. Kenney argues that Ixion is an unlikely member of Lucretius’ ‘catalogue of notable sufferers’. He talks of Servius’ ‘list’ and denounces Ixion as an ‘intruder who really belongs in a note on A. 6. 601 . . . transferred by Servius or his source to follow the Lucretian list.’ Many scholars have been impelled by a general scepticism about Servius’ reliability to push the problem to one side.
Kenney is right to think that if Lucretius did include Ixion the latter’s proper place was after v. 1002. His arguments for excluding Ixion are not, however, plausible.

It makes no moment that Homer did not mention Ixion in describing the underworld. He did not mention the Danaids either. It is much more important that Epicurus included Ixion’s punishment among the stories whose literal truth he dismissed. Accounts of the underworld after Lucretius’ time rarely omitted the wheel.

Purmann argued that a reference to ‘negotiatores’ and their troubles at sea would be too specific in a general discussion of disturbing emotions. Kenney seems to make a similar point: ‘if L. had allegorised Ixion, he would not have been likely to interpret him as the type of the ‘negotiatores’, who would represent merely a particular case of the ‘curaet’ dealt with at 984–94.’ Servius’ words ‘per rotam autem ostendit negotiatores, qui semper tempestatibus turbinibusque uoluuntur’ do in themselves imply a text open to such objections. The brevity of the style of the commentary must, however, be taken into consideration. Servius could have had in mind the lust for material possessions which impel those who take to the high seas. This was a vice condemned by both poets and philosophers. It claimed a place in Lucretius’ diatribe alongside superstition, lechery, political ambition and discontent with one’s lot. There may be a feeling that Ixion’s crime repeats that of Tityos, but Lucretius’ allegories set out from the punishments suffered by the figures of myth rather than from the crimes for which they were punished.

Kenney goes on to assert that as a type of ambition Ixion would have duplicated Sisyphus and as a type of those who act without ‘consilium’, ‘ratio’ or ‘uritus’ he would have lacked definition. The views of Dio Chrysostom and Macrobius clearly depend on other than Epicurean sources and have no relevance to our problem. There is no reason why Epicurus and Lucretius could not have allegorised Ixion’s sufferings as those of the person obsessed with adding to his material wealth.

The final sentence of Servius’ note fits the structure and argument of the previous three. It was surely composed by Servius himself for the position it now occupies. Kenney’s theory would imply that Servius took the substance of his discussion from the exegetical tradition rather than a direct acquaintance with Lucretius’ poem and that he combined unintelligently two statements from his sources, one about Lucretius’ allegorical account of the underworld and the other about somebody else’s. It is much simpler to interpret the note at its face value and add another lacuna to the several which most scholars agree in finding in the direct tradition of the De rerum natura. Servius admittedly draws some of his quotations from earlier grammarians and transmits, if he does not himself commit, a number of plain errors. There are good reasons for seeing a long and complex history behind those statements which allege words, verses, and passages to be taken from Lucretius, as well as those which cite Lucretius in illustration of points of vocabulary, morphology and syntax. Statements
about the addressee, sources and style of the poem form another category, as do those about physical reality and specific theories about this reality based on the poem. The latter categories should in the present state of our evidence be regarded as dependent on Servius' own knowledge. It is significant that the Daniele scholia add little to them. Here belongs the description of Lucretius' account of the underworld. Its details have to be taken as seriously as those provided by the direct tradition of the poem itself. Against the few indisputable errors in Servius' reports of the poem, both those at first hand and those at second or third hand, stand very many cases of agreement with the direct tradition and a significant number of unique lections either certainly true or at least worthy of serious consideration. It is simply not the case that Servius 'seldom quotes Lucretius accurately'. Even where he is in accurate he may not be as inaccurate as the direct tradition.

I hope I have succeeded in showing the extent to which in the third book of the De rerum natura Lucretius gave a Roman colouring both to his account of the underworld of traditional belief and to his allegorical rationalisation of this belief; in establishing the text and sense of v. 1017; in reinforcing doubts expressed by previous students at two points of the direct manuscript tradition of vv. 978–1023; and in clarifying the significance of an ancient grammatical testimony.

NOTES

1. For the punishment of certain heroic sinners cf. Homer, Od. 11. 576–610.
2. Cf. the painting done in the middle of the fifth century by Polygnotus on the walls of the Cnidian Lesche at Delphi (Pausanias 10. 28–31). The heroic sinners remained a popular subject (cf. Demosthenes 25. 52).
4. See Lactantius, Div. inst. 7.7.13 (‘... illus inferorum poenas quae ferantur in hac esse uti interpretatus est’).
5. See fr. B. 297 Diels (Stobaeus, Ecl. 4,34.65).
9. At vv. 983 ('cuique/cumque'), 995 ('quoque' om. Q), 1007 ('uita fructibus/uitae runctibus'), 1008 ('ut om. O'), 1017 ('carminicis/carnificis').
10. At 985 ('quid'), 988 ('dispersis'), 992 ('es'), 994 ('curpedine'), 997 ('tristicis'), 999 ('laborem sufferre'), 1001 ('summo'), 1009 ('cogere/congere'), 1010 ('ulla'), 1011 ('fumae'), 1016 ('factus eorum'), 1017 ('iam minu'), 1018 ('factis').
11. This is clearly deductible from Seneca, Epist. 24.18.
12. Servius on 6.596.
17. *Aen. 6.577–9*. Virgil, however, and the other classical Latin poets normally referred to this place as 'Tartara' (cf. Hesiod's ῥῆματα [*Theog.* 119]); as indeed had Lucretius (3.42, 3.966, 5.1125–6).
20. See below, n. 74, on their whips.
23. So Kenney, *op. cit.* (n. 7) 223.
24. For the darkness of the underworld see Aeschylus, *Eum.* 71–2.
25. See above, n. 5.
34. For a provision of the Twelve Tables see Gaius, *Dig.* 47.9.9. For the *lex Tribonia* of 449 see Diodorus 12.25.13. The extant historical record contains two cases when this mode of execution was employed (485: Valerius Maximus 6.3.2, Dio Cassius, fr. 22. 1; 109: Appian, *Bell. Num.* fr. 3). Many a person below the notice of history would have suffered (cf. Cicero, *Q. fr.* 1.2.6, 52
Asinius ap. Cic. Fam. 10.32.3).

36. See 1.155–6.

37. See Gaius, Dig. 47.9.9. For decapitation see Polybius 1.7.12, Livy 2.5.8, 26.13.15, 28.29.11; for strangulation see Sallust, Ing. 69.6, Livy 2.41.10, 8.20.7, 24.45.2; for hurling from the ‘saxum’ Lex XII tab. ap. Gell. 11.18.8, Livy 24.20.6, 25.7.13; for sucking and drowning Modestinus, Dig. 48.9.9; for crucifixion Livy 2.5.8, 33.36.3, Cicero, Verr. 2.5.14.163; for burial alive Dionysius Hal. Ant. Rom. 9.40.3.

38. Livy could say (1.28.11) ‘in alius gloriar i licet, nulli gentium mitiores placuiss e poenas’.


40. Only one case seems to be recorded (Antiphon 1.20). The proposal to torture the condemned Phocion was greeted with horror (Plutarch, Phoc. 35).

41. See Plato, Gorg. 473c.

42. See Cicero, Verr. 2.5.163, Propertius 4.7.35, Valerius Max. 6.8.1, Seneca, Epist. 78.19, Plautus, Asin. 548–50 would reflect Roman conditions; likewise Seneca, Contr. 2.5.6, Valerius Max. 3.3. ext. 5.


44. Cf. Cicero, Phil. 2.86.

45. See Plautus, Pseud. 1240. For the use of ‘stimuli’ on slaves and their like see further Plautus, Andr. 45–8, Cat. 446–7, Men. 951, Mil. 511, Most. 55–7, Persa 795. For Persian practice see Herodotus 3.130; for Spartan practice see Xenophon, Hell. 3.3.11.


47. See Reynolds, op. cit. (n. 12), 221.

48. PIO (n. 32) cited Verrius Flaccus’ doctrine: ‘rob us quoque in carcere dicurus est locus quo praeципitatur maleficorum genus quod ante arcis robusteis includebatur’ (Paulus Fest. p. 325.4–6 Lindsay). Livy 38.59.10, Tacitus, Ann. 4.29, Calpurnius Flaccus, Decl. 4 and Apuleius, Apol. 81 associate ‘rob ur’ with the ‘career’ but leave unclear what precisely is meant. Lambin (n. 32) allowed that it could be a question of the ‘ecules’ or the ‘fustis’.


50. T. Lucretius Carus De rerum natura libri sex lateinisch und deutsch, Band I, Berlin 1923, 172.


52. T. Lucretii Cari De rerum natura libri sex . . . Zürich 1975, 131, 337.
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