Ciceronian Invectives

Edited by
Philipp Geitner, Dennis Pausch,
Christoph Schwameis,
and Rainer Wierzcholowski

Emotions in Antiquity 5

Mohr Siebeck

Emotions in Antiquity (EmAnt)

5

Ciceronian Invectives

Emotions, Configurations, and Reactions

Edited by

Philipp Geitner, Dennis Pausch, Christoph Schwameis, and Rainer Wierzcholowski

Mohr Siebeck

Philipp Geitner, 2020 PhD; Postdoc at the Collaborative Research Center 1285 "Invectivity. Constellations and Dynamics of Disparagement".

Dennis Pausch, 2004 PhD; Professor of Latin at Technical University Dresden.

Christoph Schwameis, 2018 PhD; teaches Roman literature and Latin grammar at the University of Vienna.

Rainer Wierzcholowski, teaches Latin literature at the University of Wuppertal.

ISBN 978-3-16-161035-6 / eISBN 978-3-16-162285-4
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-162285-4

ISSN 2750-4689 / eISSN 2750-4700 (Emotions in Antiquity)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at *http://dnb.dnb.de.*

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen using Minion typeface. Printed on non-aging paper. The cover was designed by Uli Gleis in Tübingen. Image: The cover was set by Uli Gleis in Tübingen. Cover picture: Cicero denouncing Catiline by Hans Werner Schmidt, 1912.

Printed in The Netherlands.

Preface

This book assembles the contributions to the conference *Ciceronian Invective. Emotions, Reactions, Performance* (24/25 September 2020), hosted by the classics project of the Collaborative Research Centre *Invectivity. Constellations and Dynamics of Disparagement* (CRC 1285) at the Technische Universität Dresden. Originally planned and organized for April 2020 at a beautiful venue in Dresden, the event had to be postponed and moved into a digital environment, with the pleasant outcome that all invitees were able to present their papers and share their thoughts in an insightful discussion.

By focussing on Ciceronian invective beyond its traditional place in ancient rhetoric,[1] our aim was to gain a deeper understanding of late Republican invective practices in their social and historical context.[2] Hence, instead of limiting ourselves to typical *orationes inuectiuae*, such as *In Pisonem*, and debating the legitimacy and limitations of literary genres,[3] we wanted to explore in Cicero's work the complexity of the very phenomenon that the CRC 1285 understands and investigates as *invectivity*.[4] In this context, the latter's speeches offer valuable insights: they are not only situated in a more or less well documented historical setting whose society is challenged by fundamental changes. The invectives also actively engage with the communication situation and the inherent tension that, whilst they are conceptualized for oral presentation and for an interaction in the so-called *invective triad* (that is to say the *invectant*, the *invected*, and the audience)[5] they are, in the end, captured in written texts.

Since the rhetorical notion of speeches as a means of expressing and arousing emotions (see for example Cic. *De or.* 2.188–191) holds particularly true for invectives, *Emotions* shall serve as a starting point of our considerations, which nonetheless enables us to focus on further problems whose connection to

[1] On this see e. g. Koster (1980) and Powell (2007).

[2] See amongst others Corbeill (1996), Booth (2007) (esp. Uría (2007)), and Jehne (2020).

[3] For further discussions see e. g. Arena (2007).

[4] The CRC's explicit goal is to examine the totality of invective actions within a common interdisciplinary analytical framework, in order to overcome the often prevailing treatment of phenomena of this kind in a rather scattered or fragmentary manner and thus to establish its perception as a *Fundamentalphänomen* of sociality in the discussion of the humanities. Cf. Ellerbrock et al. (2017).

[5] Cf. Ellerbrock et al. (2017).

emotion may rather be implicit but is very close to its basic aspects – affects and their expressions in invective contexts. Accordingly, the two other main focuses of this book, *configurations* and *reactions*, will rather consider basic dimensions of invectivity, the first the historical and rhetorical contexts and the latter the question of how offended persons react to insults or reproaches.[6]

The first section, entitled *Emotions*, starts with a discursive approach by Christopher Degelmann who examines Cicero's use of *uomitio* as a bodily invective based on the affect of disgust (*fastidium*). Proving how Cicero exploits instances of *uomitio* in order to rebuke his opponents' transgression of norms, Degelmann also sheds light on the metaphorical expression of *uomitio* in invective contexts.

Also focussing on body-related invectives, Judith Hack explores allegations of sexual deviance in Cicero's speeches by taking into account the broader context of Roman society, law, and literature. She argues that these kinds of insults aim not only at denigrating the opponent but also at entertaining the audience, thus provoking a particular expression of emotions: laughter.

Rather than discussing their emotional impact, Ken Heuring investigates to what extent invective texts reflect Cicero's own emotions. To this end, Heuring analyses the second *Philippic* applying categories of emotion linguistics and offers interesting insights on Cicero's rather implicit, yet pinpoint use of emotions in interacting with and evaluating his opponents.

The second section, entitled *Configurations*, begins with Catherine Steel's contribution on how the development of provincial government may have formed a genuine framework for invective speech. Since provincial government was a topic of growing concern in the Late Republic and the early Principate, its impact on the oratorial accounts we can trace in Cicero and Livy is of great importance.

Rainer Wierzcholowski, then, focusses on Cicero's *certamen* with Hortensius and explores the role of apostrophe in the course of the *actio secunda* against Verres. As he convincingly shows, these direct addresses are strategically prepared in order to underline the attack on Hortensius in a moral, oratorical, and political dimension.

Lastly, Christoph Schwameis offers a detailed analysis of invective incidents in the so-called *pirate chapter* of the *Verrines* (2.5.80–138) and demonstrates the various and cleverly entwined levels of invective in Cicero's speech – levels that are constituted by personal relations, the temporal and spatial conditions of the speech, and, in particular in the second *Verrine*, its mediality.

The third section, entitled *Reactions*, discusses a performative aspect of Cicero's invectives: on the one hand, the invectives of Cicero's political enemies and judicial opponents and their reactions to Cicero's attacks, and on the other hand, the ways Cicero countered and afterwards presented them in his speeches.

[6] A subject the CRC calls *Anschlusskommunikation* and whose general importance for orators is also acknowledged by ancient rhetorics (see *Inst.* 10.1.22–3).

In the first contribution, Henriette van der Blom methodically sums up five themes of invective which political foes used against Cicero. Then, she thoroughly analyses two cases of invective against Cicero and the responses to his public expressions, Clodius' reactions to Cicero's narrative about his consulship, exile, and recall, and Mark Anthony's public statements about Cicero in the autumn of 44 BC.

Kathryn Tempest, secondly, focusses on the 'rhetoric of anti-rhetoric' in the trial of Plancius (54 BC). Apart from demonstrating and explaining the lack of this strategy in Cicero's own speeches, she convincingly argues that the prosecutors Laterensis and Cassius presented Cicero as a mendacious and cunning orator in order to alienate him from the audience in Plancius' trial.

Concluding the section, Christoph Pieper not only reviews the diverse accounts in ancient historiography of how Catiline reacted to Cicero's invective in the autumn of 63 BC, but also deals with the medieval *pseudepigraphon* of Catiline's 'lost speech'. He shows its dependence on the ancient sources and argues for its rhetorically persuasive character.

We warmly thank Antje Junghanß and Ken Heuring for providing essential help with the planning and organization of the conference and Glenn Patten for his translations and invaluable corrections. We also thank the unknown reviewer for his profound remarks. Georg Imgraben provided significant assistance in designing the posters and announcements. For the stimulating environment we have been lucky to enjoy the last years we furthermore thank our colleagues of the CRC 1285 as well as the German Research Foundation whose funds not least would have enabled us to actually welcome our guests in Dresden.

Dresden 2021

Philipp Geitner,
Dennis Pausch,
Christoph Schwameis
Rainer Wierzcholowski

Bibliography

Arena, V. (2007) 'Roman oratorical invective', in W. Dominik and J. Hall (eds), *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (Malden) 149–60

Booth, J. (2007) *Cicero on the Attack: Invective and Subversion in the Orations and Beyond* (Swansea)

Corbeill, A. (1996) *Controlling Laughter: Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic* (Princeton)

Ellerbrock, D., Koch, L., Müller-Mall, S., Münkler, M., Scharloth, J., Schrage, D. and Schwerhoff, G. (2017) 'Invektivität – Perspektiven eines neuen Forschungsprogramms in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften', *Kulturwissenschaftliche Zeitschrift* 2.1, 2–24

Jehne, M. (2020) *Freud und Leid römischer Senatoren: Invektivarenen in Republik und Kaiserzeit* (*Karl-Christ-Preis für Alte Geschichte* 4) (Göttingen)

Koster, S. (1980) *Die Invektive in der griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Meisenheim am Glan)

Powell, J. G. F. (2007) 'Invective and the orator: Ciceronian theory and practice', in J. Booth (ed.), *Cicero on the attack: Invective and Subversion in the Orations and Beyond* (Swansea) 1–23

Uría, J. (2007) 'The semantics and pragmatics of Ciceronian invective', in J. Booth (ed.), *Cicero on the Attack: Invective and Subversion in the Orations and Beyond* (Swansea) 47–70

Contents

Section III: *Reactions*

Section I:
Emotions

1.

Ex ore impurissimo euomuit

Disgust and vomiting in Cicero's invective repertoire*

Christopher Degelmann

In memoriam Elke Hartmann (1969–2021)

Abstract This article examines the phenomenon of *uomitio* in Cicero's writings. It becomes evident that he used vomiting both to devalue his political opponents morally and rhetorically and as an exculpatory argument for his own oratorical outbursts. To this end, he used, on the one hand, a taxonomy of disgust that made use of smell in terms of belching, burping, and vomiting. In this way, he exposed his opponents to ridicule in the style of Roman satires and comedies. On the other hand, he used *uomitio* as a bodily metaphor for formally breaking out of the oratorical mould in order to excuse his own attacks which sometimes reached below the belt.

In his diatribe *In Pisonem*, Cicero fiercely attacks L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, the consul of 58 BC. The reason for this hostility was not necessarily the assumed exploitation of Macedonia as governor during the years from 57 to 55 BC, as might be assumed from *De provinciis consularibus*. Rather, Piso had only been granted the province, which provided the best opportunity for personal enrichment, by the tribune Clodius because he had neither participated in Cicero's agitation against his arch enemy nor prevented the banishment of the famous orator. In addition to numerous other vituperations, the invective also informs the audience and posterity of an incident that is said to have taken place in front of the house of the consular Piso:

'... you filth, when I visited you at about the fifth hour with Gaius Piso, how you were emerging from some mean hovel with a hood upon your head and slippers upon your feet? and how, when from your malodorous lips you had exhaled upon us the fumes of that disgusting tavern, you pleaded your enfeebled health, and alleged that you were in the

* I would like to thank the organising team of the conference on which this volume is based for their invitation and the discussants and editors for their valuable advice on improving my contribution – especially Henriette van der Blom, Dennis Pausch and Rainer Carl Wierzcholowski. My thanks also go to our student assistant Laura Brauer in Berlin for her support in obtaining literature under pandemic conditions. Any remaining inconsistencies are my responsibility. Unless otherwise noted, the translations and texts are taken from the Loeb edition.

habit of taking some sort of vinous remedies to support it? and how, when we had accepted your explanation … we stood for a while in the reek and fume of your stew-houses, until at length you drove us thence by your impudent replies and your disgusting eructations?'[1]

This episode combines numerous disparagements.[2] Piso was late for his own *salutatio* because he only returned from a drinking bout at 11 o'clock in the morning and was also inappropriately dressed.[3] As a result, he neglected his aristocratic duties due to his drunken stupor – not an isolated case, as we learn later. But that was not all, because the drunkenness had unpleasant side effects. According to this report, Piso smelled extremely unpleasant. Due to his drinking, he had a disgusting mouth odour, stank of the tavern and finally even belched in the direction of his visitors, who then preferred to take flight. In short: Cicero and his companion C. Piso were overcome with disgust.

This degradation is physical, but it does not correspond to aesthetic criteria as they have frequently been studied, because the stimulus does not affect the eyes but the nose.[4] Thus, the recipient's olfactory senses in particular are being addressed here. It is therefore less surprising that Cicero also used bodily invectives that go far beyond exhalation and belching. Against this background, this article aims to shed light on *uomitio* in the Ciceronian oeuvre and to show that vomiting

[1] Cic. *Pis.* 13: *… caenum, cum ad te quinta fere hora cum C. Pisone uenissem, nescio quo e gurgustio te prodire, inuoluto capite, soleatum? et cum isto ore foetido taeterrimam nobis popinam inhalasses, excusatione te uti ualetudinis, quod diceres uinolentis te quibusdam medicaminibus solere curari? quam nos causam cum accepissemus … paulisper stetimus in illo ganearum tuarum nidore atque fumo; unde tu nos cum improbissime respondendo, tum turpissime ructando eiecisti.* On the historical background of the *Pisoniana* cf. in detail Nisbet (1961) and in condensed form Fuhrmann (1980) 137–44; further Koster (1980) 210–81.

[2] On the concept of invective invoked here, in addition to the reflections of Christoph Schwameis in this volume and the research literature cited there, see fundamentally Koster (1980) 39: 'The invective is a structured literary form whose aim is to use all appropriate means to publicly disparage a named person as a personality against the background of the values and norms in force at the time' (my translation). Ellerbrock et al. (2017) 2–24 (here 3) describe invectives in more complex terms as 'phenomena of insult and debasement, of humiliation and exposure, as – cross-cultural and epoch-spanning – basic operations of societal communication. Due to their disruptive, stabilising or dynamising effects on social order, invective communication has the potential to unite and shape societies. The term includes all aspects of communication (either verbal or non-verbal, oral or written, gestural or graphic) that are used to degrade, to hurt or to marginalize others. Manifestations and functions of the Invective are not systemised under strict patterns but medially, politically, socially, and aesthetically contextualized depending on the diverse historical contexts and complex constellations they occur in. Thus, they can only be properly understood as performative events which develop through the interaction of ascription, response, and follow-up communication as well as by means of the social, discursive and media conditions in which they arise' (my translation). See now also the thematic issue 'Invektive Spaltungen' of the journal *Saeculum. Jahrbuch für Universalgeschichte* and especially the contribution by Jehne (2020) on the late Roman Republic as well as Dubreuil (2013); see also below note 53 on the invective triad.

[3] On this passage see fundamentally Nisbet (1961) 72–3; now Thurn (2018) 171–3; on Piso's inappropriate clothing see 208–9; further Degelmann (2019) 256.

[4] Cf. Meister (2012) 51–94; on Piso also especially 45–6 and 57–83, as well as Meister (2009).

was suitable for demarcation in two ways. On the one hand, it was an expression of disgust and hierarchisation, in that one claimed to feel nausea oneself in the face of unsavoury circumstances brought about by others; on the other hand, one could attribute the vomiting of the other to unmannerly behaviour, "orgies of eating and drinking."[5] For this purpose, passages with stems of *uomere*, but also (*re*)*spuere* are examined.

It will also turn out that *uomitio* in Cicero can already stand for breaking out of the frame of rhetorical norms, for the overflowing and bubbling over of emotions that can simply no longer be held back. Of course, this alleged spontaneity can also be staged in order to justify the vehemence of the accusations, as one may well assume in Cicero's case. Before we come to this, however, it is necessary to consider disgust (*fastidium*) in a historical perspective, because it could cause *uomitio*; at the same time, disgust could also be its result if one had to witness it directly, since such stimuli are considered "contagious."[6]

1. Preliminary reflections on odour and *fastidium*

Bernadette Descharmes has recently called for a differentiated consideration of various objects described in the texts as dirty, repulsive, and smelly, and consequently labelled as disgusting stimuli. She groups the sources of disgust into three categories: food, utilitarian objects, and frameworks.[7] These undoubtedly included vomiting. According to Descharmes, the exact reconstruction of what specifically disgusted historical figures is not possible through literature that is at least partly fictional; in reality, the actual stimulus may well have dif-

[5] The accusation of excessive use of body oils, perfumes, and ointments as well as careful hair and beard care also works according to a similar mechanism; cf. Cic. *Cat.* 2.10, 2.22; *Red. sen.* 13; *Sest.* 18; *Att.* 1.14.5, 1.16.11; *Phil.* 3.12, 13.31 et al. with Thurn (2018) 204–18, 252–53. Comparable passages are usually interpreted as attacks on the effeminate behaviour of opponents, but they also have an expression of disgust attached to them. One of the oldest examples is to be found in Gell. *NA* 6.12.5 (= *ORF*[4] 127) in the invective against C. Sulpicius Galus (cos. 166) by P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus: 'For one who daily perfumes himself and dresses before a mirror, whose eyebrows are trimmed, who walks abroad with beard plucked out and thighs made smooth, who at banquets, though a young man … with a lover, who is fond not only of wine but of men – does anyone doubt that he does what wantons commonly do?' *Nam qui cotidie unguentatus aduersum speculum ornetur, cuius supercilia radantur, qui barba uulsa feminibusque subuulsis ambulet, qui in conuiuiis adulescentulus cum amatore …, qui non modo uinosus, sed uirosus quoque sit, eumne quisquam dubitet, quin idem fecerit quod cinaedi facere solent?*

[6] Scheler (1923) 25–7 already described the phenomenon of 'emotional contagion'; today this effect is ascribed to neurological mechanisms; cf. Hickok (2014).

[7] See Descharmes (2019) 269 and *passim*, on whose methodological considerations this section draws heavily; Goh (2018) 438–39 draws attention to the ambivalence of *uomitio* when he describes it, on the one hand, as an expression of illness, which however, on the other hand, knows how to alleviate discomfort partially through vomiting. Cic. *Pis.* 13 also establishes a connection between illness and vomiting.

fered from the dynamics described in the tradition. Consequently, answerable questions can only be asked on a discursive level. The investigation of a small section of the Ciceronian discourse on disgust therefore only allows us to grasp social norms and values that nevertheless had a very real influence on people and their everyday world. Just as it is methodologically difficult to capture "real" sense perceptions such as smells through written testimonies, it is impossible to reconstruct disgust as an inner emotion of historical actors. What is experienced must be separated from its expressions in gestures and facial expressions as well as from the written representation of feelings and their expressions.

Mark Bradley has recently dealt from a classical studies perspective with the smell that Cicero makes the punch line of his anecdote about Piso.[8] In doing so, he has emphasised that disgust – for example from bad breath – is not to be understood solely as the anthropological constant of a reflexively functioning body. Rather, disgust is a behaviour that is acquired in the context of specific cultural parameters.[9] Therefore, not all people are disgusted by the same things or to the same degree; consequently, the Romans sometimes detested substances and incidents different from those we detest in Western industrial nations today. Vice versa, people in Rome perceived certain smells, foods, objects, and practices that we are disgusted by today as far less repulsive or not repulsive at all. Robert Kaster has added that among the Romans the sense of smell in particular seemed crucial to the expression of disgust in its social function, as the Piso episode also suggests.[10] In disgust, as the psychologist Paul Rozin points out, the oral cavity and the oral ingestion of food, drink, and other substances are of particular importance. It was Rozin who was able to show that feelings of disgust can be transferred to others through facial and gestural expressions. From Kaster's historical perspective, human and animal excrement as well as bodily excretions in general are among the central causes of disgust, which also coincides with *uomitio*.[11] This idea was already familiar to the Romans, however, as Bernadette Descharmes was recently able to show using the example of the *os impurum* in the early imperial period.[12]

In his comprehensive study of the emotional order of Roman culture, Kaster was confronted with the methodological hurdle of what an emotional term such as *fastidium* should mean (although it is doubtful whether disgust should be regarded as an emotion at all or rather as an affect). In order not to reduce his

[8] Cf. Bradley (2015) who clearly focuses on Rome; see also Corbin (1982) on cultural-historical studies and Classen et al. (1994) 13–50 for antiquity.

[9] Cf. Rozin and Fallon (1987) 35.

[10] Cf. Kaster (2001) 174. Contrary to expectation, Fuhrmann (1968) hardly deals with Cicero at all (but rather with Seneca) and focuses more on war atrocities, for example in Lucan's account of the *bellum civile*.

[11] Cf. Rozin and Fallon (1987) 23; Rozin et al. (2016) 824.

[12] Cf. Descharmes (2019) *passim*; on the *os impurum* see also section 3 below.

study to a purely semantic evaluation, he introduced the concept of emotional scripts. According to this concept, every feeling in a specific culture at an equally specific point in time is equipped with a more or less fixed repertoire of actions and motives.[13] Kaster explores the question of how a culturally socialised emotion "works" in certain social contexts and how it is processed both mentally and cognitively by the participants in such contexts. Deciphering these scripts makes it possible to approach emotions even if they are not explicitly mentioned in the sources.

Fastidium, too, expressed itself in gestural and linguistic expressions. This is precisely where my contribution comes in. Cicero's speeches and letters as well as his statements about his rivals offer precisely this insight into the emotional scripts of the late Roman Republic. Of particular importance for the context of invective is that the expression of disgust encompasses a social practice that can serve, purposefully or unconsciously, to distinguish, hierarchise, and marginalise.[14] In Republican Rome, too, the expression of disgust generated and confirmed social hierarchy. Therefore, the way one portrayed disgust depended on social standing, cultural origin, gender identity, and age. Kaster referred to this process as 'deliberative ranking.'[15] Donald Lateiner and Dimos Spatharas appropriated the model of projective disgust, borrowed from Martha Nussbaum, for the mechanism by which disgusting stimuli are transferred to persons. This model can also be observed in Cicero, as the following two points seek to show in different ways.[16]

2. *Vomitio* as accusation

2.1 Nausea in early Roman literature

Cicero and his companion were forced to flee in the face of the stench and fumes that Piso was spreading. One reads between the lines that a further stay in the vicinity of the *nobilis* would inevitably have led to nausea; they preferred to avoid it in order not to vomit. We can already read that bad smells, especially bad breath, cause nausea in Plautus' comedy *Casina*, an adaptation of a play by Di-

[13] Cf. Kaster (2005) 8: 'To explore this fact [*sc.* the emotion], then, I propose that we suspend concern with lexical meaning or equivalence and instead think about all such talk just as the end-product of a process that engages body and mind together: any emotion-term is just the lexicalized residue of what happens when the data of life are processed in a particular way – through a sequence of perception (sensing, imaging), evaluation (believing, judging, desiring), and response (bodily, affective, pragmatic, expressive) – to produce a particular kind of emotionalized consciousness, a particular set of thoughts and feelings.'

[14] Miller (1997) 8–9; Rozin et al. (2016) 827.

[15] Cf. Kaster (2005) 112–21.

[16] Cf. Lateiner and Spatharas (2017) 1–42 with Nussbaum (2004) 107–15.

philos from the fourth century. In the *Casina*, a slave reviles his *dominus* with the words: 'Faugh, faugh! It stinks when you speak.'[17] Of course, the slave can only allow himself such hefty criticism in the *palliata*; moreover, he has the master in the palm of his hand through secret knowledge of an undue affection for his son's love interest. When the *dominus* pesters him to plan his plot against the title heroine, the slave renews his reproach: 'O Zeus! Can't you leave me, unless you want me to vomit today?'[18]

It thus becomes quite clear that the foul stench that the *dominus* emits from his mouth (for which we are given no specific reason) causes a feeling of nausea in the *servus*, and so it will have been in Cicero's encounter with L. Piso. Later, Plautus' fellow poet C. Lucilius is more explicit in one of his fragmentary satires, when he insinuates that an otherwise unknown L. Trebellius, as a person, causes vomiting (*uomitum*) in addition to fever, anger and pus.[19] In the Plautine *Mercator*, a slave expresses himself in a similar manner about his master, who is also chasing a young girl: 'You should kiss her all the less. On an empty stomach, with stinking / breath, you goaty old man would kiss a woman? In order to make / her throw up when you approach her.'[20]

Bad breath appears a second time as a characteristic attributed to old men who were reputed to be lustful, so that it can be assumed that Cicero was also alluding to a voluptuous side of Piso's character, which he does not forget to mention in the further course of his speech.[21] Plautus does not give a reason for his old man's bad breath, but it is probably the ingestion of unusual substances and an excessive amount of food and alcoholic beverages that lead to *uomitio*, for why else should the stomach be empty if not from hunger, which does not play a role here? In any case, unpleasant or disgusting food and drink could anticipate vomiting,[22] and vomiting, in turn, causes an odour that one usually tries to avoid. The Plautine plays, along with Ennius (see below), probably contain the oldest evidence for *uomitio* in Latin literature. They illustrate that the mockery they contain provides a parallel to the vituperations of late Republican invective; conversely, the invective not infrequently served to expose opponents

[17] Plaut. *Cas.* 727: *fy fy! foetet tuos mi sermo.*

[18] Plaut. *Cas.* 730–3: *ὦ Ζεῦ, / potin a med abeas, / nisi me uis / uomere hodie?*

[19] Lucil. 15.531–2 Wormington (= Non. p. 5 Lindsay): *In numero quorum nunc primus Trebellius multost / Lucius, nam arcessit febris senium uomitum pus.*

[20] Plaut. *Merc.* 574–6: *iaiunitatis plenus, anima foetida, / senex hircosus tu osculere mulierem? / utine aduenies uomitum excutias mulieri?*

[21] Cf. Cic. *Pis.* 70 where Cicero speaks of *stupra* and *adulteria*; on sexually loaded invectives see also Judith Hack in this volume.

[22] In Plaut. *Curc.* 71–4 the feared vomiting of the goddess Venus is referred to the offer of the dialogue partners to serve as food, and in *Rudens* (508–11) a banquet, but ultimately an exceptional emotional situation is held responsible for nausea; in Ter. *Eun.* 406, we read of *respuere*.

to ridicule and to damage their reputation.[23] Cicero seems on the whole to have had a scene from Plautus' *Pseudolus* in mind when he drew up the episode about Piso described at the beginning.[24]

2.2 Intemperance in Cicero

From Cicero, on the other hand, we learn explicitly what promoted vomiting. Excessive drinking in particular caused people to throw up – at worst in public or 'only' at a banquet. In any case, in *De finibus* Cicero rebukes the immorality of some of his peers who adhere to Epicureanism and portrays them as hedonistic revelers: 'I should be sorry to picture to myself, as you are so fond of doing, debauchees who are sick at table (*in mensam uomant*), have to be carried home from dinner-parties, and next day gorge themselves again before they have recovered from the effects of the night before …'[25]

The burping and belching (*ructare*) of Piso mentioned at the beginning, which had already been used against Catilina and later in the *Tusculanae disputationes* against parts of the decadent elite in general,[26] was merely a weakened version of his accusations against Mark Antony, whom Cicero presents as an unbridled drunkard and glutton. The consequence was repeated episodes of nausea and subsequent *uomitio*. Above all, Cicero gleefully exploits the incident in which Antony vomited in public, but not without showing himself to be ultimately disgusted:

---

[23] Cf. in general Corbeill (1996). On the use of *uomitio* as a means of making certain individuals look ridiculous, see now Goh (2018) 446–54, who in addition to Cicero discusses the Roman satirists Horace, Persius, and Juvenal, and the epigrammatist Martial as well as the biographer Suetonius and the historian Tacitus.

[24] Cf. Plaut. *Pseud.* 1295–1300 with Cic. *Pis.* 13; see also Koster (1980) 232 with footnote 789, which however fails to recognize the way in which the passage serves as comic mockery.

[25] Cic. *Fin.* 2.23: *Nolim enim mihi fingere asotos, ut soletis, qui in mensam uomant et qui de conuiuiis auferantur crudique postridie se rursus ingurgitent …*

[26] Cf. Cic. *Cat.* 2.10: 'If in their drinking and gambling they only looked for wild revelry and whores, they would admittedly be beyond hope, but we could still tolerate them; but who could stand by and watch wastrels hatch plots against men of action, fools against the wise, sots against the sober, sluggards against the wakeful? Reclining at their banquets, embracing their whores, stupefied by wine, stuffed with food, crowned with garlands, reeking with scent, enfeebled by debauchery, they belch out in their conversation the murder of loyal citizens and the firing of Rome.' *Quod si in uino et alea comissationes solum et scorta quaererent, essent illi quidem desperandi, sed tamen essent ferendi: hoc vero quis ferre possit, inertis homines fortissimis uiris insidiari, stultissimos prudentissimis, ebrios sobriis, dormientis uigilantibus? qui mihi accubantes in conuiuiis, complexi mulieres impudicas, uino languidi, conferti cibo, sertis redimiti, unguentis obliti, debilitati stupris eructant sermonibus suis caedem bonorum atque urbis incendia.* Cf. Roller (2006) 103–5 and Thurn (2018) 168–70 and 186; on the decadence of the peers cf. *Tusc.* 5.100 for the general criticism: '[C]ontrast with this, sweating, belching men stuffed with food like fatted oxen …' *Confer sudantes, ructantes, refertos epulis tamquam opimos boues …*

'With that gullet of yours, that chest, that robust physique befitting a gladiator, you engulfed such a quantity of wine at Hippias' wedding that the following day you found it necessary to vomit in full view of the Roman people (*in populi Romani conspectu uomere*). Disgusting (*foedam*) to witness, disgusting even to hear tell of! Had this happened to you at dinner in those same monstrous cups of yours, who would not think it a shameful exhibition? But while conducting public business, in a gathering of the Roman people in his role as Master of the Horse, for whom it would be disgraceful to burp (*ructare*), he vomited (*uomens*), filling his lap and the whole platform with morsels of food stinking of wine!'[27]

In this passage, all the mechanisms of invective mentioned above take effect. The nausea brought on by alcohol, which culminates in vomiting, now gives rise to disgust, which is emphasised by the reference to the stinking vomit and perhaps in turn anticipates an urge to vomit:[28] *O rem non modo uisu foedam sed etiam auditu!* An audience evaluates the incident, which it – or at least Cicero – attributes to excessive wine consumption and therefore condemns. Proper drinking at festivities was perfectly legitimate, *uomitio* of course not, but the line between temporarily desirable *ebrietas* and deviant *ebriositas* or *uinolentia* was decidedly narrow.[29] Since drinking only belonged to the ceremonial framework of the evening *cena* or *commissatio*, it is not surprising that Antony was accused of carousing, gambling, and finally vomiting in the morning: *Ab hora tertia bibebatur, ludebatur, uomebatur*.[30]

In addition, Antony insulted the dignity of the *populus Romanus* and the office of *magister equitum* by throwing up *in coetu populi Romani*, which very probably meant at a popular assembly. The reference to the office of equestrian leader dates the matter to 48/47 BC. Somewhat later in the *Second Philippic*, Cicero records the symptoms of an imminent *uomitio*: *apparet esse commotum; sudat,*

[27] Cic. *Phil.* 2.63: *Tu istis faucibus, istis lateribus, ista gladiatoria totius corporis firmitate tantum uini in Hippiae nuptiis exhauseras ut tibi necesse esset in populi Romani conspectu uomere postridie. O rem non modo uisu foedam sed etiam auditu! Si inter cenam in ipsis tuis immanibus illis poculis hoc tibi accidisset, quis non turpe duceret? In coetu uero populi Romani negotium publicum gerens, magister equitum, cui ructare turpe esset, is uomens frustis esculentis uinum redolentibus gremium suum et totum tribunal impleuit.* Cf. Thurn (2018) 179–80 and Goh (2018) 443–6 with further references (e. g. Cic. *Phil.* 2.76).

[28] Cic. *Brut.* 236 alone explicitly establishes a connection between disgorgement and disgust when he reports of the speaker M. Piso: 'The hard labour of the forum, comparable to running a race, he did not endure for long, partly because his physical strength was not equal to it, and partly because he could not put up with all the human ineptitude and stupidity which we barristers have to engorge. It roused his anger and he would have no more of it, whether from a temper naturally morose, as people believed, or from high-minded scorn and disgust.' *Is laborem quasi cursum forensem diutius non tulit, quod et corpore erat infirmo et hominum ineptias ac stultitias, quae deuorandae nobis sunt, non ferebat iracundiusque respuebat siue morose, ut putabatur, siue ingenuo liberoque fastidio.*

[29] Cf. Degelmann (2019) 249–50 and 262–63; on oral and written attacks on Antony with reference to *uinolentia*, see 251–2, 254–255, and 257–9.

[30] Cic. *Phil.* 2.104: 'From eight o'clock in the morning there was drinking, gambling, vomiting.' Cf. on this Goh (2018) 445.

Index loci

Index rerum