Innovation and Invective in Cicero's Violent Metaphors

By
Anne Meredith Rabe
B.A., University of Kansas, 2002
M.A., University of Kansas, 2007

Dissertation

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Classics at Brown University

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND
MAY 2015

© 2015 by Anne M. Rabe

This dissertation by Anne M. Rabe is accepted in its present form
by the Department of Classics as satisfying
the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Date _________________ ____
(John Bodel), Advisor

Recommended to the Graduate Council

Date _________________ ____
(Lisa Mignone), Reader

Date _________________ ____
(Adele Scafuro), Reader

Date _________________ ____
(Anthony Corbeill), Reader

Approved by the Graduate Council

Date _________________ ____
(Peter M. Weber), Dean of the Graduate School

CURRICULUM VITAE

Anne M. Rabe was born in St. Louis, MO on December 30, 1979. At the age of two she moved with her parents to Lawrence, Kansas, and there she benefitted from the superb education afforded by the city at the elementary, secondary, and collegiate levels. After graduating from Lawrence High School in 1998, Anne entered into study at The University of Kansas where she completed her B.A. first in Anthropology (2002) and then in Classical Languages (2004), graduating with Highest Distinction and receiving induction into Phi Beta Kappa. She then earned a M.A. in Classics at the University of Kansas (2007), receiving along the way the university-wide Outstanding Graduate Teaching Assistant Award (2006) and the Classics Department's Albert O. Greef Outstanding Essay Award (2007). Upon completion of her master's degree, Anne served as Adjunct Instructor of Classics at William Jewell College (2008). In 2008 she undertook a Ph.D. at Brown University, and over the course of her studies there, she delivered a paper at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South (2012) and attended courses in Roman epigraphy at the British School at Rome (2012) and in Greek paleography at the Lincoln College Summer School of Greek Paleography, Oxford (2012). Following completion of her Ph.D., Anne plans to devote herself to Latin teaching in the greater Kansas City area.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Among the many debts of gratitude I owe for the fruition and completion of this project, first mention must go to my advisor John Bodel, who, having patiently read Cicero's speeches with me in the course of my special author study, indulged me as I chose to embark on a dissertation-length study of two verbs in Cicero's usage (*frango* and *lacero*), and throughout the project helped shape my fledgling ideas into a cohesive argument. The way ahead was not always clear nor smooth, and he bore graciously several unexpected (and for my part, life-altering) announcements, rejoicing with me in the birth of our son Jacob and in good humor continuing to meet with me via Skype as I took up residence in Kansas the final year. As many faults as this work still may bear (which are entirely my own), without his guidance there would be no dissertation, and to him I give my sincere and everlasting thanks. Much gratitude is owed too to Tony Corbeill. It was with Tony at the University of Kansas that I first became a serious student of Cicero and entered into the rigors of prose philological work, and when the request came years later to be a part of this dissertation committee, Tony accepted with humility and eagerness, offering insightful comments and feedback at various stages of the project.

Additional thanks are due to the faculty and graduate students of the Brown University Department of Classics. It has been a privilege and an honor to be a part of this department in every respect, from the vigorous seminars to the annual Latin Carol Celebration, which I am sure must be one of the most uniquely joyful holiday events held anywhere. I came to Brown an enthusiastic, awestruck, and slightly overconfident girl

from Kansas, and I was met by nothing but encouragement and a warmhearted challenge to excellence, from my teachers first and foremost but from my fellow graduate students as well. I cannot imagine a more congenial atmosphere for graduate study than this department has afforded, and to the cohort of my year especially (Annie and Joe McDonald, Barbara Blythe, Mitchell Parks) I offer the final cry of 'wanquish'.

Upon moving back to Kansas, our families were crucial to finishing this project. They housed us, fed us, and cared for our son as I frantically worked day and night to turn thoughts scribbled on paper and echoing in my head into a cogent piece of writing. Their love and support proved a stay amidst the maelstrom the final year brought, and I am eternally grateful. I thank too Tara Welch and the Classics Department of The University of Kansas for providing me with an office as well as academic fellowship this past year. The smiles and warm hellos from all were glimmers of sunlight during my darkest days of writing.

My utmost thanks, however, goes to my husband Kyle, who has borne with me every step of the way, enduring two rounds of graduate school and all the stress, elation, and occasional despair there entailed. Night after night, year after year, through countless hours of feverish work he loved, encouraged, and sacrificed, listening patiently as I practicing for upcoming presentations and recounted the various woes of grad school life according to the day. He walked and talked with me as I bounced dissertation ideas off of him in the early stages, and through the end he read and offered apt stylistic feedback on numerous pieces of the dissertation itself, including sections of detailed philological analysis. I cannot express my gratitude and love in writing here and hope instead that in the future I may return the loving service he has given so selflessly.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Curriculum Vitae iv

Acknowledgements v

Table of Contents vii

List of Tables ix

Abbreviations x

Introduction 1

Chapter 1 Invective Reference Before Cicero 15

- I. The Greek Divide 17
  - I.a. The Iambic Testimonia 21
  - I.b. The Attic Orators 26
  - I.c. Aristophanes 32
  - I.d. Plato 38
- II. The Roman Contribution 40
  - II.a. Plautus and Terence 43
  - II.b. Pre-Ciceronian Oratory 54
  - II.c. Lucilius 60

Chapter 2 Cicero's Pre-Consular Language 65

- I. Documentation 71
  - I.a. Verb Entries 73
  - I.b. Initial Comments 87
- II. Categories by Meaning and Sphere 89
  - II.a. Categories by Meaning 89
  - II.b. Categories by Sphere 92
- III. Application 98
  - III.a. Specificity of Imagery 99
  - III.b. Tendency to Cluster 101
  - III.c. Verb Forms and Application 105
- IV. Conclusion 111

Chapter 3 **Post-Consular Cicero: An Innovative Posture** **113**

I. 63-58 BCE (The Consular Years and Exile) 115

II. 57-55 BCE (The *Post Reditum* Years) 127

III. 54-45 BCE (The Years of Remove) 141

IV. 46-43 BCE (The Final Years) 145

V. Conclusion 152

Chapter 4 ***Novus Homo* Self-Fashioning and an Imperial Legacy** **158**

I. Post-Consular Self-Fashioning 159

II. A *Novus Homo* Perspective 171

III. Imperial Afterlife 178

Conclusion **191**

Works Cited 200

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Verb Frequency in the Attic Orators 26

Table 2: ‘Affliction’ Verbs in Cicero’s Pre-Consular Works 93

Table 3: Agents and Objects in Parallel Instances from Plautus and Terence 172

ABBREVIATIONS

Latin texts are cited throughout this dissertation according to the conventions of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, and those in Greek likewise follow the abbreviations listed in Liddell and Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon* with the exceptions of Aeschines and Demosthenes, abbreviated here "Aesch." and "Dem.".

LSJ	H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, revised and augmented by H.S. Jones, with revised supplement. (Oxford, 1996).
OCT	*Oxford Classical Texts*, series published by Oxford University Press. (Clarendon Press).
OED	*The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed., prepared by J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner. (Oxford, 1989).
OLD	P.G.W. Glare, *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 2012).
ORF	E. Malcovati, *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta Liberae Rei Publicae*, 3rd ed. *Vol. 1: Textus*. (Turin, 1967).
RE	*Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* (Stuttgart, 1893–1980).
SB	D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero: Letters to Atticus*; *Letters to Friends*; *Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem et M. Brutum*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries. (Cambridge).
TLL	*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Leipzig, 1900-).

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation presents a detailed and focused examination of the language used in reference to invective attacks and verbal abuse in Greek and Roman literature up through Cicero. Its focus is metaphors, specifically those whose meaning can roughly be conceived of as 'violent' and take the form of a verb. Its ultimate goal is to argue 1) that from the year of his consulship on, Cicero, in depicting invective attacks, employed three specific semantic strands of violent metaphors heretofore unattested in prose, and, moreover, deployed them in a phrasing and syntax atypical of earlier prose, including his own; and 2) that his usage represents an innovative *ad hominem* posture of self-fashioning, serving to bolster his image and *auctoritas* in the post-consular years and paralleling a psychology of violent self-elevation over a social superior that is characteristic of Plautus' slaves in particular.

Its investigations are inspired by a simple statement in the sixteenth epistle of the *ad Atticum* collection (*Att*. 1.16, 61 BCE), the letter in which Cicero famously recounts to Atticus his *altercatio* with P. Clodius Pulcher during Clodius' trial for violation of the Bona Dea rites.[1] Having described several debates in which he battled Clodius, Cicero boasts to Atticus, "I broke Clodius in person in the senate" – *Clodium praesentem fregi in senatu* (*Att*. 1.16.8). In this instance Cicero employs a verb of 'breaking' to signify his triumph over Clodius. The semantics here are not of mere hostile 'attacking' or forceful

---

[1] On this *altercatio*, see Crawford 1984: 107-12.

‘battling’ but of violent injury and destruction – Cicero ‘breaks’ Clodius with his oratory (*cum oratione perpetua ... tum altercatione*, *Att*. 1.16.8). Moreover, the phrasing of this instance is exceedingly direct and explicit, for Cicero presents himself not as ‘breaking’ Clodius’ spirit, reputation, or *dignitas*, for example, but Clodius himself directly. Only context indicates that *fregi* is not used literally here.

The reference, then, is at once subtle yet striking, on the one hand a mere lone verb, and on the other a savagely direct picture of invective attack. Yet this instance has received little scholarly attention. Katherine Geffcken, for instance, deems Cicero’s use of *fregi* here “aggressive rhetoric” in “physical terms” but ultimately dismisses it as an isolated incident of “hyperbole,” and Severin Koster and D.R. Shackleton Bailey, in discussing this passage, pass over the metaphor in silence.[2] Yet Cicero repeats the boast nearly word for word in another letter to Atticus (*qua <de> re cum in senatu ageretur, fregi hominem*, *Att*. 2.1.5), and moreover, he applies the verb *frango* to *ad hominem* attack throughout his later career, for example boasting of ‘breaking’ P. Servilius Isauricus in a letter to L. Munatius Plancus (*hunc ... fregerim*, *Fam*. 10.12.4) and praising the senate in the *Philippics* for having done the same to L. Sergius Catilina (*Catilinam ... fregistis*, *Phil*. 4.15).[3]

The metaphor *fregi* at *Att*. 1.16.8 is therefore not an isolated incident, but to the contrary it proves a recurring phenomenon in Cicero’s post-consular corpus. Indeed, during the second half of his career, Cicero employs several other ‘violent’ verbs in the same direct and explicit fashion. Besides *frango* and ‘breaking’ metaphors, Cicero calls upon verbs of ‘wounding’ and ‘cutting’ to fashion himself as vigorously quashing a foe, whether through his oratory specifically or his actions more generally. For example, within the *First Catilinarian*, Cicero warns Catiline and his fellow conspirators that he has not yet begun to ‘wound’ them with his voice (*eos nondum voce volnero*, *Cat.* 1.9); in a letter to his brother, Cicero gloats of ‘cutting down’ P. Vatinius during Sestius’ trial of 56 BCE (*Vatinium ... concidimus*, *Q. fr.* 2.4.1); and in the vicious *Second Philippic*, Cicero stops mid-abuse of Antony to inform the latter that his speech is ‘lacerating’ and ‘bloodying’ Antony (*haec te ... lacerat, haec cruentat oratio*, *Phil.* 2.86). In these three instances, Cicero again paints himself as violently injuring his target in some fashion, and in each case this target appears directly in the text, forming the verb’s explicit accusative object. These then align with *Clodium ... fregi* of *Att.* 1.16.8 above, as well as the other instances of *frango* given here, but just as Geffcken and others dismiss *fregi* at *Att.* 1.16.8, so too John Ramsey considers *lacerat* and *cruentat* above simply representative of the traditional “barbs of oratory.”[4] A cursory perusal of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, however, indicates that neither *frango* nor *lacero* appears – or at least survives – in this usage in Latin literature before Cicero.[5] Furthermore, as the various instances above cross the boundaries of genre within Cicero’s output, a consistent and substantive phenomenon seems indicated. These metaphors do not represent mere ‘aggressive rhetoric’, nor were they ‘traditional’ to Republican usage nor even classical literature at large. Rather, they signal innovation on Cicero’s part, a step away from the traditional discourse into a much more personal, direct, and graphic means of depicting invective.

---

[2] Geffcken 1973: 62; cf. Koster 1980: 117-8 and Shackleton Bailey 1965: 318-9 on *Att*. 1.16.8 and the *altercatio* to which it refers.

[3] Note that here and throughout I refer to verbs by their first-person singular form, that is by a verb’s ‘dictionary-entry’ form.

---

[4] Ramsey 2003: 287 *ad loc.*, citing as a parallel Cicero’s use of *aculeos orationis meae* in *Sul.* 47 and D.H. Berry’s note on this metaphor (Berry 1996: 226 *ad loc.*).

[5] Cf. *TLL* s.v. *frango* 6.1.1246.64-1247.19 (*de affectibus, vitiis sim.*) and 6.1.1250.34-1251.3 (*spectat ad universum statum*), and s.v. *lacero* 7.2.827.52-828.8 (*vituperando, detrectando*).

These factors form both the impetus and the grounds for this dissertation. In this thesis I examine the language used in reference to invective in classical literature before Cicero, and I expound the details of this *ad hominem* phenomenon more fully, ultimately arguing that its significance extends to the realm of self-fashioning, with specific implications of social perspective at that. The particular methodology of each chapter will be explained *in situ*, but here I outline the project's general scope and approach.

At its core, this dissertation presents a diachronic investigation of the language used to signify verbal abuse, harsh oratory, or *ad hominem* attack otherwise conceived in Greek and Republican Latin literature. Its examinations are conducted through a survey of carefully selected sources from each of the time periods considered – Archaic and Classical Greece, Rome of the second-century BCE, and Cicero's life and career, both before and after his consulship. The specific sources for each period – as well as the reasons for their selection – are detailed in the chapters that follow, but in general I have chosen for analysis those sources most frequently and most closely associated with invective, and in the case of Cicero particularly, those that provide representative coverage of his pre- and post-consular output in both dating and genre. Accordingly, this investigation treats Cicero's epistles and orations primarily, but too his treatises (rhetorical and philosophical), and it follows Cicero from his earliest surviving works – the youthful *De Inventione* (ca. 90 BCE) and *Pro Quinctio* (81 BCE) – to the *Philippics* (44-43 BCE) and his final letters.[6]

Now, unlike the speeches and treatises, the four collections of Cicero's epistles as they have survived (*Epistulae ad Atticum; ad Familiares; ad Quintum Fratrem; ad M.*

---

[6] On the dating of *De Inventione*, see Chapter Two, p. 67 n. 3.

Brutum) vary widely in the degree to which they were intended – or at least expected – to circulate. Such variance occurs between the four collections as well as within them, as for instance the first epistle of the *ad Quintum Fratrem* collection (*Q. fr.* 1.1) is more properly viewed as a political tract – the *Commentolarium de Provincia Administranda* – and stands out sharply amidst Cicero's otherwise private letters to his brother.[7] Even within the *ad Atticum* collection, on various occasions Cicero acknowledges both an expectation of wider circulation and a desire for the utmost privacy, in one instance assuring Atticus that he in no way is bothered by the circulation of his letter to Caesar, having distributed it himself to many people to copy (*Att.* 8.9.1), and in another directing Atticus to tear up several earlier letters in which Cicero had written rather harshly about Quintus, in fear that they might later leak out (*Att.* 10.12.3).

Thus, the surviving collections of Cicero's correspondence display a wide spectrum of tone and intended privacy. Yet by 44 BCE Cicero seems to have intended to publish a collection of his own letters, for he writes to Atticus about the possibility of such a collection in *Att.* 16.5.5.[8] In addition, the evidence I cite in the following chapters derives from both ends of the spectrum – and fairly equally at that – that is, from epistles of a more private nature (e.g. *Q. fr.* 2.4) as well as those of a distinctly literary quality, likely meant for wider distribution (e.g. *Att*. 1.16).[9] Accordingly, for the purposes of this dissertation I treat Cicero's correspondence at large as a source rather similar to the speeches, often expected and even intended to circulate – though only after Cicero's own edits and corrections – and most importantly, through the variation entailed, as indicative of a broader, more personally 'Ciceronian' usage distinct from concerns of publication or privacy.[10]

---

[7] On *Q. fr.* 1.1, see Shackleton Bailey 1980: 147.

[8] I.e. *mearum epistularum nulla est συναγωγή; sed habet Tiro instar septuaginta, et quidem sunt a te quaedam sumendae. eas ego oportet perspiciam, corrigam; tum denique edentur* (*Att.* 16.5.5); cf. also hints of similar intent in *Fam.* 16.17.1; on both passages, see Shackleton Bailey 1965: 59-60. On the actual, initial publication of Cicero's correspondence, in means and chronology, see Shackleton Bailey 1965: 60-73 on the *ad Atticum* collection, the publication of which is generally dated to the Neronian period; Shackleton Bailey 1980: 14 and 1977: 23-24 on the three remaining collections, likely collected and circulated at least originally by Cicero's secretary Tiro, though the extent of his editing and arrangement is uncertain; and Beard 2002: 116-18, who provides an overview of the evidence for the collection and publishing of the *ad Atticum* and *ad Familiares* epistles particularly, noting that for the latter, individual books may have circulated at first before being amassed into a full collection in the fourth or fifth century AD. On the role of later editors in the collections as they now stand, see Beard 2002 and White 2010.

To return to the outline, in examining the language of the sources considered here, this dissertation concentrates specifically on verbs, as it is verbs that comprise the instances from Cicero previously cited.[11] Nouns occasionally appear in the discussion, especially in treating the language of the testimonia accompanying archaic *iambos* in Chapter One and Cicero's own pre-consular language in Chapter Two, but here as elsewhere, nouns are given only to corroborate the evidence of verbs. Moreover, though I include non-figurative verbs within these examinations – again, particularly in the first chapter, where the overwhelming presence of such verbs in prose sources proves fundamental to the argument – in considering metaphors, I focus on those whose sense can roughly be considered violent.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines violence as "the exercise of physical force so as to inflict injury on, or cause damage to, persons or property, " and in this dissertation I take up this definition as a guiding principle and means of orientation, but not as a rigid qualification.[12] For applying and following this definition in practice still involves a certain amount of subjectivity, and more importantly, as much of this study aims to identify antecedents to Cicero's violent metaphors, passing over verbs of related sense simply because they fail to meet these criteria excludes a crucial body of evidence. Thus, in this dissertation I consider a range of violent and semi-violent verbs, from those whose violent sense is clear – encompassing verbs of precise signification (e.g. *caedo,* "to cut;" *frango*, "to break;" and *scindo*, "to tear") as well as those whose meaning (and manner of injury there indicated) is less specific (e.g. *interficio*, "to kill;" and *vulnero*, "to wound") – to those that often do not directly entail or result in injury, for instance verbs of 'attacking' (*oppugno*) or 'repelling' (*repello*) an opponent rather than explicitly effecting his harm, as these verbs in sense prove a close cousin to the more strictly violent verbs given above and in fact comprise the bulk of metaphors found in pre-Ciceronian prose sources.

---

[9] On the literary nature of *Att*. 1.16, see Hutchinson 1993.

[10] Cf. the emphasis Cicero places on the need for editing and correcting these letters before their publication – *eas ego oportet perspiciam, corrigam; tum denique edentur* (*Att*. 16.5.5). On similar practices for the speeches, cf. *Att*. 13.12, 13.29, and 13.20 on *Pro Ligario*, as well as *Att*. 15.1a, where Cicero discusses a speech that Brutus has sent him for correction before publication. On the publication of Cicero's speeches in general, especially the manner in which their published form relates to their delivered form, see Chapter 4, p. 160 n. 2.

[11] Note that Corbett 1964: 54 considers verbs the most apt part of speech for expressing violent or forceful imagery.

Thus, in scope this dissertation is rather narrow, examining metaphors of a specific part of speech (verbs) and a specific range of meanings ('violent'), and furthermore of a specific type of referent (abusive, *ad hominem* speech). Yet again, such strictures provide focus, and most importantly they allow for depth and detail within the project's course.

To be sure, this is not the only study to treat violent metaphors or even violent verbs specifically in Cicero, let alone within Greek and Roman literature at large. For metaphors in Latin literature of the Republic, Elaine Fantham's *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Literature* (1972) provides the fundamental treatment, and her study not only identifies the primary spheres of imagery in Republican Latin texts – including those specific to oratory and political discourse – but also offers specific observations on Cicero's metaphor usage.[13] Yet Fantham too places limits on her investigations, for she focuses on sources that represent colloquial language and usage, and in the realm of violent terminology, she does not seek to identify or qualify imagery beyond the designations of 'warfare' and 'single combat'.[14] Thus, while Fantham's study well illustrates the imagery spheres typical of Republican literature, it cannot speak for Cicero's usage exhaustively (nor does it claim to), and like similar studies of metaphor, it does not distinguish by referent.[15] In the realm of Roman comedy, Philip Corbett's study of comic *vis* in Plautus and Terence aligns most closely with the approach of this thesis, for in order to assess the amount of *vis* appropriate to each of the two playwrights, Corbett details the violent or otherwise 'forceful' and 'aggressive' verbs found in these plays, grouping such verbs by semantics and general sense.[16] Again, though, Corbett distinguishes these metaphors no further than their meanings, for instance lumping references to physical action together with those whose nature is verbal.

---

[12] *OED* s.v. 'violence' 1a.

In concentrating on references to invective and verbal activity, therefore, this dissertation utilizes an unconventional approach that distinguishes it from previous studies of metaphor, whether those of Cicero specifically or of Greek and Latin literature more broadly, and more importantly, by this approach it is able to treat more fully the language and usage of sources before Cicero. Such detail is necessary for this project, for as mentioned at the outset, one of its primary goals is to demonstrate that in his post-consular metaphors for invective, Cicero innovated in both syntax and semantics, and such an argument requires in-depth documentation of the previous tradition. And at a more basic level, this referent-based approach establishes consistency in assembling and comparing instances; that is, it ensures that in assessing references that span the Greek iambographers to Cicero himself and even beyond, comparisons are truly analogous.

---

[13] For the common imagery spheres outlined, see Fantham 1972: 7-41, and on Cicero, cf. especially 115-36 on the imagery of the highly elevated *Pro Sestio*, and 137-75 on *De Oratore*.

[14] On the sphere of 'warfare and single combat', see Fantham 1972: 26-33. I cite Fantham's study throughout this dissertation and discuss more fully the ways in which my work diverges from hers at the start of Chapter Two.

[15] Various treatments of metaphors in Greek and Latin literature – including those of Cicero himself – are cited as appropriate over the course of this examination.

[16] Cf. Corbett 1964: 52-54 for discussion of Corbett's approach.

Violence has long been associated with classical invective, encompassing the language of such attacks as well as their function. At a fundamental level, the surviving texts of Greek and Roman invective are filled with abusive epithets and colorful passages of varying nature, from the graphically sexual to the crudely scatological, the terminology of which has been detailed on the Latin side in such studies as J.N. Adams' *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (1982) and Ilona Opelt's *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter und verwandte sprachliche Erscheinungen: Eine Typologie* (1965), and on the Greek, Jeffrey Henderson's *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Old Comedy* (1975 and 1991).[17] Accordingly, in reception such invective is labeled 'violent'. Enzo Degani for instance applies this characterization to Archilochus' language as well as Hipponax's content overall, and Henderson describes the invective of Aristophanes and Old Comedy specifically as "fiery."[18] And even in antiquity Lucilius' satires resonated so fiercely that Juvenal famously pronounced '*ense velut stricto quotiens Lucilius ardens infremuit*' (Juv.

---

[17] For additional studies of the insults and epithets common in abusive contexts, see as a starting point Hoffmann 1892, treating both Greek and Latin literature; for comedy specifically, see Müller 1913 and Lilja 1965, as well as Hammer 1906 on Cicero's abusive terms that overlap with those of Plautus; and on Latin insults in direct, second-person address, see Dickey 2002: 163-85.

[18] Degani 1993: 24, 30; Henderson 1991: 26. For further scholarly assessments of these sources as invective, see Chapter One, p. 17 n. 3 and p. 19 n. 8.

1.165-6). Moreover, in the Greco-Roman world, invective, especially political abuse, bore a similarly violent function. For such attacks aimed to 'injure' the reputation of another – "to harm a person's *fama* or *existimatio*," as Jonathan Powell observes – and through the public denigration entailed, to achieve his social exclusion and offer a warning to future offenders, as detailed by Severin Koster and Anthony Corbeill.[19]

Yet such metaphors as *frango* and *lacero* above render invective 'violent' in quite another sense than function and content, however intense and graphic, can effect. The violence of these verbs forms the essence of this dissertation, for through their semantics these metaphors fashion Cicero as violently vanquishing his target, whether a courtroom adversary or political foe. And thus too this thesis follows in the line of scholarship that explores Ciceronian self-fashioning of various sorts, especially that at the level of individual lexical items, for instance Brian Krostenko's *Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance* (2001), which examines a specific set of aesthetic, Hellenizing terms (e.g. *bellus, lepidus, venustus*) in use as cultural capital among the elite of the late Republic.[20] In a similar vein, John Dugan's *Making a New Man: Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works* (2005) investigates Cicero's self-presentation in the rhetorical works specifically, tracing the progressive development of a 'transgressive aesthetic' seen therein, and in *Reading Cicero: Genre and Performance in Late Republican Rome* (2005), Catherine Steel explores Cicero's use of innovative written genres as an extension of his public persona, enabling him to retell continually the story of his glorious consular activities against Catiline. Of such studies, though, James May's *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos* (1988) is particularly valuable for this study, for in detailing Cicero's ethos-fashioning at various phases of his career – particularly the struggle for *auctoritas* and *dignitas* seen in later years – May's work provides the conceptual framework necessary to assess the relationship of the metaphors given above to Cicero's overall efforts at image-fashioning in his post-consular career.

---

[19] For the quote, see Powell 2007: 3, speaking specifically of political invective. Koster defines invective as a verbal attack against a named individual with the goal of public denigration and social exclusion (Koster 1980: 38-39, 354). Corbeill refines this notion, arguing that invective charges – especially those leveled against the body – were made in order to identify deviance from traditional, elite *mores* and to exclude the victim from the community on these grounds (Corbeill 1996); on the didactic function of such attacks, see Corbeill 2002: 198-200.

[20] Note that Krostenko observes that Cicero ultimately worked to disable this language of performance (Krostenko 2001: 176-93).

To summarize, through its examinations, this dissertation aims to show that Cicero's use of such verbs as *frango* and *lacero* in signifying abusive, invective attack is unparalleled in previous Greek or Latin literature, especially in prose sources, whose language differs greatly from verse sources in both semantics and phrasing. It demonstrates that such metaphors – specifically verbs of 'wounding', 'breaking', and 'cutting' – are characteristic of Cicero's post-consular career in particular, and it argues that these metaphors serve the purpose of self-fashioning for Cicero, bolstering his power and authority as a statesman and orator as his true position began to falter in later years. Indeed, the power of these metaphors is witnessed in enthusiasm with which later generations embrace them – especially *lacero* – as standard, emblematic terms for invective abuse, and by understanding the particularly Ciceronian ring that attends these verbs, one can better read their use in literature of the Empire. Finally, this dissertation identifies antecedents to Cicero's metaphors in the hyperbolic boasts and threats of Roman comedy, especially Plautus, and it argues that Cicero's usage parallels that of comedy not only in semantics and syntax but also in psychology. For in Plautus such metaphors most frequently denote the verbal actions of slaves and serve to elevate them in the face of a social superior; likewise, Cicero's violent boasts and threats are those of a *novus homo* struggling to reposition himself in an aristocratically-dominated political landscape, and thus their deployment marks a similar means of self-elevation for Cicero.

Chapter Previews

The investigations of this dissertation are divided into four chapters. Chapter One surveys Greek and Latin literature before Cicero. It focuses particularly on the prime representatives of invective on both the Greek and the Roman sides, and it tracks the language of these sources in signifying verbal abuse or harsh, *ad hominem* attack. Taking as an example Cicero's boast *Clodium praesentem fregi in senatu* (*Att.* 1.16.8), this chapter generally treats the following questions – what precedents can be found for Cicero's use of verbs such as *frango* and *lacero* as metaphors signaling harsh and abusive speech? More specifically, do similarly violent verbs appear in previous Latin or Greek literature, and if so, in what sources do they appear, and what semantic categories do they encompass? Through its examinations, this chapter demonstrates that pre-Ciceronian prose sources rely primarily on non-figurative verbs of 'abusing', 'reproaching', and 'slandering' to signal an invective act, and that the metaphors they do employ are rare and specific to the realms of combat and athletics. Comedy, however, frequently employs metaphors beyond these realms, and as the direct, personal, and physical phrasing of such instances additionally parallels Cicero's usage, this chapter identifies comedy – especially that of Plautus – as the most prominent source of antecedents to Cicero's violent metaphors.

Chapters Two and Three examine Cicero himself. These chapters divide Cicero's career at the year of his consulship (63 BCE), comparing the syntax and semantics seen in his pre-consular works with those from 63 on. Chapter Two treats the pre-consular years, and it uses the evidence gleaned from this period both as a contrast to the metaphors of his later career and also as a means of specifying tentatively the discourse common at the start of Cicero's career. This chapter considers two main questions – what types of language and semantics generally characterize Cicero's pre-consular works, and within this language, can similarly violent metaphors and phrasing be found? Accordingly, this chapter documents the verbs Cicero uses most frequently in referring to harsh oratory or *ad hominem* attack in select works before 63 BCE, and from this list it details the semantic categories and broader imagery spheres represented by these verbs, observing that verbs of 'breaking' or 'cutting' are conspicuously absent in this period. In addition, it specifies Cicero's manner of usage in applying these verbs – namely, that these verbs typically appear in concentrated imagery clusters, and that the syntax and phrasing of these instances tends toward the impersonal and the indirect, both of which characteristics Cicero's post-consular metaphors belie.

Working against the backdrop of semantics and usage laid out by Chapter Two, Chapter Three picks up at 63 BCE, and it traces three new strands of violent metaphors that Cicero employs of *ad hominem* attack henceforth – verbs of 'wounding', 'breaking', and 'cutting'. This chapter examines the sources in which Cicero calls upon these metaphors, the syntax and phrasing of their application, and the larger trends demonstrated over the course of their introduction and development. Throughout it emphasizes the exceedingly direct and personal nature of these instances, as first-person forms prove the norm in Cicero's post-consular works, and his targets in each case form the verb's explicit accusative object. And since these instances cross generic boundaries within Cicero's output – appearing first in his personal correspondence as well as in his orations, and later in assorted treatises as well – this chapter argues that Cicero's use of these verbs marks an innovative *ad hominem* posture through which Cicero represents himself as personally and directly 'crushing' his opponents, thereby positioning himself as Rome's predominant statesman and orator.

Finally, Chapter Four explores the larger purposes served by Cicero's *ad hominem* posture, and it follows the course of these violent verbs – especially *frango* and *lacero* – in the early Empire. In taking up the first topic, this chapter reviews the instances discussed in Chapter Three in their larger political context. It demonstrates that Cicero's use of 'wounding', 'breaking', and 'cutting' metaphors aligns with his larger efforts at identity fashioning in the post-consular years, and thus it argues that these verbs too serve the purpose of self-fashioning, bolstering Cicero's identity and *auctoritas* in moments of his own image crisis. In addition, this chapter returns to the closest parallels from Roman comedy identified in Chapter One, and in comparing the social relationships involved in both the Plautine instances as well as those from Cicero, it refines 'self-fashioning' as a label for Cicero's usage to that of 'self-elevation', arguing that just as similar metaphors in Plautus typically elevate a slave above his social superior, so too does Cicero employ *frango* and *lacero* from a *novus homo* perspective, fighting to gain and maintain his status amidst Rome's aristocracy. Finally, in considering the afterlife of Cicero's violent metaphors, this chapter highlights the emblematic status that *frango* and *lacero* in particular achieved in prose authors under the Empire.

CHAPTER 1

Invective Reference Before Cicero

The primary object of investigation in this dissertation is Cicero – the metaphors he applies to verbal abuse and *ad hominem* attacks before his consulship, those that then appear from 63 BCE on, and the significance marked by his shift in usage. This dissertation ultimately argues that his post-consular metaphors represent an innovation in semantics and syntax that served the purpose of self-fashioning, a means of bolstering his image and authority in the post-consular years as his true standing began to falter. To argue for innovation requires examination beyond merely Cicero himself, however. Thus, this chapter surveys the terms used in earlier Latin and Greek literature to signify that 'invective' roughly conceived – abusive speech, *ad hominem* attacks, etc. – has taken place.

As outlined in the Introduction, I focus here on those sources most likely to yield such references, particularly on the Greek side, where roughly seven-centuries' worth of literature survives before Cicero. For continuity of discussion, I divide this chapter into two parts – the first part treats the Greek tradition, and the second discusses Latin sources through the second century BCE. Part one surveys archaic and classical Greek sources most closely associated with invective, and it details both the semantics and the manner of usage seen in these sources when the topic turns to verbal abuse and attack.[1] Part two proceeds similarly for the surviving literature of the mid to late Republic, focusing again on sources with a greater link to invective. Here too semantics and usage are exposed. In addition, this section establishes the force and nuance of two verbs in particular in this period: *laedo* and *differo*. The first appears in Cicero's early works as well, and to contextualize its use there it is necessary to expose its force here; the second, on the other hand, is conspicuously absent from Cicero of any period, and this absence must therefore be explained.

---

[1] These sources as well as those on the Roman side are detailed and discussed more fully at the start of each section.

As a whole, this chapter bears two primary aims. First, it seeks to establish the main antecedents to Cicero's post-consular metaphors on both the Greek and Roman side, and it locates these in comedy in particular, that of Aristophanes to a certain extent, but more immediately the surviving dramas of Plautus and Terence. Second, this chapter aims to demonstrate that in both the Greek and the Roman traditions before Cicero, a semantic divide is seen between prose and verse in the terms employed to denote invective attacks. More simply put, when referring to verbal abuse, verse sources – especially comedy – use metaphor ranges that are not found on the prose side. On the somewhat rare occasions that prose sources, both Greek and Latin, choose to depict invective attacks through imagery, they consistently employ terms from the realms of combat (military and gladiatorial) and competition (athletic).[2] Comedy, however, pulls images from spheres beyond these. For in addition to such metaphors, Aristophanes portrays abusive speech through terms of 'striking', 'trampling', and 'thrusting' in particular, and in Plautus and Terence, a variety of verbal actions 'cut' and 'shred' their targets. By establishing not only Cicero's most direct antecedents but also the specifics of their semantics and usage, it will be possible in later chapters to demonstrate the areas in which Cicero either follows or diverges from this tradition.

---

[2] For discussion of military and gladiatorial imagery as a sphere in Republican Latin literature, cf. Fantham 1972: 26-33.

I. The Greek Divide

In this section I examine the language of those sources typically deemed the prime representatives of Greek invective. From the outset I confine these sources to the archaic and classical periods in order to ensure that their evidence is free from Roman – and especially Ciceronian – influence. In this regard, exception has been made for the testimonia that accompany the fragments of Archilochus and Hipponax, for these testimonia afford the otherwise unparalleled opportunity of comparing directly a wide range of both Greek and Latin sources that discuss the same material, namely the poetry and poetic activities of Hipponax and Archilochus.

Otherwise, the primary material for this section derives from Aristophanes' extant corpus and select speeches of the Attic orators. The invective quality of Aristophanes' comedies has been frequently noted, especially those comedies that predate 420 BCE, and most particularly *Knights* of 424 BCE, whose relentless personal attacks against Cleon render it "the first comedy entirely devoted to the vilification of a single individual."[3] Though this survey encompasses all eleven extant comedies, in fact *Knights* as well as *Clouds* yield the bulk of the evidence discussed for Aristophanes, as both devote particular attention to the topics of speech and argumentation of various types.

---

[3] On the invective quality of Aristophanes' comedies and Old Comedy in general, cf. e.g. Henderson 1991: 26, who describes Old Comedy as characterized by "fiery abuse, invective, and satire," and Koster 1980: 72, who argues that the ἰαμβικὴ ἰδέα was particularly prominent in Aristophanes' comedies up to 420 BCE, especially *Acharnians*, *Knights*, *Clouds*, and *Peace*; cf. similarly Degani 1993: 7. On the invective of *Knights* in particular, cf. e.g. Dover 1968: 169, Dover 1972: 99-100, and Degani 1993: 8, who sees *Knights* as the pinnacle of Aristophanes' invective; for the quote, see Henderson 1998: 7, noting that thereby *Knights* established the demagogue figure for future comedy.

Similarly, scholars have indentified six speeches of the orators in which invective plays an especially prominent role – Demosthenes' *On the Crown* (Dem. 18), *On the False Embassy* (Dem. 19), and *Against Meidias* (Dem. 22); Aeschines' *On the Embassy* (Aesch. 2) and *Against Ctesiphon* (Aesch. 3); and Dinarchus' *Against Demosthenes* (Din. 1).[4] Thus, these are the speeches examined in this chapter, and they, along with the evidence of the iambic testimonia, provide the main contrast to Aristophanes' evidence. Three dialogues of Plato are added to this survey – *Symposium*, *Gorgias*, and *Protagoras* – for inasmuch as they too concern speech at a fundamental level, their language proves an important witness for the period. But though these dialogues are technically prose in form, in style and vocabulary they often approach the poetic, and their evidence accordingly should be considered to represent a sort of middle ground between prose and comedy, as in fact it will be seen to do.[5]

Now, this survey necessarily excludes tragedy, which as a genre is linked less prominently to invective, but it also bypasses Homer, perhaps a surprising move given that Thersites' speech (*Il.* 2.212-277) is well-known for its abuse and has been called the most representative passage of blame poetry in epic.[6] Yet it is this speech in particular, rather than the bulk of the Homeric corpus, that is associated with invective, and it contains no traces of violent metaphors.[7] This chapter, therefore, will not include evidence from Homer.

---

[4] Of the speeches listed above, *On the Crown* and *Against Ctesiphon* are often considered the prime examples of oratorical invective; cf. Koster 1980: 78 for this assessment, and for *On the Crown* in particular, cf. Kennedy 1963: 261, 1985: 520, and Yunis 2005: 12. The invective quality of all, however, has been noted by scholars: for *On the False Embassy*, cf. Kennedy 1963: 229, Kennedy 1985: 520, MacDowell 2000: 28, and Yunis 2005: 12; for *Against Meidias*, cf. Blass 1887 (3.3): 238, Kennedy 1985: 518, and MacDowell 1990: 24 – cf. also Schmid 1895: 20-21, who notes that with the exception of *On the Crown* and *On the Embassy*, *Against Meidias* displays by far the most numerous and the harshest *convicia* of the public speeches; for *On the Embassy*, cf. Carey 2000: 93; and for *Against Demosthenes*, cf. Dobson 1919: 223; 305-6.

[5] Plato's varied style has often been seen to fall somewhere between prose and poetry, with such assessments dating back as early as Aristotle (cf. Aristotle via Diogenes Laertius, *On Plato* – φησὶ δ' Ἀριστοτέλης τὴν τῶν λόγων ἰδέαν αὐτοῦ μεταξὺ ποιήματος εἶναι καὶ πεζοῦ λόγου, D.L. 3.37); for similar statements in modern scholarship, cf. e.g. Sandbach 1985: 496, who dubs Plato's "a poetic prose, in which elevated vocabulary, periphrasis, metaphor, and above all simile, played their parts." Louis 1945 offers an examination of Plato's metaphors by domain, but the standard modern treatment of Plato from a literary standpoint, including his use of imagery, is Rutherford 1995, who provides examples and discussion of images from all three dialogues listed above – see Rutherford 1995 *passim*, per his discussion of each dialogue (*Protagoras*, 121-40; *Gorgias*, 141-78; *Symposium*, 179-205).

Before turning to the body of this section I offer a final note on sources. Besides Old Comedy and the speeches of Attic oratory listed above, the genre in this time frame identified perhaps most frequently with invective is archaic *iambos*, specifically the iambics of Archilochus and Hipponax. Indeed, Martin West has declared invective to be "the outstanding feature of the genre," and the poetry of both Archilochus and Hipponax is typically associated with violent language and fierce personal abuse.[8] Violent though their iambics may be in both language and content, however, in them are found no clear references to verbal abuse of any sort, non-figurative or metaphorical.[9] To elaborate, the surviving fragments of both do indeed contain a significant amount of physical violence –

---

[6] Nagy 1979: 263. For a few select treatments of this speech and its invective, see Nagy 1976: 199-200 and 1979: 259-64; cf. Rosen 2007: 67-78, who uses Nagy's analysis of the Thersites passage as a basis from which to detect comedy and satire in Homer.

[7] What is found in this speech are verbs meaning "to quarrel," "to reproach," and "to jeer," plus related forms; e.g. forms of νεικέω (νεικείεσκε, *Il*. 2.221; νείκεε, *Il*. 2.224; νεικείων, *Il*. 2.243, νεικείειν, *Il*. 2.277), ὀνειδίζω (ὀνειδίζων, *Il*. 2.255; cf. ὀνείδεα, *Il*. 2.222, 251; ὀνειδείοις, *Il*. 2.277), and other such words as κερτομέων, *Il*. 2.256. For a more complete catalogue of blame-associated lexical items found in this passage, see Nagy 1976: 200 and Nagy 1979: 259-64.

[8] For the quote, see West 1974: 22; for similar assessments of *iambos* as blame poetry marked by invective and aggressive abuse, cf. Nagy 1979: 244, Bartol 1993: 33, 35, and Brown 1997: 49. On the generally violent character of Archilochus' and Hipponax's language, cf. e.g. Degani 1993: 24 and 30 respectively on Archilochus and Hipponax; Brown 1997: 50, 69 on Archilochus' "fierce" and "devastating" invectives against the Lycambids; and Koster 1980: 58, who likewise emphasizes the ruthlessness and brutality of Hipponax's iambics.

[9] Only one fragment survives that could even remotely be considered a reference to verbal abuse – Archilochus fr. 45W. This fragment derives from Photius' entry for 'κύψαι' in his *Lexicon*: κύψαντες ὕβριν ἁθρόην ἀπέφλυσεν (Arch. 45W), translated by Gerber as "stooped over they spewed out all their insolence." That what the unknown subjects of the participle κύψαντες 'spewed forth' could be abusive language is suggested by the noun ὕβριν. This fragment lacks any other context, however, and though its interpretation is much disputed, scholars have tended to see it either as a sexual reference or as connected somehow with the Lycambids tradition; on the interpretation of this fragment, see Bossi 1990: 135-7.

some of which has been associated with their ‘invective’ stances overall, particularly that of Hipponax – as well as multiple curses and violent metaphors of other referents.[10] Yet within this context of violence and metaphor no images of specifically verbal violence occur, and thereby these fragments underscore the difference between invective *content* and invective *reference*, a difference which is fundamental to this dissertation. For here, as elsewhere in this chapter’s survey, a source’s tendency toward invective *topoi* and material does not necessarily imply his use of violent metaphors in discussion of such content, as will be the case for instance with the well known Roman *vituperator* M. Porcius Cato. Of course for both Cato as well as Archilochus and Hipponax, the issue may lie partly in the fragmentary state in which each survives, yet still one may reason, especially in the case of the latter, that a vivid and violent metaphor for speech would have piqued the interest of a selecting source – be he compiler, lexicographer, etc. – and thereby would likely have ensured the survival of the surrounding passage. Thus, despite the close ties between Old Comedy and *iambos*, whereas the former furnishes the most significant material of this section, the latter proves inconsequential to this study in its direct evidence.[11]

---

[10] As an example of physical violence, compare a fragment in which Hipponax threatens to strike Bupalus in the eye (λάβετέ μεο ταἰμάτια, **κόψω** Βουπάλου τὸν ὀφθαλμόν, 120W); since Hipponax directs this threat against his famed enemy Bupalus, scholars have associated his use of κόπτειν with the attacks of invective and blame poetry (cf. Rosen 1988a : 15-16), yet still its context is purely physical. For curses in these fragments, cf. forms of (ἀπ)όλλυμι used to wish for an enemy’s ruin in general terms in Archilochus 26W and Hipponax 25W and 128W, in addition to Hipponax’s “formalized curses” (e.g. Hipponax 115W; cf. Rosen 1988b: 295), the violence of which is graphic and detailed (cf. Burnett 1983: 100-2). For metaphors of other referents, compare two fragments in which Archilochus depicts the intensity of his emotion in violent terms – overcome by desire and despair, Archilochus is ‘pierced through his bones’ (χαλεπῇσι θεῶν ὀδύνῃσιν ἕκητι **πεπαρμένος** δι᾽ὀστέων, 193W) and his heart ‘strangled by friends’ (σὺ γὰρ δὴ παρὰ φίλων **ἀπάγχεαι**, 129W).

[11] In addition to contexts suffused with physical violence and hyperbolic language, both Old Comedy and *iambos* have been hypothesized to derive from the same ritual origins of αἰσχρολογία – on the ritual origins of these two genres, cf. West 1974: 22-28; on *iambos* in particular, cf. the detailed discussion of Brown 1997: 16-42; and on comedy, cf. Henderson 1991: 13, 16-17, *et passim*, followed e.g. by Degani 1993: 21. Moreover, both comedy and *iambos* frame their verses in a dramatic context, with the iambographers

I.a. The Iambic Testimonia

The testimonia that accompany the fragments of Archilochus and Hipponax, however, are of great value here, for in addition to spanning a wealth of sources and centuries, they neatly demonstrate the semantic divide between prose and verse sources that the rest of this section and chapter at large corroborate.[12] From Aristotle to Eusebius, the Greek prose testimonia are consistent in their language. To refer to the poetry and poetic activities of Hipponax and Archilochus, these sources do not apply metaphors. Rather, they signify abusive activity through a handful of non-figurative terms which in fact form the basis of prose references throughout this chapter – verbs of such meaning as "to slander," "to abuse," and "to reproach," specifically βλασφημέω, διαβάλλω, λοιδορέω, ὀνειδίζω, and ψέγω, as well as their related nouns and adjectives.[13] For the sake of simplicity, examples are collected below according to individual terms and are given in roughly chronological order, from the fifth and fourth centuries BCE up through the Empire.

---

typically writing through a first-person, semi-fictional *persona* – cf. Dover 1964: 205-11, whose arguments have generally been embraced by the scholarly community (cf. though Carey 1986: 66-67, who, through a defense of Archilochus' quarrel with Lycambes, argues that the biographical fallacy often assumed for archaic poetry is on the whole false).

[12] Although the testimonia date to the twelfth century CE and beyond, in this section I consider only those dating up to approximately the fifth century CE on the assumption that those beyond this point are too late to yield truly relevant linguistic evidence. In addition, since the language that appears in the testimonia for Archilochus and Hipponax is so similar, I consider the two together. Instances included in Gerber's *Greek Iambic Poetry* are cited according to his numbering; the remainder I cite from the editions of Tarditi for Archilochus, Degani for Hipponax, and occasionally from the testimonia given along with West's fragments in his *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* (e.g. 15W test.).

[13] Cf. The similar cluster of nouns that Rotstein draws from fourth-century BCE witnesses on *iambos* – ψόγος, λοιδορία, κακηγορία, αἰσχρολογία, etc. (Rotstein 2010: 319). Of the same sense as the verbs listed above, though occuring less frequently, is the phrase λέγω κακῶς which appears in two testimonia – cf. ὁμοίως τοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς **κακῶς ἔλεγε** (test. 33 Gerber; Critias 88 B 44 DK, in Ael. *V.H.* 10.13) and οὐ τοίνυν οὐδ᾽ Ἀρχίλοχος περὶ τὰς βλασφημίας οὕτω διατρίβων τοὺς ἀρίστους τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τοὺς ἐνδοξοτάτους **ἔλεγε κακῶς**, ἀλλὰ Λυκάμβην .... καὶ τοιούτους ἀνθρώπους **ἔλεγε κακῶς** (test. 17 Gerber; Aristid., *Or*. 46).

βλασφημέω: In Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Alcidamous deems Archilochus himself 'blasphemous' (Πάριοι γοῦν Ἀρχίλοχον καίπερ **βλάσφημον** ὄντα τετιμήκασι, test. 6 Tarditi; Alcidamas ap. Arist., *Rh*. 2.23). Aelius Aristides too considers Archilochus' poetry against Lycambes 'blasphemies' (οὐ τοίνυν οὐδ' Ἀρχίλοχος περὶ τὰς **βλασφημίας** οὕτω διατρίβων τοὺς ἀρίστους τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τοὺς ἐνδοξοτάτους ἔλεγε κακῶς, ἀλλὰ Λυκάμβην, test. 17 Gerber; Aristid., *Or*. 46), and Plutarch applies the same label to the iambics of Hipponax as well as Archilochus (τὸν μὲν γὰρ Ἀρχίλοχον καὶ τὸν Ἱππώνακτα **βλασφημίας** συγγράψαι κατὰ τῶν λυπησάντων, test. 56 Degani; Plu. fr. 40 Sandb. ap. Procl. ad Hes. Op. 286 p. 96, 11-15 Pertusi).

διαβάλλω: Plutarch describes Archilochus as 'slandering' the island of Thasos (**διέβαλε** τὴν νῆσον εἰπών, 21W test.; Plu., *De Exilio* 12.604c), and in Athenaeus too Archilochus uses his tetrameters to 'slander' (Ἀρχίλοχος δὲ ἐν τετραμέτροις Χαρίλαν εἰς τὰ ὅμοια **διαβέβληκεν**, 167W test.; Ath. 10.415d).

λοιδορέω: In the treatise *De Elocutione* attributed to Demetrius of Phaleron, Demetrius conjectures that Hipponax altered his meter out of a desire to 'abuse' his enemies, rendering it suitable for 'abuse' and 'blame' (**λοιδορῆσαι** γὰρ βουλόμενος τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἔθραυσεν τὸ μέτρον καὶ ἐποίησεν χωλὸν ἀντὶ εὐθέος καὶ ἄρυθμον, τουτέστι δεινότητι πρέπον καὶ **λοιδορίᾳ**: τὸ γὰρ ἔρρυθμον καὶ εὐήκοον ἐγκωμίοις ἂν πρέποι μᾶλλον ἢ ψόγοις, test. 12 Gerber; Demetr. *Eloc*. 301). Similarly, in Eusebius, Oenomaus speaks of 'abusing' in the manner of Archilochus (τὰ Ἀρχιλόχου ... **λοιδορῆσαι** μὲν πικρῶς τὰς οὐκ ἐθελούσας ἡμῖν γαμεῖσθαι, 294W test.; Oenomaus apud Eus. *P.E.* 5.33.5), and in the estimation of Dio Chrysostom, it is likewise for laughter or 'abuse' that Archilochus and the comedic poets write (τὰ δὲ γέλωτος ἕνεκεν ἢ **λοιδορίας** πεποιημένα, ὥσπερ τὰ τῶν κωμῳδοδιδασκάλων καὶ τὰ τοῦ Παρίου ποιητοῦ, test. 49 Tarditi; D. Chr. 2.4).

ὀνειδίζω: Dioscorides describes Archilochus as overflowing with chilling 'reproach' (ῥιγηλὸν **ὄνειδος** ... ἔφλυσεν Ἀρχίλοχος, test. 20 Gerber; *Anth. Pal.* 7.351.5-6, Diosc.); Lucian declares that in his poetry, Archilochus never hesitated to 'reproach' anyone (Ἀρχίλοχον ... μηδὲν ὀκνοῦντα **ὀνειδίζειν**, 223W test.; Luc., *Pseudol.* 1); and Origen similarly describes him as ‘reproaching’ Lycambes in particular (καὶ **ὀνειδίζων** γε ὁ Πάριος ἰαμβοποιὸς τὸν Λυκάμβην, 173W test., Orig. *Cels*. 2.21).

ψέγω: Dio states that Archilochus went to the opposite extreme of Homer and ‘censured’ people, himself first and foremost (Ἀρχίλοχος δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐναντίαν ἧκε, τὸ **ψέγειν** ... καὶ πρῶτον αὐτὸν **ψέγει**, test. 16 Gerber; D. Chr. 33.11-12), and Menander Rhetor deems him a suitable model for the reader who wishes to ‘censure’ anyone (καὶ Ἀρχιλόχου δὲ οὐκ ἀμελήσεις, ἱκανῶς κολάσαντος τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τῇ ποιήσει, ἵνα καὶ αὐτὸς ὅταν ἐθέλῃς **ψέγειν** τινάς (test. 111 Tarditi; Men. Rh. *π. ἐπιδεικτ*. IX, p. 254 Walz; for κολάσαντος, see n. 14 below). Compare again Demetrius’ reference to Hipponax’s meter as suitable for ‘abuse’ and ‘blame’ given above (s.v. λοιδορέω; μᾶλλον ἢ **ψόγοις**, Demetr. *Eloc*. 301).

These are the terms that both dominate the Greek testimonia as a whole and in fact comprise nearly the sole means of reference in the prose sources specifically, spanning the fourth century BCE to the fourth century CE.[14]

Sources in verse, on the contrary, employ metaphors almost exclusively.[15] For instance, the fifth-century Old Comedy poet Cratinus portrays Archilochus as ‘waging war’ against Lycambes (ἐπεὶ **ἐπολέμησεν** Ἀρχίλοχος τῷ Λυκάμβῃ, test. 45 Tarditi; Cratin. *Νόμοι*, fr. 130, I, p. 54 Kock); Callimachus compares Archilochus’ poetry to a dog’s bile, a wasp’s sting, and the venom of both (εἵλκυσε δὲ δριμύν τε **χόλον** κυνὸς ὀξύ τε **κέντρον** σφηκός, ἀπ᾽ ἀμφοτέρῶν δ᾽**ἰὸν** ἔχει στόματος, test. 36 Gerber; Call. fr. 380 Pfeiffer); and Leonidas of Tarentum characterizes Hipponax’s verses as ‘fiery’ (τὰ γὰρ **πεπυρωμένα** κείνου ῥήματα πημαίνειν οἶδε, test. 9 Gerber; Anth. Pal. 7.408.5-6, Leon.).[16] These vivid images mark a sharp departure from the verbs of ‘abusing’ and ‘slandering’ that suffuse the prose testimonia. Even still, though, in force they are best classified simply as aggressive, for none extends to the realm of blood or injury.

---

[14] Two other verbs used by the Greek prose testimonia, again less frequently than those listed above, are κολάζω and λυπέω; for κολάζω, cf. ἤδη καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν ... ἐξεῖπον ταῦτα ... λέγοντες ὅτι μέλλουσι **κολάζεσθαι** ... ὁμοίως καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος (126W test.; Theophil. *ad Autolycum* 2.37) and καὶ Ἀρχιλόχου δὲ οὐκ ἀμελήσεις, ἱκανῶς **κολάσαντος** τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τῇ ποιήσει (test. 111 Tarditi; Men. Rh. *π. ἐπιδεικτ*. IX, p. 254 Walz); and for λυπέω, cf. Ἀρχίλοχον ... μάλιστα **λυπήσειν** ἔμελλε τοὺς περιπετεῖς ἐσομένους τῇ χολῇ τῶν ἰάμβων αὐτοῦ (223W test.; Luc., *Pseudol*. 1). Note that among these prose testimonia one metaphor does in fact occur (Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistae*), but it represents a fragment of the Old Comedy poet Cephisodorus in which the latter describes Archilochus as ‘skinning’ every sort of man in his poetry (οἷα παρὰ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχῳ τὸ πάντ᾽ ἄνδρ᾽ **ἀποσκολύπτειν**, test. 31 Tarditi; Cephisod. ap. Athen. 3.94 (122b)), and thus it does not actually represent prose usage.

[15] For non-figurative references among Greek verse sources, cf. the adjective ψογερός in Pindar (**ψογερὸν** Ἀρχίλοχον βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν πιαινόμενον, test. 35 Gerber; Pi. *P*. 2.55-6) and the verb πημαίνω in a poem of Leonidas of Tarentum (τὰ γὰρ πεπυρωμένα κείνου ῥήματα **πημαίνειν** οἶδε, test. 9 Gerber; Anth. Pal. 7.408.5-6, Leon.).

On one occasion, however, the imagery used denotes precisely this. In poem 7.71 of the *Palatine Anthology*, a certain Gaetulicus describes Archilochus as having ‘bloodied’ Helicon with his poetry (**αἱμάξας** Ἑλικῶνα, test. 22 Gerber; Pal. Anth. 7.71, Gaet.). Now, this Gaetulicus is frequently identified with Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus, consul of 26 CE and legate, whose son was engaged to Sejanus’s daughter.[17] If this Gaetulicus is indeed the same as the author of the epigram in question, he was very much a Roman and deeply steeped in Roman means of expression. Moreover, this poem would then have been penned in the first century CE, by which time the violent metaphors of Cicero’s post-consular career were already entering wider Latin usage, as the fourth chapter will demonstrate. The language of this poem is more properly Roman than Greek, therefore, and its evidence should be reckoned accordingly.

---

[16] Note too that a change in perception of *iambos* occurred in the fourth and third centuries BCE, as the genre’s originally cheerful associations shifted to those of abuse and invective at this time (cf. Rotstein 2010: 165-6, 319, 343-4); Callimachus himself is thought to have played a significant role in developing the image of Archilochus’ ferocity that Horace and others eventually followed (cf. von Blumenthal 1922 *passim*, Bossi 1990: 32-34), and this may account for the particularly colorful nature of the imagery found in Callimachus and Leonidas listed above.

[17] For a summary of the career of Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus, see Skutsch *RE* 4.1384-5. Page 1981: 50-51 discusses the little evidence we have for the poetry of this Roman statesman and the potential obstacles in identifying him with the Gaetulicus who penned several Greek epigrams, including *AP* 7.71; he ultimately concludes, however, that “the proper judgment is that there is no obstacle to the identification; that it is intrinsically quite probable; but that it cannot be proved” (51); cf. Courtney 1993: 345, who deems the identification “likely enough, though not certain.”

And in fact Gaetulicus' αἱμάξας agrees with the imagery found in the Latin verse testimonia, for images of 'blood' occur here as well. In the vicious invective poem *Ibis*, Ovid depicts Archilochus' poetry in graphic terms, as weapons stained and soaked with Lycambes' blood (*tincta* ***Lycambeo sanguine tela*** *dabit*, test. 28 Gerber; Ov. *Ib*. 54), and in his seventh book of epigrams, Martial echoes Ovid's image and exact phrasing (*si qua* ***Lycambeo sanguine tela*** *madent*, test. 32 Gerber; Mart. 7.12.6).[18] Yet verbs of similar signification appear on the prose side too. Cicero describes Archilochus' poetry as 'wounding' its targets (*qui erat Archilochi versu* ***vulneratus***, test. 59 Degani; Cic. *N.D.* 3.91), and both Valerius Maximus and Atilius Fortunatianus go so far as to apply the verb *lacero* to the poetic activities of the two iambographers, the former noting that Archilochus' poetry was banned by the Spartans for 'lacerating' an enemy's house with abuse (*quia domum sibi invisam obscenis maledictis* ***laceraverat***, test. 46 Gerber; Val. Max. 6.3. ext. 1), and the latter surmising that iambic is thus named because it is in that meter that the iambographers used to 'lacerate' their targets (*iambica maledica carmina appellant, quod hoc pede* [*id est metro*] *olim* ***lacerare*** *... solebant*, test. 23 Degani; Atil. Fortun. *Ars* 10, GL 6.286.2-9 Keil).

In sum, then, the Greek testimonia display separate strands of terminology in reference to the invective of Archilochus and Hipponax, for sources in verse consistently apply metaphors to such activity, whereas the prose sources consistently do not. The Latin testimonia, however – all of which date to Cicero or later – defy this divide, and the collection of iambic testimonia at large thereby anticipates the contrast that Cicero's post-consular metaphors will mark to those of previous Latin prose sources, including his own. Examination of the orators and Aristophanes substantiates this divide, for again in the select speeches considered here, verbs of ‘accusing’, ‘slandering’ and the like predominate, while metaphors are rare and derive solely from the realm of athletic competition. In Aristophanes, however, figures of abusive speech abound, and more importantly, many of them extend to other ranges of semantics and imagery.

---

[18] On Martial's use of *Lycambeo sanguine tela* as an echo of *Ibis* 54, cf. Galán Vioque 2002: 108.

I.b. The Attic Orators

To begin with the orators, within the six speeches surveyed here, the following verbs are those used most frequently to denote harsh or abusive speech: διαβάλλω, λοιδορέω, κατηγορέω, αἰτιάομαι, ὀνειδίζω, βλασφημέω, and ψέγω. Below is a chart that lists the frequency with which each term occurs in this collection as a whole.[19]

Table 1: Verb Frequency in the Attic Orators

Verb	Total Number of Occurrences
διαβάλλω	21
λοιδορέω	19
κατηγορέω	(14)
αἰτιάομαι	(12)
ὀνειδίζω	11
βλασφημέω	7
ψέγω	3

---

[19] The figures in this chart as well as throughout this section are based on the indices of Preuss 1963 for Demosthenes, Preuss 1965 for Aeschines, and Forman 1962 for Dinarchus. Note that the figures for κατηγορέω and αἰτιάομαι reflect only instances of non-technical usage, and the parentheses surrounding these figures indicate their tentative nature; both are discussed below. For the twenty-one instances of διαβάλλω, cf.: Dem. 18.11, 14, 20, 24, 28, 111, 225, 293; 19.97; 21.134; Aesch. 2.2, 44, 69, 81, 89, 121, 145, 153; 3.216, 226, 254; for the nineteen of λοιδορέω: Dem. 18.10, 180, 256, 274, 284, 285, 290; 19.210, 213, 251, 255; 21.132, 138, 200; Aesch. 2.8, 78, 150; 3.207; Din. 1.99; for the fourteen of κατηγορέω: Dem. 18.162, 213, 261, 291, 294; 19.31; 21.132, 134, 193, 196, 197; Aesch. 2.66, 165; 3.216; for the twelve of αἰτιάομαι: Dem. 18.76, 263, 272 (x2); 19.92, 120, 157, 333, 336; Aesch. 2.12, 24; 3.223; for the eleven of ὀνειδίζω: Dem. 18.51, 252, 269, 274, 284; 21.58, 120, 147; Aesch. 2.164; 3.78; Din. 1.36; for the seven of βλασφημέω: Dem. 18.10, 82; 19.210, 213; Aesch. 2.149; Din. 1.9, 12; and for the three of ψέγω: Aesch. 2.123; 3.53, 217.

Two things should be apparent from this chart – first, that significant overlap is seen between these verbs and those used by the Greek prose iambic testimonia. This in and of itself may not surprise given the meanings of these verbs; yet it underscores that for both the orators and the testimonia, these verbs constitute the primary – if not sole – means of reference. And though these verbs carry their own particular nuances, in fact they also serve as a group of near synonyms from which the orators drew on occasion, often appearing in parallel with each other to amplify general accusations of slander or abuse in these speeches. For example, in *On the Crown* Demosthenes uses λοιδορέω and βλασφημέω together to express the notion of 'slander', declaring that he will give a simple and right response to Aeschines' slanders against his private life (περὶ μὲν δὴ τῶν ἰδίων ὅσα **λοιδορούμενος βεβλασφήμηκεν** περὶ ἐμοῦ, θεάσασθε ὡς ἁπλᾶ καὶ δίκαια λέγω, Dem. 18.10). And for the parallel use of terms somewhat less similar in their individual meanings, compare διαβάλλω in conjunction with προπηλακίζω in *On the Embassy*, where Aeschines protests that Demosthenes has continued to insult and slander his colleagues throughout his accusation (οὓς **προπηλακίζων** οὗτος καὶ **διαβάλλων** ἐν τῇ κατηγορίᾳ διατετέλεκε, Aesch. 2.44).[20] Thus, these verbs represent a cohesive group that, despite particularities of nuance, display basic conceptual unity.

Second, in indicating harsh or attacking speech, the orators occasionally employ verbs of 'accusing' as well as those of 'slandering' and 'abusing', specifically κατηγορέω and αἰτιάομαι. Since both of these verbs can be used in a technical sense of 'bringing a charge against' someone in court, I number here only those instances whose application clearly seems to fall outside these bounds.[21] For instance, used in conjunction with the verb καταψεύδω at Dem. 18.291, κατηγορέω assumes a sense of 'slandering' or 'denouncing falsely'; coupled with φάσκων ὄνειδος it denotes 'blaming' at Dem. 21.132; at Dem. 21.134 it suggests 'denouncing' more generally; and at Aesch. 3.216, paired with διαβάλλω, the verb's sense again is that of 'slandering'.[22] Similarly, αἰτιάομαι appears in non-technical usage at Aesch. 2.24 and Dem. 18.76, for example, as Aeschines in the former explains that he will have only himself to 'blame' if he fails to refute any of Demosthenes' accusations (ἐάν τι μὴ λύσω τῶν κατηγορημένων, οὐχ ὑμᾶς, ἀλλ᾽ ἐμαυτὸν **αἰτιάσομαι**, Aesch. 2.24), and in the latter Demosthenes observes that even Philip casts no 'blame' on Demosthenes in regard to the war (ὁ Φίλιππος οὐδὲν **αἰτιᾶται** ἐμ᾽ ὑπὲρ τοῦ πολέμου, Dem. 18.76).

---

[20] In such instances of parallel usage, forms of λοιδορέω or διαβάλλω consistently form one half of the pair, serving as semantic anchors for the other verbs; cf. an additional instance of λοιδορέω with βλασφημέω (Dem.19.210) as well as its use with ὀνειδίζω (ἐμοὶ **λοιδορεῖ** καὶ **ὀνειδίζεις** ταῦτα, ὧν πάντας μᾶλλον αἰτίους εὑρήσεις, Dem. 18.284; cf. also Dem. 18.274) and with ὕβριζω (διατετέλεκε γὰρ εἰς ἡμᾶς **ὑβρίζων**, καὶ **λοιδορίας** ψευδεῖς οὐκ ἐμοὶ μόνον **λοιδορούμενος**, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις, Aesch. 2.8); cf. also Demosthenes' use of λοιδορία together with ὕβρις and προπηλακισμός in *On the Crown* (ἐχθροῦ μὲν ἐπήρειαν ἔχει καὶ **ὕβριν** καὶ **λοιδορίαν** καὶ **προπηλακισμὸν** ὁμοῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα, Dem. 18.12). Likewise, cf. διαβολή with αἰτίαομαι (πολὺν μὲν τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ τὸν Φίλιππον ἐν ταῖς **διαβολαῖς** φέρων, **αἰτιώμενος** δέ τινας ἐμποδίζειν τοὺς τῆς πόλεως καιροὺς, Aesch. 3.223).

I enclose in parentheses the respective figures of fourteen and twelve for κατηγορέω and αἰτιάομαι, however, because at times the use of each verb is somewhat ambiguous; that is, for κατηγορέω it can be difficult to discern whether the verb's subject 'denounces' his object in a specifically legal context or in a broader sense, and likewise whether αἰτιάομαι refers to 'blaming' of the sort that lodges judicial accusations or casts aspersions more generally.[23] Again, I have erred on the side of caution in these figures, excluding any instances of a seemingly ambiguous nature, and thus the true number of non-technical occurrences for each verb is likely somewhat higher. Now, since κατηγορέω occurs in total some 140 times in these speeches and αἰτιάομαι twenty-five times, these non-technical instances comprise only a small portion of the verbs' overall usage, especially in the case of the former. Yet even the conservative figures given here surpass the totals for three of the 'slandering' and 'abusing' verbs (ὀνειδίζω, βλασφημέω, and ψέγω), and thus for the orators, κατηγορέω and αἰτιάομαι in non-technical usage prove an equally viable – and in fact equally frequent – means of denoting harsh and *ad hominem* speech at a basic level.

---

[21] For technical use of κατηγορέω to denote the legal action of bringing a charge against someone, see *LSJ* s.v. κατηγορέω I.2-4, and for αἰτιάομαι employed in a similar fashion, cf. *LSJ* s.v. αἰτιάομαι I.2 and II.2.

[22] Cf. respectively πολλὰ τοίνυν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ ἄλλα **κατηγορηκότος** αὐτοῦ καὶ **κατεψευσμένου** (Dem. 18.291); ἴστε ... πάντες οἷα ἐδημηγόρησεν παρ᾽ ὑμῖν ... **κατηγορῶν** καὶ **φάσκων ὄνειδος** ... (Dem. 21.132); εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἐποίεις ταῦτα, ὦ Μειδία, ἃ σέ φασιν οἱ συνιππεῖς καὶ κατηγόρεις ὡς λέγοιεν περὶ σοῦ (Dem. 21.134; cf. *LSJ* s.v. κατηγορέω I.1, listing this instance as an example); ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἡσυχίαν αὐτὴν τοῦ βίου **διαβάλλει** καὶ τῆς σιωπῆς μου **κατηγορεῖ** (Aesch. 3.216); cf. similarly the noun κατηγορία with διαβάλλω at Aesch. 2.44.

Finally, two other verbs of somewhat similar meaning are found in these speeches and in fact occur more frequently than many of the verbs listed above – ὑβρίζω, with eighty-seven instances, and προπηλακίζω with twelve. Yet all but two instances of ὑβρίζω and four of προπηλακίζω denote physical rather than verbal outrage, and the majority of these appear in *Against Meidias*, referring to the punch that forms the central issue – if not the formal charge – of the speech.[24]

The verbs listed in the chart above, then, prove the most common non-figurative means of indicating harsh, abusive, or *ad hominem* attacks in the six speeches of this survey.[25] Moreover, again they constitute the orators' near exclusive means of reference, for in these speeches only a handful of images appear, and these are confined almost completely to the realm of athletics. Within this realm, on most occasions the imagery is as general as possible; the verb ἀγωνίζομαι and the corresponding noun ἀγών portray the orators as participating in an athletic competition, and their combined appearances in the speeches of Demosthenes surveyed here number more than sixty.[26] In *On the Crown* for example, Demosthenes refers to his quarrel with Aeschines in these terms, rebuking the latter for involving someone else – namely Ctesiphon – in their contest (ἀγωνίζεσθαι), when rightly it should have been kept between the two of them (18.16).[27] Yet these terms were such a regular part of courtroom parlance that they assumed a quasi-technical status, meaning simply "to contend in court," and thus as imagery they retained little of their original force by the time of Aeschines and Demosthenes.[28] That is, due precisely to their high frequency here and elsewhere, the terms ἀγωνίζομαι and ἀγών hardly qualify as metaphors at all.

---

[23] For ambiguous usage of αἰτιάομαι, cf. e.g. Dem. 18.191, 19.244; κατηγορέω seems to refer to 'denouncing' speech more broadly e.g. at Dem. 18.162, 195, 196, 266, 275; 19.24, 73, 75, 96, 104.

[24] In these speeches ὑβρίζω refers to verbal abuse in Dem. 19.246 and Aesch. 2.8, and προπηλακίζω in Dem. 18.48, 132; Aesch. 19.309; and Din. 1.23. But ὕβρις itself serves as the theme of *Against Meidias*, as Demosthenes again and again refers to Meidias' offense as ὕβρις; cf. MacDowell 1990: 17, who notes the repeated emphasis that Demosthenes places on these concepts throughout the speech. Harris 2008: 79 thus suggests that the charge in this case was ὕβρις, but MacDowell 1990: 16 argues that the formal charge that Demosthenes brought was ἀδικεῖν περὶ τὴν ἑορτήν, rather than ὕβρις or ἀσεβεία.

And more precise imagery within the sphere of athletics is rare. In these speeches I can point only to several examples in *Against Ctesiphon* where Aeschines, calling to his aid language of wrestling and boxing in particular, refers to Demosthenes' rhetorical trickery as a πάλαισμα (3.205) and urges the jury to fight Demosthenes on his arguments just as boxers (τοὺς πύκτας) would in gymnastic contests (γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν) (3.206).[29] Rarer still, though, are any other quasi-violent metaphors for harsh and abusive oratory, in my count numbering two – Demosthenes on a handful of occasions applies the vaguely military metaphor ἐπιβάλλω to Aeschines' 'attacks', and Dinarchus refers once to the Athenian leaders' purposeful abusing and 'knocking about' (προσκρούω) of each other in the Assembly (1.99).[30]

---

[25] For verbs of similar meaning and indication that appear only occasionally, cf. e.g. σκώπτω, used specifically of mocking or jesting speech (cf. Dem. 18.245, 263) and again the phrase λέγω κακῶς, applied to speech of a generally abusive fashion (cf. e.g. Dem. 19.214).

[26] Demosthenes uses ἀγωνίζομαι a total of twenty-three times (18.2, 3, 16, 66, 101, 177, 195, 203, 238, 262, 290, 299; 19.214, 226, 242, 246, 250, 337; 21.7, 17, 56, 66, 90) and ἀγών forty-two times (18.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 14, 15, 34, 67, 103, 201, 209, 215, 226, 235, 262, 279, 280; 19.1, 3, 120, 219, 223, 285; 21.8, 9, 15, 18 (x2), 28, 39, 55 (x2), 59, 99, 145, 151, 185, 200, 205).

[27] I.e. οὐ τὸ μὲν πρὸς ἀλλήλους **ἀγωνίζεσθαι** παραλείπειν, ἑτέρῳ δ᾽ ὅτῳ κακόν τι δώσομεν ζητεῖν (Dem. 18.16).

[28] For ἀγωνίζομαι as a law term, cf. *LSJ* s.v. ἀγωνίζομαι A.II; cf. also s.v. ἀγών III.3-4 for the noun as a term specific to courtroom oratory and action.

Thus, all but one of the rare metaphors for *ad hominem* attack in these speeches derive from the realms of athletics and the military, as will be true indeed of the few metaphors in the remains of pre-Ciceronian oratory. Furthermore, these metaphors were safe and familiar, staying comfortably within the bounds of polite diction that characterizes the courts; for not only was ἀγωνίζομαι by this point so established as a courtroom metaphor as to wield little force, athletic – and especially wrestling – imagery was in fact pervasive in Greek literature, just as wrestling itself as a sport was ubiquitous.[31] And thus stand the prose semantics in the Greek portion of this examination – to signify verbal abuse, Greek prose sources primarily employ non-figurative verbs such as διαβάλλω, λοιδορέω, and βλασφημέω, and when metaphors do enter the discourse, they are infrequent and specific to the realms of athletic competition and the military.

---

[29] I.e. μηδ' ἀγνοεῖθ' ὅτι **πάλαισμα** τοῦτ' ἔστι δικαστηρίου, Aesch. 3.205; ὥσπερ οὖν ἐν τοῖς **γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν** ὁρᾶτε **τοὺς πύκτας** ... διαγονιζομένους, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ... μάχεσθε, Aesch. 3.206. Note that the latter pair of images, due to the presence of ὥσπερ, technically represent a set of comparisons via simile rather than metaphors.

[30] For ἐπιβάλλω, cf. μέρος γ'**ἐπιβάλλει** τῆς βλασφημίας ἅπασι, καὶ μάλιστα σοί (Dem. 18.272) as well as Dem. 18.254 (τοὐπιβάλλον) and 21.179 (ἐπιβαλεῖν); for προσκρούω, cf. οἱ δὲ διηλλαγμένοι πρὸς αὑτοὺς ἐν μὲν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις λοιδορῶνται καὶ **προσκρούωσιν** ἀλλήλοις ἐξεπίτηδες (Din. 1.99), where the verb's reference to verbal abuse is confirmed by λοιδορῶνται two words previously.

[31] On the ubiquity of wrestling imagery, cf. Dover 1968: 109 *ad* 126. The general nature of forensic oratory's language is widely assumed yet surprisingly little discussed, as most studies focus on the style and features of a particular figure – e.g. Blass 1887-98 (3 vols.), Jebb 1876 (2 vols.), Dobson 1919, etc. – rather than the language displayed by the genre as a whole. A few general assessments can be found in the more recent scholarship, however. For instance, Carey 1994: 174-5 emphasizes that the language of the courts was one of "polite conversation" and "decent discourse," and Cooper 2007: 207 notes that it was necessary for forensic oratory to be in line with social expectations and its language appropriate to the common values of one's fellow citizens and jurymen. Cf. also Dover 1974: 32-33 on oratory's circumspect and reserved language in contrast to the graphic and blunt speech of comedy.

I.c. Aristophanes

Turning to comedy and Aristophanes, however, one sees the other side of the divide. Of course the military and athletic images of prose appear here too; oratory, particularly in a competitive setting, is a 'battle' (ἁδρὸς ὁ **πόλεμος** ἔρχεται, *Ra*. 1099; τῇ γλώττῃ **πολεμίζων**, *Nu*. 419), and 'inescapable' words allow one character to 'overthrow' another (λόγους **ἀφύκτους**, ὅτοισι τόνδ᾽**ὑπερβαλεῖ**, *Eq*. 757-58) as though the two were engaged in a wrestling match.[32] Yet just as often Aristophanes portrays aggressive – and especially abusive – speech through metaphors of *other* meaning and sphere.[33]

Specifically, when Aristophanes moves beyond the familiar metaphors of prose, he calls upon three sets of verbs: those of 'striking', 'trampling', and 'thrusting'. Instances of all three are found in the parabasis of *Clouds*, a fitting comedy for reflection on language. In this parabasis, Aristophanes argues that his comedies are notably superior to those of others; *he* produces comedies that are fresh and new (καινὰς ἰδέας,

---

[32] For other instances of oratory as a military battle, cf. Taillardat 1965: 339-41, e.g. 'attacking' in words (**ἐπῆλθες** ἐν λόγοισιν, *Eq*. 459) and speaking 'without the protection of a shield' (οὐκ **ἐνασπιδώσομαι**, λέξω δ᾽ ὑπὲρ Λακεδαιμονίων ἃ ᾽μοι δοκεῖ, *Ach*. 368-9). For similar wrestling metaphors, cf. the following examples, all of which smack of the *palaestra* – διαβαλὼν **ἀγκυρίσας**, εἶτ᾽**ἀποστρέψας** τὸν ὦμον αὐτὸν ἐνεκολήβασας (*Eq*. 262-63); κὀυκ ... ἐπεμπηδῆσ᾽ **αὐτῷ κειμένῳ** (*Nu*. 550); ὡς ἅπαξ **παρέδωκεν λαβὴν** Ὑπέρβολος (*Nu*. 551); see generally Taillardat 1965: 352-5 as well as Starkie 1966: 138 *ad* 551 for other examples.

[33] For the variety of such metaphors in Aristophanes, which range from wool-working to agriculture to cooking, cf. generally Taillardat 1965: 343-52, though Taillardat's discussion here encompasses threats of physical violence as well as references to verbal action. Taillardat (355-6) lists only two examples of military imagery associated with this category: a form of δενδροτομεῖν at *Peace* 747 and the verbs κινεῖσθαι, ὑπάγειν, and ἐπικεῖσθαι at *Birds* 1013, 1017, 1018 respectively; both examples, however, signify physical violence rather than verbal actions.

Nu. 547), whereas others rely on hackneyed slapstick (537-43) and can only copy Aristophanes (τὰς εἰκοὺς ... τὰς ἐμὰς μιμούμενοι, *Nu*. 559). Moreover, Aristophanes understands proper decorum in attacking politicians, for though he 'struck Cleon in the belly at the height of his power' (ὃς μέγιστον ὄντα Κλέων'**ἔπαισ**' εἰς τὴν γαστέρα, *Nu*. 549) – referring to his attacks against Cleon in *Knights* – he was not foolish enough to 'trample him when he was down' (κοὐκ ἐτόλμησ' αὖθις **ἐπεμπηδῆσ**' αὐτῷ κειμένῳ, *Nu*. 550).[34] Other playwrights, however, have continued to 'trample' poor Hyperbolus ever since he let his guard down (οὗτοι δ', ὡς ἅπαξ παρέδωκεν λαβὴν Ὑπέρβολος, τοῦτον δείλαιον **κολετρῶσ**' ἀεὶ, *Nu*. 551-52), first Eupolis and then Phrynichus (553-56). Hermippus' play renewed the assault, and others have now followed suit in 'pressing' against him (εἶθ' Ἕρμιππος αὖθις ἐποίησεν εἰς Ὑπέρβολον, ἄλλοι τ' ἤδη πάντες **ἐρείδουσιν** εἰς Ὑπέρβολον, *Nu*. 557-58).[35]

In this passage Aristophanes uses four different verbs from three distinct semantic ranges to represent comedy's abuse of politicians – ἔπαισ' (549), belonging to the 'striking' category; ἐπεμπηδῆσ' (550) and κολετρῶσ' (552), both signifying 'trampling'; and ἐρείδουσιν (558), marking a 'pressing' or 'thrusting' motion.[36] Now, the deployment of these semantics here could be read in two different ways. First, one could interpret each category as indicating an attack's relative intensity of force. In this manner of reading, metaphors of 'striking' represent the standard, base-line semantics for verbal attack – in attacking Cleon, Aristophanes exercises reasonable moderation and thus abides by this semantic standard. Others, however, did not observe such moderation, and accordingly they move beyond the standard semantics and 'trample' their targets, with verbs of 'trampling' indicating abuse that exceeds the standard level. Finally, later imitators simply 'thrust against' Hyperbolus, and such semantics point to their weak and derivative nature.

---

[34] Note that though Komornicka 1964: 66 treats ἔπαισ' and ἐπεμπηδῆσ' as a part of the surrounding *palestra* imagery (i.e. παρέδωκεν λαβὴν, *Nu*. 551; αὐτῷ κειμένῳ, *Nu*. 550), Taillardat 1965: 352-3 includes neither verb in his discussion of the wrestling metaphors in these lines. Moreover, Aristophanes' boast here to have 'struck Cleon in the gut' directly recalls – and in fact linguistically echoes – a command given in *Knights* to strike Cleon's character Paphlagon in the gut (παῖ' αὐτὸν ἀνδρικώτατα καὶ γάστριζε (*Eq*. 453-54), thus suggesting that ἔπαισ' at *Nu*. 549 is independent from the athletic images that surround it.

[35] 'Others' (ἄλλοι) here likely refers at least to the *Hyperbolus* of Plato Comicus and perhaps to Hermippus' *Artopolides* as well; cf. Starkie 1966: 138 *ad* 552 and Dover 1968: 171 *ad* 558.

[36] The verbs ἐπεμπηδάω and κολετράω in fact are each a *hapax legomenon*; their sense however is clear, for ἐπεμπηδάω, broken down into its constituent parts (επ + εμ + πηδᾶν), is 'to leap upon' with the feet. And since Aristophanes intends the actions of others (οὗτοι) in lines 551-52 to stand in direct contrast to his own in line 550, κολετρῶσ' must function as a parallel to ἐπεμπηδῆσ'; cf. that Hesychius glosses κολετρῶσ' as 'καταπατοῦσιν', though he derives its etymology from the act of treading olives (ἀπὸ τῶν τὰς ἐλαίας πατούντων, ὃ δὴ λέγουσι κολετρᾶν; Hesch. s.v. κολετρῶσ'; for the various textual and scholarly interpretations of κολετρῶσ', see Dover 1968: 170 *ad* 552). Thus, the *LSJ* defines both as "to trample on."

In the other reading, these categories bear more specific conceptual significance. Here 'striking' refers to verbal attack as a basic concept; Aristophanes 'struck' Cleon from a conceptual standpoint. Verbs of 'trampling', however, are applied to attacks aimed specifically to achieve superiority and elevate the attacker, as was the goal of Aristophanes' initial wave of imitators, while the 'thrusting' category is used to indicate continuous attack, that is verbal abuse that forms a continuous action – Hermippus and the final wave just kept pressing on Hyperbolus in their abuse. This second manner of interpretation is preferable for two reasons; first, because in this reading the verbs' significations accord with their meanings – 'striking' denotes a one-time action that simply places the attacker in opposition to his target, 'trampling' indicates that the attacker has assumed a physically superior position to the target, in fact standing on top of him, and 'pressing' or 'thrusting' signifies fundamentally a motion of continually applied force; and second, because such readings fit the other instances in Aristophanes' comedies where these types of verbs occur. For indeed Aristophanes uses the same three categories of verbal attack and abuse elsewhere, and in fact of two separate types of abuse.

Toward the end of *Clouds*, Aristophanes applies verbs of 'striking' and 'thrusting' to the context of private abuse, as Strepsiades tells the Chorus of his quarrel with his son Pheidippides. Strepsiades explains that he merely asked his son to sing something from Aeschylus, and that when the latter refused, he requested something modern instead. Pheidippides then recited Euripides, and Strepsiades, outraged at the speech's content, began to 'pelt his son with a great deal of abuse' (ἀλλ' εὐθέως **ἀράττω** πολλοῖς κακοῖς καἰσχροῖσι, *Nu*. 1373-4). The two then 'laid into each other word-by-word' (ἔπος πρὸς ἔπος **ἠρειδόμεσθ**', *Nu*. 1375). Whereas the instances from the *parabasis* discussed above depict the abuse of politicians by comedies at large, here is a performance of private abuse; Strepsiades and Pheidippides were at home having a feast when the quarrel arose (1353-62). And yet the imagery is identical, for just as Aristophanes is said to have 'struck' Cleon, so now Strepsiades 'strikes' Pheidippides; note that in both scenes the 'striking' verb initiates discussion of abusive speech and is followed by at least one additional and semantically separate metaphor, and thus it stands as a conceptual signifier. In both scenes too one of such verbs to follow is ἐρείδω, and in each instance it portrays on-going abuse as a forceful, pressing attack.[37] In the second set of instances, Aristophanes merely states explicitly that these are attacks of words (πολλοῖς κακοῖς καἰσχροῖσι; ἔπος πρὸς ἔπος). Yet the phrasing of each still suggests a physical delivery, in particular κακοῖς καἰσχροῖσι, which, as an instrumental dative, represents the physical object with which Strepsiades' strikes Pheidippides.[38]

---

[37] Cf. Taillardat 1965: 362 for ἐρείδω as signifying 'force' in the passages cited above.

Application to specifically political abuse occurs in *Knights*, a comedy concerned accordingly with Athenian political life. Here appear again both a 'trampling' verb and the particular verb ἐρείδω. Reference to 'trampling' comes fairly early on in the comedy, as the Sausage Seller is being convinced to enter the political arena; to suggest to the Sausage Seller the kind of political prominence he will shortly achieve, the First Slave proclaims that he will 'trample the Council' (βουλὴν **πατήσεις**, *Eq*. 166). Just as 'trampling' verbs signified superiority in the *Clouds* parabasis, here too πατέω marks the Sausage Seller's projected rise to preeminence – he will be a 'great man' and 'leader over all'.[39] And though this statement does not refer to abusive speech in particular, it is through oratory that the Sausage Seller's climb to the top will begin. The verb ἐρείδω comes later as the Sausage Seller begins to tell the Chorus about his speech (625-9). He reports that when he arrived at the Council, he found Paphlagon already present and spouting off his oratorical bombast (626); in particular, he was 'thrusting against' the Knights (**ἤρειδε** κατὰ τῶν ἱππέων, *Eq*. 627), and he hurled forth mountains of abuse against them, saying that they were conspirators (κρημνοὺς **ἐρείδων** καὶ ξυνωμότας λέγων, *Eq*. 628). Again, in the first reference given above ἐρείδω signifies on-going, continuous verbal attack – Paphlagon's assault against the Knights went on and on – and the participle ἐρείδων in the next line, albeit governing the object 'peaks' (κρημνοὺς) in particular, nevertheless maintains this image of 'thrusting'.

---

[38] The *LSJ* lists this instance of κακοῖς καἰσχροῖσι as a dative of manner with ἀράσσω (*LSJ* s.v. ἀράσσω 2, c. *dat. modi*); the imagery here clearly seems intended to be physical, however, with Strepsiades' words standing in for actual weapons, and thus I consider κακοῖς καἰσχροῖσι a dative of instrument.

[39] Cf. τούτων ἁπάντων ἀρχέλας αὐτὸς ἔσει (*Eq*. 164); γίγνει γάρ ... ἀνὴρ μέγιστος (*Eq*. 177-8).

In sum, then, in the various passages from *Clouds* and *Knights* discussed above, Aristophanes applies the same three semantic categories (‘striking’, ‘trampling’, ‘pushing/thrusting’) to various types of verbal abuse (comic, private, political), and in each case the signification of a given category remains the same – verbs of ‘striking’ mark the basic concept of verbal attack; those of ‘trampling’ designate attacks aimed specifically to elevate their agents; and those of ‘thrusting’ refer to continuous and sustained verbal assaults. Thus, in these passages the signification of each semantic category is confirmed and the consistency of these three specific semantic groupings is illustrated. Indeed, the image of harsh or abusive speech ‘striking’ its target is echoed in tragedy too on several occasions, accompanied in each instance by an instrumental dative. In Sophocles’ *Ajax*, for instance, the Messenger reports that all the Greeks are ‘pelting’ Teucer with abuse (ὀνείδεσιν **ἤρασσον**, *Aj*. 724-5), and in the *Philoctetes* Neoptolemus reports to have done the same to Odysseus upon learning that the latter was in possession of his father’s arms (χολωθεὶς εὐθὺς **ἤρασσον** κακοῖς τοῖς πάσιν, *Ph*. 374-5).[40] Such examples testify further that this class of verbs proved a prominent and fundamental means of representing verbal attack in the theater at least.

In contrast to the prose sources examined previously, therefore, the verse of comedy – and in fact of the theater more broadly – applies to verbal abuse imagery beyond that of the military or the *palaestra*. In addition, the presentation of such imagery is distinctly physical; verbs of ‘striking’ especially are typically accompanied by an instrumental dative through which words form the weapon with which an attacker carries out his assault. Moreover, Aristophanes' comedies abound in actual and exaggerated physical violence – that is 'physical' hyperbole – as well as in linguistic hyperbole, as Aristophanes applies an array of semi-violent and hyperbolic metaphors – both generalizing and specific – to threats, curses, vows, and the like.[41] Thus, the imagery specific to abusive speech detailed previously marks a mere extension of Aristophanic violence and hyperbole, and in consequence these metaphors form a natural and comfortable part of comic discourse.

---

[40] Cf. similarly Aesch. *Th*. 382 (θείνει δ’ ὀνείδει μάντιν). Usener 1901: 15-16 n. 26 in fact deems ‘striking’ verbs the fundamental Greek metaphor for abusive speech overall, listing several examples from Homer as well as from tragedy; the context of discussion for Usener is Plautus, however, and thus Usener does not add the qualification that ‘striking’ imagery is characteristic of Greek verse sources specifically.

I.d. Plato

This portion of the chapter closes with a brief note on Plato. In the three dialogues surveyed here – *Symposium*, *Protagoras*, and *Gorgias* – Plato's language mirrors the prose tendencies seen previously; that is, to mark harsh and abusive speech Plato relies primarily on non-figurative verbs of 'accusing', 'reproaching', and the like.[42] Yet he turns to metaphor more frequently than do the orators, and though his images derive mostly again from the military and athletic realms, often these are more specific within their particular sphere, particularly that of the military.[43] For instance, not only does speech mark a battle or occasion for attack, but with it the dialogues' characters, including Socrates himself, 'cast at' (βαλὼν, *Smp*. 189b8), 'wound' (τετρῶσθαι, *Smp*. 219b4), and 'sack' (ἐκπέρσῃ, *Prt*. 340a7) the recipients of their speech.[44] And from the sphere of athletics, Eryximachus generally 'contends' well in the *Symposium* (ἠγώνισαι, *Smp*. 194a1), but in the *Gorgias*, Socrates speaks more specifically of 'striking' Callicles on the head with abuse in the manner of a boxer (τυπτήσει ... ἐπὶ κόρρης, *Grg*. 527a3).[45] Moreover, like Aristophanes' comedies, here too appears the occasional 'other' metaphor. For example, in these three dialogues speech is represented as 'burying' its targets or recipients (καταχώσειεν, *Grg*. 512c1), as 'snatching at' the arguments of another (προαρπάζειν, *Grg*. 454c3), and as 'casting in one's teeth' a certain matter (ἐπιπλήττει, *Prt*. 319d5).[46] In the last of these an additional parallel to Aristophanes is seen, for the verb ἐπιπλήσσω denotes 'striking', as in fact lies at the heart of the boxing images that Plato employs.[47]

---

[41] See Kaimio 1990 for an in-depth analysis of physical violence in Aristophanes' comedies by scene categories. For linguistic exaggeration in threats, cf. e.g. κατατεμῶ in *Acharnians* as the Chorus threatens to 'cut Cleon up into strips of leather' (Κλέωνος ... ὃν **κατατεμῶ** τοῖσιν ἱππεῦσι καττύματα, *Ach*. 300-2) and διαφορήσω in Paphlagon's threat to rip the Sausage Seller apart in *Knights* (**διαφορήσω** σ', εἴ τι γρύξει, *Eq*. 294). Aristophanes' favored vocabulary in curses and vows include the second-person optative 'διαρραγείης' (*Av*. 2, 1257; *Ec*. 803; *Pl*. 279, 892) as well as verbs of 'dying', 'destroying', or 'ruining' more generally – especially ἀπόλλυμι, ἐξόλλυμι, φθείρω and its compounds, and (ἀπο)θνήσκω; for a lexical list and general treatment of curses in Aristophanes, cf. Müller 1913: 335-57, though Müller's list is not comprehensive, lacking for instance compound forms of φθείρω.

[42] Cf. e.g. forms of the following verbs and phrases: κακηγορέω (Pl. *Smp*. 173d5; *Grg*. 467b11), λέγω πρός (Pl. *Grg*. 457e5), κατηγορέω (Pl. *Grg*. 491b6), ψέγω (Pl. *Prt*. 346c2, 347a1, 3), ψόγος (Pl. *Prt*. 344a3), ψόγους ψέγω (Pl. *Grg*. 483c1), μέμφω (Pl. *Grg*. 491b7), ὀνειδίζω (Pl. *Grg*. 508c5, 515a3; *Prt*. 341c7).

[43] On the common image of 'dialectical combat' in Plato, see Louis 1945: 57-63; for a listing of athletic and military metaphors in Plato's works, cf. Louis 1945: 213-7.

---

[44] For the fuller context of these three images, the last of which technically marks a comparison via simile: **βαλὼν** γε, φάναι, ὦ Ἀριστόφανες, οἴει ἐκφεύξεσθαι (Pl. *Smp*. 189b8); ἐγὼ μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ἀκούσας τε καὶ εἰπών, καὶ ἀφεὶς ὥσπερ βέλη, **τετρῶσθαι** αὐτὸν ᾤμην (Pl. *Smp*. 219b3-4), the image of casting missiles here repeated (ἀφεὶς ... βέλη; cf. Dover 1980: 112 *ad loc*. and 171 *ad loc*.); and μὴ ἡμῖν ὁ Πρωταγόρας τὸν Σιμωνίδην **ἐκπέρσῃ** (Pl. *Prt*. 340a6-7); this last instance, however, directly follows a quote from the Iliad (*Il*. 21.308-9), the next word of which in fact is ἐκπέρσει (*Il*. 21.310), and thus ἐκπέρσῃ in Socrates' mouth here directly plays on knowledge of this quote (cf. Denyer 2008: 150 *ad loc*.). For other instances of military imagery, cf. 'fleeing' (ἐκφεύξεσθαι) at *Smp*. 189b8 and 'attacking' (ἐπιθῶμαι) at *Smp*. 214e2.

[45] In full: σε ἴσως **τυπτήσει** τις καὶ **ἐπὶ κόρρης** ἀτίμως καὶ πάντως προπηλακιεῖ (Pl. *Grg*. 527a3-4; cf. similarly *Grg*. 508d1-2); 'καλῶς γὰρ αὐτὸς **ἠγώνισαι**, ὦ Ἐρυξίμαχε' (Pl. *Smp*. 194a1); cf. similar boxing imagery in the *Protagoras* as well, though here in simile form (καὶ ἐγὼ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον, ὡσπερεὶ **ὑπὸ** ἀγαθοῦ **πύκτου πληγείς**, ἐσκοτώθην, Pl. *Prt*. 339e1-2). See Rutherford 1995: 147 on the extended analogy of rhetoric to combat sports in *Gorgias* too (*Grg*. 456c-457a), and 113-4 on similar combat and athletic imagery applied to sophistic argumentation in *Euthydemus*.

[46] In full: καίτοι εἰ βούλοιτο λέγειν, ... **καταχώσειεν** ἂν ὑμᾶς τοῖς λόγοις (Pl. *Grg*. 512c1); ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα μὴ ἐθιζώμεθα ὑπονοοῦντες **προαρπάζειν** ἀλλήλων τὰ λεγόμενα (Pl. *Grg*. 454c3); τούτοις οὐδεὶς τοῦτο **ἐπιπλήττει** ὥσπερ τοῖς πρότερον (Pl. *Prt*. 319d4-5). Cf. also an extended simile in *Gorgias* where orators are compared to despots in the power they possess in the city, 'killing' whomever they wish, robbing them of their possessions, and expelling them from the city (οὐχ, ὥσπερ οἱ τύραννοι, **ἀποκτεινύασί** τε ὃν ἂν βούλωνται, καὶ ἀφαιροῦνται κρήματα καὶ ἐκβάλλουσιν ἐκ τῶν πόλεων ὃν ἂν δοκῇ αὐτοῖς, Pl. *Grg*. 466c9-d2).

Now, as the evidence from Plato above derives from a mere three dialogues, one must be cautious in drawing any firm conclusions from it. Thus, one may assert the following only tentatively: that Plato's language in *Symposium*, *Gorgias*, and *Protagoras* confirms the essential characteristics of prose references, consisting primarily of terms of 'accusing', etc. and imagery from athletics and the military; but that as his metaphors occasionally extend beyond these realms into the semantics of 'striking' in particular, his usage overlaps to a degree with that of Aristophanes, and thereby Plato's own 'poetic' tendencies too are affirmed.[48]

II. The Roman Contribution

The first part of this chapter has demonstrated that an inherent semantic divide exists between Greek prose and verse sources, especially comedy. In referring to verbal abuse, the orators as well as prose authors from Aristotle to Eusebius typically employ non-figurative verbs of the sort as "to accuse," "to blame," and "to reproach," and when metaphors do enter their discourse, they derive consistently from the spheres of the military and athletics, signifying 'combat' or 'competition' in various regards. Metaphors prove more common in verse, however, and in comedy especially they feature entirely separate semantic ranges; in Aristophanes' extant comedies, these ranges consist specifically of 'striking', 'trampling', and 'thrusting', and several examples of each appear unsurprisingly in *Clouds* and *Knights* particularly, the comedies in which speech and personal invective feature most prominently. Such metaphors represent an extension of the violent hyperbole, both physical and linguistic, that characterizes Aristophanes' comedies as a whole, and in phrasing they often mimic physical actions, with instrumental datives denoting speech standing in for actual weapons. Through such phrasing verbal 'attacks' truly become direct and violent.

---

[47] Cf. again in boxing imagery forms of: πλήσσω (Pl. *Prt*. 339e2) and the phrase τύπτω ἐπὶ κόρρης (Pl. *Grg*. 508d1-2, 527a3).

[48] On the poetic color of Plato's style, cf. again p. 18 n. 5 above.

This portion of the chapter extends these concepts to Rome of the second century BCE, examining the comedies of Plautus and Terence, Lucilius' satires, and the fragments of the orators collected in Malcovati's *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta*, for not only are these the period's sources most frequently associated with colorful language and abuse, more simply it is these that furnish the bulk of the period's surviving literature.[49] In particular, this portion seeks to identify Roman comedy as the primary source of antecedents to Cicero's post-consular metaphors, for not only do mid to late Republican sources display the same divide seen in the Greek sources examined previously, in fact the comedies of Plautus and Terence – particularly the former – mirror and extend Aristophanes' manner of usage and ultimately parallel that of Cicero. For this examination, however, Roman comedy proves by far the more significant source of evidence in comparison to Aristophanes, for from a basic standpoint, nearly twice as many comedies of Plautus survive than do those of Aristophanes, and Terence's corpus furnishes an additional six comedies for the Roman side.

---

[49] Of comedy, Plautus in particular is associated with invective due to his colorful and complex insults and extended passages of abuse, e.g. *Mos*. 1-75, *Per*. 405-26, *Ps*. 360-70. *Ps*. 360-70 especially has been seen as the pinnacle of Plautine invective (contra Koster 1980: 100) – e.g. Fraenkel calls this the most brilliant invective scene in Plautus (Fraenkel 2007: 387 n. 37) and Lilja deems it the "the most remarkable of the scenes of abuse inserted by Plautus" (Lilja 1965: 91); on Plautus' comedies in general as characterized by verbal violence and vivid abuse, cf. e.g. Duckworth 1952: 331 and 336, Fantham 1972: 183, and Wright 1974: 11. Likewise, of invective in the pre-Ciceronian orators and prose literature in general, M. Porcius Cato is the foremost representative; on the ἰαμβικὴ ἰδέα in Cato as well as Lucilius, cf. esp. Koster 1980: 106-11 and 101-5 respectively.

In addition, comedy and the theater in general are likely responsible for encouraging a culture of mocking and abusive song in Rome. Popular songs of various sorts, including theater tunes, deeply pervaded Roman culture. From the brash Fescennine verses that might accompany the leading of a bride home to the playful mockery directed by soldiers at their general in celebration of a triumph, these songs were often sexual in tone, sometimes harsh in delivery, and generally abusive in nature.[50] As an example, consider a triumphal song fragment from Suetonius in which Nicomedes 'masters' Caesar just as Caesar mastered Gaul – *Gallias Caesar subegit, Nicomedes Caesarem: / ecce Caesar nunc triumphat qui subegit Gallias, / Nicomedes non triumphat, qui subegit Caesarem*.[51] In its sexual mockery of Caesar, this verse illustrates the abuse typical of such songs. Once produced, these verses swiftly entered the realm of anonymous performance and re-performance within popular discourse.[52] And in fact, such songs were closely related to the theater, for not only were they too composed primarily in senarii and septenarii, many may have originated in the theater particularly, with especially popular tunes likely disseminated to the aristocracy as well as to the masses.[53] Mocking and abusive verses thus permeated Roman society at all levels, and the Romans were thereby primed for abusive language and 'invective' in other contexts as well, the political realm especially. And thus too the theater, a rich source for new metaphors in general, fostered a culture of mockery, jesting, and abuse in Rome and in fact provides the most graphic depictions of such abuse to be found before Cicero.[54]

---

[50] On the nature of Fescennine verses, cf. Horace's description of them as "pouring out rustic reproaches in alternating verses" (*versibus alternis opprobria rustica fudit*; Hor. *S.* 2.1.146) and Catullus' mention of "brash Fescennine joking," (*procax Fescennina iocatio*; Cat. 61.119-20), referring here to the songs that accompany the end of a wedding ceremony. The standard collection and treatment of popular and triumphal songs is Courtney 1993: 470-85, though Ruffell 2003: 44-61 provides updated discussion of such songs from the viewpoint of performance and audience; on triumphal songs in particular, see too Horsfall 2003: 111-5 and Ruffell 2003: 56-58. For a song of explicitly sexual nature, cf. e.g. Courtney 1993: 470, #2 (*quem non pudet et rubet, non est homo sed sopio. sopio autem est aut minium aut piscis robeus aut penis*); and for verses whose tone was especially harsh, cf. e.g. Courtney 1993: 473, #7, a parody of the infamous banquet of the twelve gods that Antony attended in corresponding dress, cited by Suetonius as an example of the severe reproaches (*acerbissime ... exprobrant*, Suet. *Aug*. 70.1) Antony suffered after the incident.

[51] Suet. *Div. Iul*. 49.4, Courtney 1993: 483, #1. On the decidedly sexual tone of *subegit*, cf. Courtney 1993: 484 n. 1 and Ruffell 2003: 48-49.

[52] Cf. Ruffell 2003: 54-56.

II.a. Plautus and Terence

Like Aristophanes, the comedies of Plautus and Terence are filled with violent hyperbole, and consequently they too are rendered a natural context for violent metaphors of any sort, from those that denote physical acts to those whose realization is verbal. To illustrate, in these plays slaves are constantly threatened with beatings and torture, on-stage quarrels often lead to fist-fights, and violent curses – from the simple '*i in crucem*' to more elaborate execrations – pepper the exchanges that fill every act and every scene.[55] In fact, one may go so far as to declare Roman comedy *more* violent than

---

[53] On the metrical unity of popular verses and theater songs, see Ruffell 2003: 53. Purcell 1999: 186 traces the origins of ribald songs and displays such as triumphal songs to the theater; Horsfall 2003: 16 likewise suggests that even what are typically conceived of as 'work songs' of the type seen in the *Cena Trimalchionis* (e.g. 31.4, accompanying nail cutting; and 31.6, accompanying the serving of wine) may in fact have consisted of such theater songs. On the dissemination of popular theater songs to the plebs and aristocracy, cf. Horsfall 2003: 12-14 and 36 respectively, and more generally Ruffell 2003, demonstrating elite familiarity with popular invective verses by arguing that Horace employed such verses as the subtext of his own poetry in an attempt to demarcate his poetry as the domain of the elite specifically.

[54] Adams 1982: 3 suggests that the coining of metaphors is particularly characteristic of the theater.

[55] For the exaggerated violence of Roman comedy, particularly Plautus, cf. Duckworth 1952: 321-8 on physical violence in general; and Segal 1968: 137-44 and Parker 1989: 240-6 on the prominence of slave beatings in particular, especially unfulfilled threats and jokes. For threats of beatings in Plautus and Terence, cf. e.g. Pl. *As*. 406; Ter. *Eu*. 742, *Ad*. 171; for the on-stage exchange of blows, cf. e.g. the fight between Menaechmus, Messenio, and the slaves in *Menaechmi* (*Men*. 1016-18). For curses, cf. variations on the phrases *ire in crucem* (e.g. Pl. *As*. 940, *Rud*. 1162), *ire in malam rem* (e.g. Pl. *Per*. 288, *Poen*. 295), *Iuppiter te perdat* (e.g. Pl. *Am*. 569-70, *Ps*. 250-1; Ter. *Ad*. 713-4, *di te perdant* (e.g. Ter. *Hau*. 810-11, *Ph*. 687-8), as well as more elaborate instances such as *ego edepol illam mediam dirruptam velim* (Pl. *Cas*. 326) and *malum quod isti di deaeque omnes duint* (Pl. *Mos*. 655).

Aristophanes, for the physical violence it threatens is not fantastical but occurs in very real situations – the beating of a slave by his master – and in a very Roman manner – crucifixion.[56] The physical action of Roman comedy therefore exhibits comic exaggeration, even at the level of simple buffoonery and slapstick. And again, just as comedy's action is exaggerated, so too is its language.[57] The characters of Plautus and Terence frequently paint their emotional distress in violently hyperbolic terms, in any given situation declaring themselves so utterly ruined as to have 'died' or been 'killed'.[58] Moreover, threats of physical violence often warrant hyperbole of more specific imagery. At the start of *Aulularia*, for instance, Euclio threatens to gouge out Staphyla's eyes in fear that she might find out about the pot of gold, and in *Casina* Lysidamus threatens to bash out Pardalisca's brains if she does not explain what has happened.[59] And beyond such threats, Plautus in particular applies vivid and violent metaphors to a range of referents. For example, the verbs (*ex*)*crucio* and *macero* frequently render a character's mental or emotional anguish ‘torture’, and with *caedo* and *lacero* the squandering of one’s goods or money becomes ‘slaughter’.[60]

---

[56] Cf. Segal 1968: 140 and Parker 1989: 240. Indeed, such violent theatrical charades eventually turned fatal; under the Empire, public execution in the arena was common and in fact was often conducted through a mime or mythological reenactment, for instance the Laureolus mime seen in Martial (*Sp*. 7) in which the condemned, acting the part of the bandit-leader Laureolus, was crucified on stage. On the Roman staging of public executions, see generally Coleman 1990; on the Laureolus mime in particular, cf. Coleman 1990: 64-65.

[57] Cf. Glick's (1941) detailed study of hyperbole in comic language, including both simple exaggeration and hyperbole involving metaphor.

[58] Particularly common in this sense are first-person singular forms of *intereo* (e.g. Pl. *Bac*. 853, *Epid*. 56, *Per*. 779; Ter. *Hau*. 559), *occido* (e.g. *Capt*. 534, *Mos*. 369, *St*. 401; Ter. *Hec*. 638, *Ph*. 198), *pereo* (e.g. Pl. *As*. 233, *Cas*. 407, *Men*. 136, *Poen*. 364; Ter. *Ad*. 543, *Eu*. 947), as well as second-person singular forms of *enico* (Pl. *Cas*. 233, *Per*. 484, *Rud*. 944). Cf. Glick 1941: 6-33 on these verbs in general, many of which she deems the equivalent of oaths (e.g. Glick 1941: 10-11 on *occidi* as expressing disgust or despair; 18-19 on *perii* as '*actumst de me*').

[59] I.e. *oculos hercle ego istos, improba, effodiam tibi, ne me opservare possis quid rerum geram* (Pl. *Aul*. 53-54); *nam nisi ex te scio, quicquid hoc est, cito, hoc iam tibi istuc cerebrum dispercutiam* (Pl. *Cas*. 643-4). For other examples in Plautus and Terence, cf. e.g. *exossabo ego illum simulter itidem ut murenam coquos* (Pl. *Ps*. 382); *diminuam ego caput tuom hodie, nisi abis* (Ter. *Eu*. 803; cf. also *Ad*. 571). On comedy's tendency toward specific – or in Glick's terms 'concrete' – metaphors in physical threats, cf. Glick 1941: 137.

Thus, violent images of speech in particular naturally flow out of this context, just as was true of Aristophanes, and Roman comedy thereby proves a rich source for such metaphors. These images vary in form and semantics, and not all signify abusive or *ad hominem* speech in particular. Two, however, do indeed mark abusive verbal attacks, and these instances, along with several others of speech more generally, serve as models for Cicero’s post-consular metaphors. For in application these instances display the direct – and in the context of comedy’s abundant violence, ‘pseudo-physical’ – phrasing characteristic of Cicero in his later career, where the recipient of the verbal violence stands as the accusative direct object of an active and frequently first-person verb, thus placing agent and object in direct opposition to one another. In addition, often an ablative noun or phrase indicating speech of some sort accompanies the verb and functions as the physical instrument with which the verb’s action is carried out – a weapon of words, as was true of the instrumental datives seen previously in Aristophanes. In short, therefore, the phraseology of such instances generally resembles that of instances where physical, not verbal, violence is signified. And that these metaphors frequently occur in the first-person renders their violence distinctly personal. Finally, like Cicero’s post-consular metaphors, many of the violent images of speech in comedy – especially in Plautus – extend semantically beyond the military and athletic realms.

---

[60] For (*ex*)*crucio* and *macero* of mental and emotional anguish, cf. in individual usage (*ex*)*crucio* at Pl. *Cas*. 227, *Cur*. 170, *Mil*. 1321, *Per*. 33, *Poen*. 842, *Trin*. 103; Ter. *Hau*. 673, *Ph*. 187; and *macero* at Pl. *Cist*. 76, *Poen*. 818; for the two in parallel, cf. e.g. Pl. *Cas*. 445, *Cist*. 59, *Mil*. 616-7. For *caedo* and *lacero* of the squandering of goods or money, cf. respectively Pl. *Truc*. 742 and *Mer*. 48.

Here I present the ten instances most similar in phrasing to Cicero's metaphors. Beyond invective and abuse, the verbal action of these instances encompasses deception, confounding, and gaining the upper hand more simply. As those instances that mark attacking, abusive speech in particular are most directly comparable to the metaphors of Cicero with which this dissertation is concerned, these receive first and fullest discussion. The two references specific to *ad hominem* speech both occur in Plautus. Each employs the verb *differo* in first-person active form (*differam*, *Ps*. 359 and *Aul*. 446), and each displays the pseudo-physical phrasing outlined above. Moreover, these two instances are all the more physical in that both occur in contexts out of which physical violence, both threatened and realized, tends to occur, for in each the speaker suffers directly or vicariously some sort of serious outrage.

In *Pseudolus*, it is Ballio's treachery that causes this outrage. Calidorus, unable to produce the money to purchase Phoenicium's freedom by the agreed-upon date, comes to the pimp Ballio to request more time. Ballio seems to console him at first, promising that he will not sell Phoenicium to anyone else, but eventually he reveals that he has in fact already sold Phoenicium to the Macedonian soldier (230-346). Enraged, Calidorus orders Pseudulos to stand by him and insult Ballio, and his command in and of itself is suggestive of physical action – 'heap on him much abuse' (*ingere mala multa*, 359):[61]

---

[61] On *ingero* as a metaphor evocative of physical action and frequently associated with verbal abuse in Plautus and Terence, cf. Fantham 1972: 57.

357 Cali Pseudole, assiste altrim secus atque onera hunc male-
dictis.
Pseu licet.
numquam ad praetorem aeque cursim curram, ut emit-
tar manu.
359 Cali ingere mala multa.
Pseu iam ego te **differam** dictis meis.

In line 359 comes the first instance of *differo*; Pseudolus responds to Calidorus' order with a warning to Ballio – 'Now I'm going to tear you apart with my words' (*iam ego te differam dictis meis*). In a famous scene of *flagitatio* (on which see below, n. **67 ???**), Calidorus and Pseudolus then proceed to issue a flood of abusive insults and epithets against Ballio (360-70), each of which the latter rebuffs nonchalantly in his turn.

In the second instance of *differo*, found in *Aulularia*, the speaker again is outraged; here, however, the outrage is physical as well as emotional. As preparations are underway at Euclio's house for the wedding of his daughter, Congrio the cook enters to ready the food. Euclio, desperately afraid that someone will discover the pot of gold hidden in the house, overhears Congrio mention the word 'pot', and in his paranoia he beats him and kicks him out of the house (390-445). Congrio then explodes in a fit of anger and frustration as Euclio storms back inside:

Con quo abis? redi rursum.
445 ita me bene amet Laverna, te <iam> iam, nisi reddi
mihi vasa iubes, hic pipulo te **differam** ante aedis.

In this scene Congrio reacts to two offenses: the beating he has already received at Euclio's hands, and Euclio's threat of future violence should Congrio ever enter again without his order.[62] Congrio has suffered both physical and emotional injury, and in return he issues his own threat: 'If you don't order that my equipment be returned, I will tear you apart with my screeching before the house' (445-6). Wolfgang de Melo translates *hinc pipulo te differam ante aedis* "I'll tear up your reputation with my shrill voice here and now, right in front of your house."[63] But this rendering fails to capture the essence of the threat, its physicality. For again, not only do the two instances of *differo* above arise in situations that often lead to violence, they are also are phrased so as to suggest that an act of violence will in fact follow – that is, that Congrio will physically tear up Euclio himself, not his reputation.

Key to the violence of this phrasing is the accusative pronoun *te* which appears in both instances above. As the direct object of *differam*, this pronoun allows the verb its violent meaning. In its primary sense, *differo* simply indicates the moving of an object in different directions, often rather forcefully.[64] Now, this action is not inherently violent but becomes so when applied specifically to a whole, continuous object – the human body for instance – for in such cases the motion turns from mere separation into the act of splitting or rending. When a person serves as the verb's object, therefore, *differo* assumes the sense of *lacero*, signifying the violent rending of this person.[65] Plautus himself employs *differo* thus in *Curculio*, as the soldier Therapontigonus threatens to have ants ‘shred’ Cappadox into bits if he fails to return Planesium (*iam ego te faciam ut hinc formicae frustillatim* ***differant***, *Cur*. 576), and nearly two centuries later the verb’s force in such usage remained strong enough for Vergil to apply it to the drawing and quartering of Mettius Fufetius (*haud procul citae Mettum in diversa quadrigae* ***distulerant***, *A*. 8.643).[66] In each case, an active form of *differo* governs a personal accusative object (*te* and *Mettum*), and as both instances refer to physical action – figurative, hyperbolic violence in the case of *Curculio* and actual rending in Vergil – the verb’s violent meaning is thereby made clear.

---

[62] I.e. *si ad ianuam huc accesseris, nisi iussero, propius, ego te faciam miserrumus mortalis uti sis* (*Aul.* 442-3).

[63] Cf. de Melo 2011: 307.

[64] Cf. *OLD* s.v. *differo* 1a, "to carry away in different directions, scatter, disperse; to stretch in different directions." Note that *TLL* s.v. *differo* 5.1.1069.50 states specifically that such motions often contain "a certain amount of force" (*plerumque de motibus, quae* ***vim quandam*** *vel rapiditatem habent*). As examples of *differo* in this application, cf. Lucr. 1.272 (*venti vis ... nubila* ***differt***) and Hor. *Epod.* 5.99 (*insepulta membra* ***different*** *lupi*).

[65] Cf. *TLL* s.v. *differo* 5.1.1069.73-9, *de corpore humano i.q. lacerare*.

Now, *Ps*. 359 and *Aul*. 446 denote verbal rather than physical action, yet in phrasing they mirror the two instances above, for here too the object of the active *differam* is precisely a person – the pronoun *te*. Such phrasing evokes the physicality of the instances above, and accordingly their threats bear an underlying sense of direct physical ‘shredding’. In short, Pseudolus and Congrio threaten to ‘shred’ the *persons* of Ballio and Euclio, not their reputations – though of course this is the ultimate sense – for they themselves are the accusative objects of *differam*.[67] These threats are direct, explicit, and physical in phrasing, and in addition their tone is quite personal – both are delivered in the same first-person active form. Thus, the phrase *te differam* suggests the personal, violent rending of Ballio and Euclio themselves, each of whom stands as the direct and explicit second-person object of the verb. Moreover, *differam* is accompanied by *dictis meis* ('my words') at *Ps*. 359 and by *pipulo* ('screeching') at *Aul*. 446. Both are ablatives of instrument, and like the datives previously observed in Aristophanes, though they denote speech strictly speaking, in this context they function as the physical objects with which Pseudolus and Congrio will shred their targets. In every respect, therefore, the two instances of *differo* above are figured as personal threats of physical violence – they occur in contexts of intense outrage, they threaten bodily harm to their objects, and they specify the instruments with which they will bring about this harm.[68] And thereby these instances themselves establish a clear precedent for Cicero's own direct and pseudo-physical metaphors for *ad hominem* speech.

---

[66] Both of these examples fall under *TLL de corpore humano, i.q. lacerare* above (see 5.1.1069.73-75).

[67] The *TLL* classifies the sense of *differo* at *Ps*. 359 and *Aul*. 446 as “*diffamare*” (*TLL* 5.1.1070.66), but these instances, as well as most others within the same grouping (i.e. *TLL* 5.1.1070.66-73), are better served by Nonius’ gloss of *differo* at Lucilius 1016 M – ‘*dividere vel scindere*’ (Non. 284,17 M) – in which fragment again a person forms the verb’s object, here the assumed pronoun *me* (*et in maledicendo in multis sermonibus differs*, Lucil. 1016 M). Through this gloss Nonius distinguishes such usage from *differo* as applied to an inanimate object, as for instance Lucilius employs it in fragment 1015 (*gaudes cum de me ista foris sermonibus differs*, Lucil. 1015 M), for which usage he provides the gloss ‘*diffamare, divulgare*’ (Non. 284, 13 M). Now, though the *TLL* places Lucilius 1016 – as well as 1015 – in a separate category from *Ps*. 359 *et al*. (i.e. *TLL* 5.1.1070.54-57, *differre aliquid* (*de aliquo*)), in fact Lucilius’ use of *differo* at 1016 aligns with that of *Ps*. 359 and *Aul*. 446 and moreover is likely a direct allusion to *Ps*. 359, as John Griffith has already argued (Griffith 1970: 68) and as I further argue at the end of this chapter. Thus, Lucilius 1016 and *Ps*. 359 *et al*. should be placed in one and the same category, and Nonius’ gloss ‘*dividere vel scindere*’, which Marx deems “*apte*” (Marx 1905: 327 *ad* 1016), should be applied to all, accurately capturing the sense of physical violence that underlies these instances. Cf. pp. 60-64 below.

Compare in addition the similarity of phrasing in the following eight instances – listed alphabetically by verb – where speech, rather than abusing, serves to deceive, confuse, and gain the upper hand for its agent.

1. *em istic homo te articulatim* ***concidit****, senex, tuos servos* (Pl. *Epid*. 488-9). The soldier declares that Periphanes' slave Epidicus, who tricked his master into purchasing the wrong music girl, has 'cut up' Periphanes limb by limb.

---

[68] Hermann Usener has famously identified *Pseudolus* 357ff and *Aulularia* 446 as depicting the extra-legal practices of *flagitatio* and *vagulatio* respectively (Usener 1901: 23-27, followed by Lintott 1968: 10, Stockert 1983: 129 *ad* 446, and de Melo 2011: 307 n. 25). Both practices serve as verbal stand-ins for corporal punishment (cf. Usener 1901: 1-18, esp. 16-18), and one might be tempted to argue, therefore, that the violent image *differo* appears in both passages precisely for this reason, a metaphorical embodiment of these practices' violent origins. Yet these passages are not the only traces of *Volksjustiz* that Usener detects in Plautus (cf. Usener 1901: 19-20, 24-25, 27), and while one of these additional scenes (*Epid*. 118) does include the verb *differo*, the rest do not. Moreover, Plautus frequently applies *differo* as a metaphor of other referents – impassioned emotions, for instance love (*Cist*. 208, *Mil*. 1163), desire (*Poen*. 156), and joy (*Truc*. 701); and exaggerated physical action (*Curc*. 576, *Trin*. 833). Thus, the appearance of *differo* in *Ps*. 359 and *Aul*. 446 must be tied more to Plautus himself than to the practices that inspired him.

2. ***conficiet** iam te hic verbis ut tu censeas non Pseudolum, sed Socratem tecum loqui* (Pl. *Ps*. 464-5). In seeing his slave Pseudolus approaching, Simo sarcastically declares that Pseudolus will so 'wear him out' with words that it will seem that it is Socrates who is speaking, not Pseudolus.

3. *eos ego hodie omnis **contruncabo** duobus solis ictibus* (Pl. *Bac*. 975). The slave Chrysalus, at the end of the monologue in which he compares his connivances to Trojan War victories, claims that he will 'slay' all of Priam's (i.e. Nicobulus') sons with 'two blows'.

4. *pugnis memorandis meis **eradicabam** hominum auris, quando occeperam* (Pl. *Epid*. 433-4). As Periphanes describes to the soldier how he used to related his war-time deeds as a soldier, he says that in doing so he 'ripped out' peoples' ears.

5. *suo sibi gladio hunc **iugulo*** (Ter. *Ad*. 958). Demea, after persuading his brother Micio to marry Pamphila's mother and give Hegio the plot of land, in an aside to the audience boasts of 'cutting Micio's throat' with his own sword.

6. ***iugularas** hominem! quid ille?* (Ter. *Eu*. 417). When Thraso the soldier recounts a particularly clever and harsh retort he once made, the parasite Gnatho responds by declaring Thraso to have 'cut the man's throat'.

7. *bene ego illum **tetigi**, bene autem servos inimicum suom* (Pl. *Ps*. 1239). As Ballio exits the scene lamenting the loss of Phoenicium, Simo states that he has gotten a good 'hit' on Ballio.

8. *quo pacto Rhodium **tetigerim** in convivio, numquam tibi dixi?* (Ter. *Eu*. 420). Thraso asserts that surely he has told Gnatho of the good 'hit' he got on a certain Rhodian at a dinner party one time.

Like *te differam* at *Ps*. 359 and *Aul*. 446 above, in each of these instances the verb appears in active voicing and governs the recipient of its action in the accusative case. The exception to this is *eradicabam hominum auris* (#4, *Epid*. 433), as here the targets' ears specifically form the object of *eradicabam*. I include this instance, however, because in phrasing it otherwise mirrors the others given above; in particular, again like *differam* at *Ps*. 359 and *Aul*. 446, *eradicabam* appears specifically in first-person form, as in fact do four other verbs from the eight instances listed here (*contruncabo*, Pl. *Bac*. 975; *iugulo*, Ter. *Ad*. 958; *tetigi*, Pl. *Ps*. 1239; *tetigerim*, Ter. *Eu*. 420). The violence of *eradicabam* and six other of these ten total instances thus is decidedly personal, and the phrasing of all is direct and inherently physical. Indeed, the ablatives *verbis* (#2, *Ps*. 464) and *pugnis memorandis meis* (#4, *Epid*. 433) parallel *dictis meis* (*Ps*. 359) and *pipulo* (*Aul*. 446) as pseudo-physical instruments, while the metaphorical phrases *suo ... gladio* (#5, *Ad*. 958) and *duobus solis ictibus* (#3, *Bac*. 975) actually turn words into weapons, as verbal machinations underlie both references. Thus, as a group these ten instances display consistently physical phrasing. In most the violent action is carried out by a personal, first-person agent, and in fact in the majority too this agent, first-person or not, turns out to be a slave or soldier, as the summaries provided above indicate.[69]

Of course this is not to say that all violent images of speech in Plautus and Terence are phrased in this manner. The verb *differo* for instance appears elsewhere of speech in the comedies of both, and in these instances either the verb appears in passive voicing, or an abstract noun of speech forms its agent or object. Compare for example Chaeribulus' exclamation upon being chastised that he is being 'torn apart' by shouting (*quin edepol egomet clamore* ***differor***, Pl. *Epid*. 118) or Davus' aside to Pamphilus that the latter's father has found an argument that will confound Pamphilus (*orationem sperat invenisse se qui* ***differat*** *te*, Ter. *An*. 407-8).[70] Again, because of the hyperbole that characterizes comedy, such images are natural to these plays. Yet phrases such as *clamore differor* do not exude the direct and personal tone of those listed above, specifically the explicit opposition of agent and object that marks Cicero's own application in his post-consular career – compare again Cicero's first-person boast to have 'broken' Clodius in the senate in *Att*. 1.16 (Clodium *praesentem* ***fregi*** *in senatu*, *Att*. 1.16.8). Thus, due to their phrasing, the ten instances given here prove particularly apt models for Cicero's post-consular metaphors.

---

[69] This is true of #1-4, 6, and 8 above, as well as both instances of *te differam* (*Ps*. 359, *Aul*. 446); I will return to discuss the agency of these verbs in the final chapter.

[70] Similarly, cf. *sed ut inops infamis ne sim, ne mi hanc famam* ***differant*** (Pl. *Trin*. 689). These three passages are often cited as parallels to *te differam* at *Ps*. 359 and *Aul*. 446 (cf. Usener 1901: 12 and 12 n. 18, *TLL* s.v. *differo* 5.1.1070.66-73, and Stockert 1983: 129 *ad* 446), but again they are not phrased in the same personal, direct, and clearly pseudo-physical fashion as *te differam* and the other eight instances listed above, where both agent and object are explicitly stated and directly opposed in syntax.

Moreover, like Cicero too, most of these verbs are not specific to the spheres of combat or competition. Plautus in particular extends beyond these realms, applying to verbal action the semantics of 'cutting' (*concido*, *contrunco*), 'ripping out' or 'shredding' (*differo*, *eradico*), and 'finishing off' (*conficio*), in addition to more traditional military metaphors.[71] In the three instances from Terence listed above, however, Terence's imagery is constrained specifically to verbs associated with combat in some fashion – *iugulo*, applied frequently to slaughter in combat, whether on the battlefield or in the arena; and *tango*, a verb which, according to Elaine Fantham, functioned as a metaphor for scoring a 'hit' or 'point' in gladiatorial combat specifically.[72] And in fact both of these verbs find precedent in Plautine usage, for *tetigerim* at *Eu*. 420 (#8) recalls *tetigi* of *Ps*. 1239 (#7), and both *iugulo* of *Ad*. 948 and *iugularas* of *Eu*. 417 echo the phrase '*demisisti gladium in iugulum*' found at *Mer*. 613.[73] Thus, these ten instances also confirm traditional assessments of Terence's style as generally tamer than Plautus', lacking the violent exuberance, colorful epithets, range of imagery, and sheer artistry that characterize the latter, and indeed marking a departure from the *comoedia palliata* tradition at large.[74] That Terence should use these metaphors at all, however, suggests that still his language does wield a certain amount of comic *vis*, as Philip Corbett has argued.[75]

---

[71] Cf. e.g. the military metaphors *aciem conferro* of cunning speech (*orationis* ***aciem*** *contra* ***conferam***, Pl. *Epid*. 547), *bellum gero* of arguing (*quid mi opust decurso aetatis spatio cum <m>eis* ***gerere bellum***, Pl. *St*. 81-82), and *capio verbis* of deception (*milite, urbis* ***verbis*** *qui inermus* ***capit***, Pl. *Bac*. 966).

[72] For the combat associations of *iugulo* and *tango*, see Fantham 1972: 30-31. Cf. similarly Terence's use of the military metaphor *protelo* of verbal 'routing' in *Phormio – et verbum verbo par pari ut respondeas, ne te iratus suis saevidicis dictis* ***protelet*** (Ter. *Ph*. 212-13).

[73] In full, *demisisti gladium in iugulum: iam cadam* (Pl. *Mer*. 613), uttered by Charinus in reaction to Eutychus' report that his beloved Pasicompsa was sold to another.

In sum, then, the comedies of Plautus and Terence, characterized as they are by physical as well as linguistic hyperbole, prove both a natural and indeed a rich source for violent images of speech in particular. Thus, at a basic level these comedies offer a number of models for the type of exaggerated speech imagery that Cicero will use. The ten instances listed above, however, display a direct, pseudo-physical, and often personal phrasing reminiscent of Cicero, as well as extra-combat semantics to boot, and these therefore prove especially apt antecedents to Cicero's post-consular metaphors – in fact *the* most direct models to be found. For turning to prose and the fragments of pre-Ciceronian oratory specifically, a stark contrast appears.

II.b. Pre-Ciceronian Oratory

The evidence presented in the surviving fragments of Republican oratory is strikingly similar to that of the Attic orators seen previously.[76] Again, non-figurative verbs and phrases of 'accusing', 'slandering', and the like here dominate what references to harsh or abusive speech appear.[77] The occasional military metaphor does occur in these fragments, and unsurprisingly M. Porcius Cato proves the main source of such instances, renowned as a harsh *vituperator* who developed several keen enemies over the course of his career.[78] For instance, in one fragment Cato refers to himself as 'beset' (*lacessebamur*) by enemies on all sides (*hostium copiae magnae*), and in another, deemed Cato's 'war and invective principle' by Severin Koster, Cato declares anyone his 'enemy' (*hostis*) who simply makes preparations to 'wage war' (*bellum ... inferre*) against Cato, even if he has not yet openly attacked him with 'arms' (*armis agat*).[79] Yet despite Cato's reputation for ferocity and the invective *content* that his fragments display, in what remains of his oratory he uses no metaphors for speech other than these.[80] Indeed, terms of military association are the only metaphors for harsh or abusive speech to be found in the pre-Ciceronian fragments at large, and again, the principles by which later sources cited these fragments make it likely that a particularly vivid or violent metaphor would have been preserved.[81] Thus, in terminology these fragments conform to the Greek prose sources discussed previously and, moreover, stand in sharp contrast to the metaphors of ‘cutting’ and ‘shredding’ that appear in Plautus.

---

[74] A handy discussion of Terence's language compared to Plautus in all aspects can be found in Barsby 1999: 19-24. On the exuberance and violence of Plautus' language, cf. Duckworth 1952: 331, Wright 1964: 11, and Fantham 1972: 4, 183. On the higher frequency, greater complexity, and greater color of Plautus' abusive terms, cf. Duckworth 1952: 333-4 and Lilja 1965, esp. 78-85, 92. Cf. Fantham 1972: 76 on Plautus' range of imagery. On the stylistic similarity of Plautus' comedies with the rest of the *palliata* tradition and the notable departure seen in Terence, cf. Wright 1974: 9-10, 138, 150-51; and on the linguistic unity of Terence's plays as a whole in contrast to the rest of Roman comedy, cf. Karakasis 2005 (14-15; 203, 221, *et passim*).

[75] Corbett 1964 examines the frequency and range of violent, aggressive, and otherwise forceful verb metaphors in the comedies of Plautus and Terence, thereby indicating the level of comic *vis* appropriate to each. Corbett finds that Terence employs such verbs in a figurative manner nearly twice as frequently as does Plautus, given the relative size of each corpus, and thus Corbett argues that Terence's language in fact demonstrates ample *vis*.

[76] Here I draw evidence only from the fragments themselves rather than the testimonia that cite them, for the language of the latter is specific to the source that provides the fragment rather than the fragment itself.

---

[77] Such terms include *accuso*: *ORF* 65.26 (M. Antonius), *ORF* 70.16 (L. Marcius Philippus); *dico in*: *ORF* 58.6 (Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus); *facio contumeliam*: *ORF* 58.7 (Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus); *maledico*: *ORF* 8.23 (M. Porcius Cato), *ORF* 48.65 (C. Gracchus), *ORF* 58.6 (Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus); note that in speeches before the start of Cicero's activity, *vitupero* appears in the form of the abstract noun *vituperatio*: *ORF* 58.7 (Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus).

[78] Cicero and Livy both testify to the especially fierce (*acerbus*) nature of Cato's oratory; cf. e.g. *quis illo gravior in laudando,* ***acerbior in vituperando*** (Cic. *Brut*. 65), *asperi procul dubio animi et* ***linguae acerbae*** *et immodice liberae fuit* (Liv. 39.40.9); cf. similar assessments at Livy 39.40.8, 42.6. Cato incurred the enmity especially of Q. Minucius Thermus, against whom he delivered several speeches (cf. e.g. *ORF* 8.58-65), and M. Fulvius Nobilior, said by Livy to have been 'lacerated' by Cato (*saepe ab eo in senatu* ***laceratus***, Liv. Perioch. 49).

[79] Cf. Koster 1980: 108. For *lacesso* as a military metaphor, cf. Fantham 1972: 28. These two fragments of Cato are in full: *omnia tumultus plena, simul* ***hostium copiae magnae*** *contra me sedebant; usquequaque* ***lacessebamur*** (*ORF* 8.32); *nam qui omnia parat contra me, ut quo tempore velit,* ***bellum*** *possit* ***inferre****, hic iam mihi* ***hostis*** *est, tametsi nondum* ***armis agat*** (*ORF* 8.195).

[80] Cf. for instance in Cato's fragments themes of drinking and sleeping (*ORF* 8.111); using one's oratorical abilities for hire (*ORF* 8.111, 112); effeminate behavior (*ORF* 8.114, 115); parsimony in contrast to luxury (*ORF* 8.128), and the stomach (*ORF* 8.133).

An additional source of evidence for oratory is found in Terence’s prologues, however, for in style and language these prologues are modeled on contemporary oratory and rhetoric.[82] Employing in general a number of loosely ‘forensic’ terms, these prologues suggest that in addition to military metaphors, the verb *laedo* – identified by Gabriella Focardi as similarly forensic – may too have been at least relatively common in oratory and rhetoric of the second century BCE.[83] For in the prologues to both *Eunuchus* and *Phormio* Terence applies *laedo* to the slanderous accusations of his fellow playwright Luscius of Lanuvium. In both prologues Terence characterizes Luscius as ‘harming’ him with his accusations. In *Eunuchus* these accusations consist specifically of Terence’s ‘theft’ (*furtum*) of characters from Plautus’ *Colax* (23-29), and Terence defends his own response by reminding the audience in advance that it was Luscius who ‘harmed’ him first (*responsum non dictum esse, quia **laesit** prior*, *Eu*. 6).[84] After expounding on the flaws of Luscius’ recent comedies (7-13), Terence again uses *laedo* in reference to

---

[81] One other military metaphor – the verb *oppugno* – appears in a fragment of L. Licinius Crassus –*‘cur clandestinis consiliis nos **oppugnant**? cur de perfugis nostris copias conparant contra nos?* (*ORF* 66.52a = Cic. *de Orat*. 223).

[82] The notion of a rhetorical nature to Terence’s prologues originated with Leo (Leo 1913: 251) but was explored in depth in the 1970s and 80s in particular: cf. Gelhaus 1972 on the organization of the prologues according to the rhetorical principles of *inventio* and *dispositio*; Focardi 1972 on the prologues’ linguistic similarities with oratory; and Focardi 1978 on their stylistic similarity. Goldberg 1983: 208-11 synthesizes Focardi and Gelhaus and adds a few items of linguistic similarity to those that appear in Focardi 1972; cf. a similar discussion of style and vocabulary in Goldberg 1986: 40-52.

[83] Focardi demonstrates that these prologues contain a number of words of a decidedly legal and forensic ring, examining in particular the group of terms *malevolus*, *maledicere*, *maledictum*, *laedere*, *vituperare*, and *lacessere* and arguing that Terence’s use of these terms allows him to implicitly depict his conflict with Luscius of Lanuvium in forensic and legal terms (Focardi 1972: 67-72).

[84] In fuller context: *tum si quis est qui dictum in se inclementius existumavit esse, sic existumet: responsum non dictum esse, quia **laesit** prior* (*Eu*. 4-6).

Luscius' slander, warning Luscius that he himself possesses much more material with which to attack Luscius if the latter continues to 'harm' him (*habeo alia multa ... quae proferentur post si perget* ***laedere***, *Eu*. 17-18). The context in *Phormio* is similar. In the prologue to this comedy Terence addresses Luscius' criticisms that the style and content of Terence's plays are light and thin (5), and Terence comments in response that if Luscius knew his own successes were due more to his producer than to himself, he would not 'harm' Terence as boldly as he does now (*minus multo audacter quam nunc* ***laedit laederet***, *Ph*. 11).[85]

In all these instances *laedo* denotes slanderous, accusatory speech, and due to the particularly rhetorical nature of these prologues, it may be hypothesized that *laedo* was similarly common of abusive and slanderous speech in oratory of the second century BCE. Indeed, by the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium* of the early first century BCE, *laedo* seems to have become a somewhat standard term for malicious speech of this sort.[86] Yet too the *Phormio* prologue makes it clear that by Terence's day at least, *laedo* in fact was felt to mean little more than *maledico*. Forms of *maledico* or the related *maledicta* occur twice in this prologue. Terence opens by claiming that Luscius is using 'slander' to try to deter Terence from continuing to write plays (***maledictis*** *deterrere ne scribat parat*, *Ph*. 3), and roughly ten lines later he refutes the notion that Luscius' attacks have proved useful by providing him material for his prologues, namely someone to

---

[85] In fuller context: *quod si intellegeret, quom stetit olim nova, actoris opera magis stetisse quam sua, minus multo audacter quam nunc* ***laedit laederet*** (*Ph*. 9-11).

[86] The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* has been dated with reasonable certainty to 86-82 BCE (cf. esp. Calboli 1993: 12-17); for an overview of the arguments and scholarship that have led to this dating range, cf. Corbeill 2002: 33 n. 38 and David 2006: 431 and 438 n. 29. For *laedo* used of malicious speech in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, cf. *C. Caelius iudex absolvit iniuriarum eum qui Lucilium poetam in scaena nominatim* ***laeserat*** (*Rhet. Her*. 2.19); *item vitiosum est quod dicitur contra iudicis voluntatem aut eorum qui audiunt, si ... homines quos illi caros habent* ***laedantur*** (*Rhet. Her*. 2.43).

‘slander’ in return (*nullum invenire prologum potuisset ... nisi haberet cui* ***male diceret***, *Ph*. 14-15). That Terence applies both *laedo* and *maledico* (or *maledicta*) to the same type of abusive attacks in the same prologue suggests that the two were felt to have a roughly equivalent sense in his day. Indeed, *male diceret* of line 15 is separated from the double appearance of *laedo* in this prologue (*laedit laederet*, *Ph*. 11) by a mere three lines, rendering the link between the two terms all the tighter.

Similarly, by the early first century BCE *laedo* also functioned as a *de facto* synonym of *vitupero*, occasionally doubling and in fact replacing the latter in the standard ‘praise and censure’ (*laus et vituperatio*) formula. In a passage from the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, for instance, *laedo* directly replaces *vitupero* in this formula, as the author recommends the use of an epithet in place of a regular name as a clever means of getting across a point both in praise and in censure (*hoc pacto non inornate poterimus, et* ***in laudando et in laedendo****, ... dicere sic uti cognomen quod pro certo nomine collocemus*, *Rhet. Her*. 4.42).[87] Thus, *laedo* may indeed have been common in oratory and rhetoric, but its force even by Terence’s day was relatively weak, functioning as an equivalent and even near synonym of *maledico* and *vitupero*.

And thus too Roman comedy and oratory of the second century BCE generally displays the same divide in semantics and terminology witnessed in the Greek sources surveyed in the first portion of this chapter. On both sides prose sources denote abusive or *ad hominem* speech specifically through non-figurative verbs and occasional metaphors from athletics or the military, with the Roman orators limited strictly to the latter since warfare and the military, rather than athletics, dominated Roman culture of the time.[88] In verse sources, however, and especially in comedy both Greek and Roman, invective abuse is expressed through imagery beyond these realms and semantics, for instance verbs of 'striking', 'trampling', and 'thrusting' in Aristophanes, and those of 'cutting' and 'shredding' in Plautus. Such metaphors for speech arise naturally from the physical and linguistic hyperbole that characterizes the comedies of both Aristophanes as well as Plautus and Terence, and accordingly in phrasing these instances, especially on the Roman side, tend toward the physical. Indeed, certain instances from Plautus and Terence suggest the occurrence of actual physical violence, for in them an active – and frequently first-person – verb governs the recipient of its action as its explicit accusative object, and often these verbs are accompanied by some sort of instrumental ablative that renders the agent's speech a physical weapon. As such syntax and phrasing, as well as extra-combat semantics, will also characterize Cicero's post-consular metaphors for invective, Roman comedy in general, in its pseudo-physical representation of speech of various sorts, proves a rich source of antecedents for Cicero's own violent images, and in fact offers several direct models that denote abusive speech in particular (*te differam*; Pl. *Ps*. 359, *Aul*. 446).

---

[87] Cf. too *laedo* as a synonym for *vitupero* at *Rhet. Her*. 2.45, there functioning as a double for the latter after the traditional *vitupero* and *laudo* formula has been introduced (*item vitiosum est in rebus conparandis necesse putare alteram rem* *vituperare* *cum alteram* *laudes**; quod genus, si quaeratur utris maior honor habendus sit ... et is qui dicat alteros* ***laedat***, *Rhet. Her*. 2.45). Especially tight pairings of *laedo* with *laudo* are found also in Cicero – e.g. *qui eundem* ***et laederes et laudares*** (Cic. *Q. Rosc*. 19) and *nescit* ***laedat an laudet*** (Cic. *Phil*. 3.18); such a pairing likely appealed at least in part for its *paronomasia*, a common feature of early Latin (cf. Courtney 1999: 3 on the tendency of early Latin toward alliteration and assonance, and Landgraf 1878: 12, citing ‘*laedere – laudare*’ specifically as evidence of the type of alliteration common in early poetry and drama).

I close this chapter with the evidence of Lucilius, for in the fragments of his satires appear the two non-combat metaphors on the Roman side applied specifically to abusive and *ad hominem* attack, *laedo* and *differo*.[89] Lucilius employs both *laedo* and *differo* of slanderous, malicious speech in these fragments, and his evidence helps to explain the afterlife of *differo* in particular.

---

[88] Cf. Fantham 1972: 32 on the Roman tendency toward metaphors from warfare and the military rather than athletics.

II.c. Lucilius

Lucilius applies the verbs *laedo* and *differo* to abusive speech in a similarly physical fashion once each in the surviving collection of fragments. These two instances occur within a set of fragments considered by editors to be thematically united around the topic of verbal abuse, specifically the slander spread by satire. Following the original numbering of Marx's edition, this set is given below:

> idque tuis factis saevis et tristibus dictis (1014 M)
> gaudes cum de me ista foris sermonibus differs (1015 M)
> et maledicendo in multis sermonibus **differs** (1016 M)
> nunc, Gai, quoniam incilans nos **laedis** vicissim (1035 M)

These fragments derive from Book 30, and in them Lucilius, in the voice of an interlocutor, complains of Lucilius' own slanderous abuse against him in Lucilius' satires.[90] Within this context, the interlocutor accuses Lucilius specifically of 'shredding' (*differs*) him with his slander in 1016, and likewise of 'harming' (*laedis*) him through slander in 1035. In each of these two fragments a 'slander' word appears – *maledicendo* in 1016 and the rare *incilans* in 1035 – and the presence of these words makes clear that *differs* and *laedis* both refer to malicious speech in particular. Moreover, both instances display the same direct opposition of agent and object via an active verb that marked the references in Roman comedy discussed previously, for *nos* in 1035 forms the explicit direct object of *laedis*, and *me*, though not actually present in 1016, is the assumed object of *differs*. Indeed, it is this assumed object that distinguishes *differs* at 1016 from its twin at 1015 – the object of *differs* in the latter is *ista*, and thus in 1015 the verb assumes the sense of 'disseminating' or 'divulging' malicious slanders rather than 'shredding' a target himself by means of these slanders.[91] In fragments 1016 and 1035, then, Lucilius employs *differo* and *laedo* of slanderous abuse in a direct fashion evocative of Plautus' and Terence's pseudo-physical phrasing.

---

[89] Note that while *laedo* may have originated as a military term, Elaine Fantham suggests that by Terence's day, much of its military associations may have been lost (Fantham 1972: 28), and thus I do not consider the verb as strongly military in sense as most others discussed in this chapter and throughout.

[90] On this context, cf. Marx 1905: 326 *ad* 1015, 331 *ad* 1035; Warmington 1938: 349 *ad* 1075; Krenkel 1970: 583 *ad* 1089 and 1090; and Charpin 1991: 207.

The question, then, is why he should choose these particular verbs, and answering it helps to explain the course of these verbs – and again *differo* especially – in later Latin prose literature. Lucilius likely employs *laedo* simply because the verb was potentially common in second-century oratory and rhetoric, as suggested previously. As a likely familiar of Scipio Aemilianus and C. Laelius, Lucilius accordingly would have been exposed to its use on numerous occasions, perhaps by Scipio and Laelius themselves, as well as by others. Thus, his application of *laedo* to malicious slander in 1035 seems quite natural.[92]

His use of *differo*, on the other hand, seems more specific to Plautus. To begin, Roman comedy in general stands prominently among the various influences of Lucilius' diverse, 'pudding'-like satires.[93] Indeed, Lucilius has been demonstrated to echo both comedy's character types as well as certain features of its language, for instance its coinages and vulgarisms.[94] Now, beyond applying *differo* to speech of various sorts, including intensely abusive and threatening speech in two cases, Plautus in fact frequently employs the verb as a metaphor of other referents, from intense emotions to actual physical violence.[95] Thus, *differo* can be considered a rather Plautine verb and, in addition, one of powerful and specifically *ad hominem* associations. It should be mentioned here that although the dating of Lucilius' birth and death – as well as the beginning of his literary activity – is debated, Books 26-30 of his satires by consensus are placed somewhere between 131 and 129 BCE, and thus they are securely post-Plautine.[96] Given Lucilius' tendency to echo comedy in both content and language, it is therefore conceivable that in employing *differs* of malicious slander in 1016, Lucilius alludes directly to Plautus' *te differam* of *Ps*. 359 and *Aul*. 446. In fact, John Griffith suggests that 1016 was indeed intended to recall *Pseudolus* 359 in particular, arguing that it afforded a clever nod to the Calidorus-Pseudolus-Ballio dispute in *Pseudolus* as Lucilius in these fragments laid the groundwork for his own *altercatio* with the interlocutor.[97]

---

[91] Cf. that Nonius distinguishes the two instances in just this fashion, glossing *differo* as meaning '*diffamare, divulgare*' in 1015, but '*dividere vel scindere*' in 1016 (Non. 284, 13 and 17 M); note that Marx 1905: 327 *ad* 1016 deems Nonius' interpretation of *differo* in 1016 "*apte*." Indeed, John Griffith argues that it is precisely because of this contrast in sense that 1016 probably did follow 1015 directly, as Lucilius was generally fond of repeating words in close proximity to each other; cf. Griffith 1970: 67-78, and 67 n. 2 for examples of such repetition in the continuous fragments that survive.

[92] On the origins and nature of Lucilius' relationship with Scipio Aemilianus, cf. Gruen 1992: 273, 280-3. On the influence of the language of oratory seen in Lucilius' fragments, cf. Classen 2001: 66-67.

---

[93] Cf. Classen 2001: 63-70 on Lucilius' satires as a 'pudding' comprised of diverse elements and influences which marks both Lucilius' individuality and ultimately the style of poetry taken up by his successors as 'satire'.

[94] Cf. Auhagen 2001: 13-19 for the various incarnations of comic characters in Lucilius' satires; cf. Petersmann 1999: 296-310 (esp. 294-5, 299, and 304) on Lucilius' linguistic and stylistic echoes of comedy. Muecke 2005: 44-45 also discusses the linguistic and stylistic similarities of Lucilius and comedy, from the use of direct imperatives to comic character types and vignettes.

[95] Plautus applies *differo* e.g. to exaggerated love at *Cist*. 208 and *Mil*. 1163, desire at *Poen*. 156, and joy at *Truc*. 701; similarly, the verb appears of exaggerated physical violence at *Curc*. 576 and *Trin*. 833; cf. p. 50 n. 68 above.

[96] For a succinct account of the ancient testimonies on Lucilius' birth and death dates, the problems they present, and past scholarly debate on the matter, cf. Gruen 1992: 274-6. On the dating of Books 26-30 in particular, cf. Raschke 1979 (esp. pp. 88-89), who reviews previous suggestions and through reexamination of the historical references in Books 26-30 confirms Marx's dating of 131-129 BCE.

Moreover, such an allusion serves Lucilius' purposes here because the fragments in question are specifically programmatic. They come at the close of Lucilius' first set of books and portray him in the midst of a personal dispute, as indicated above, and in fact later satirists echo the stance and language of these fragments in their own programmatic statements.[98] By representing his own satires through the violent *differs* of 1016, Lucilius endows them with the power to cause his targets intense physical harm, to shred them. But through the fragment's nod to *differam* of *Ps*. 359, Lucilius also offers a warning to potential offenders, a near threat akin to those of Pseudolus to Ballio and Congrio to Euclio – these satires can and will destroy their targets. Note, though, that 1016, like 1035 and *laedis*, is spoken by the interlocutor, not Lucilius. By placing these lines in the interlocutor's mouth, Lucilius is able to depict himself as injuring his targets with powerfully violent slander and then deny any such practice in his own voice a few lines later – *nolito tibi me male dicere posse putare* (1030 M).[99]

In Lucilius, therefore, *differs* becomes a programmatic statement – an image of his satires' fierce power and a tidy warning and *recusatio* all in one. And thus the verb's course as a metaphor in such usage is set. Having appeared only in verse sources so far and now associated specifically with the programmatics of satire, *differo* in this usage is conspicuously absent from Cicero – and accordingly from the following chapters – and indeed from prose literature in general until Petronius.[100] In contrast, the verb *laedo* entered Lucilius via oratory and prose usage, and accordingly it continues to appear in the oratory of Cicero as a common metaphor for harsh and abusive speech, as the following chapter will demonstrate.

---

[97] Griffith 1970: 68.

[98] On the programmatic nature of Lucilius 30.1013ff and their direct linguistic echoes in Horace's *Satires* (e.g. *tristi laedere versu*, *S.* 2.1.21; *laedere gaudes*, *S.* 1.4.78), cf. e.g. Puelma Piwonka 1978: 68-69 and Charpin 1991: 207. On these fragments' resonance in Juvenal, cf. Griffith 1970, arguing that Lucilius 1014-17 M and 1033-35 M in particular served as a model for Juvenal's 'apology' of the last lines of his First Satire. For the dispute with an opponent as a programmatic stance, cf. Auhagen 2001: 11-12, who connects Lucilius' use of it to that of Terence in his prologues.

[99] Puelma Piwonka 1978: 68-70 emphasizes that Lucilius represents his criticisms as 'mere *iocus*', a *ludus*, and insists that as such, his satires are neither meant nor able to actually slander anyone; this stance is seen in full in the following fragments, which Puelma Piwonka suggests should be read consecutively: *sicuti te, qui ea* (sc. *poemata*) *quae speciem vitae esse putamus* (1029 M), *nolito tibi me male dicere posse putare* (1030 M), *quem scis scire tuas omnes maculasque notasque* (1033 M), *quem sumptum facis in lustris circum oppida lustrans* (1034 M).

---

[100] For such use of *differo* in Petronius, cf. *nos ... per totam urbem rumoribus* ***different*** (Petr. 10.5); similar usage appears in Tacitus too (*pars ... imminentes dominos variis rumoribus* ***differebant***, Tac. *Ann*. 1.4), but otherwise the verb is again absent in this sense in prose from this period on. Note in contrast, though, that in verse its use continues immediately; Lucilius' contemporary Accius applies *differo* in the same direct fashion and in fact in a fragment whose phrasing generally recalls Lucilius (*quis erit, qui non me spernens, incilans probris, sermone indecorans turpi fama* ***differet****?*, Acc. *trag*. 458-9; cf. again Lucilius' *incilans ... laedis* at 1035 M) and Propertius then under the early principate employs it in a similar fashion (*et te circum omnes alias irata puellas* ***differet***, Prop. 1.4.21-22).

CHAPTER 2

Cicero's Pre-Consular Language

This chapter turns from the second to the first century BCE and to Cicero specifically. Having demonstrated the types of language and, in the case of metaphors, the semantic classes that were used to mark abusive and *ad hominem* speech in both Greek and second-century Latin literature, this chapter aims to determine what terms were commonly applied to invective and verbal abuse when Cicero began his oratorical career. The examination here lays the foundation for the final two chapters – Chapter Four in particular – which will argue for innovations in both semantics and syntax in Cicero's post-consular language. Ideally, the present study would be able to demonstrate clearly the metaphors used not only by Cicero in the early first century BCE but also by his contemporaries. Unfortunately, however, in comparing Cicero even to his rough contemporaries one faces a "gross imbalance," for Cicero's corpus comprises by far the bulk of what has survived from this period as well as from Latin literature at large, occupying in total an impressive fifteen volumes in the *Oxford Classical Text* series and some five thousand pages – twice the number of pages encompassed by the remains of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*, nearly three times as many as the surviving comedies of Plautus and Terence combined account for, over five times as many pages as in Tacitus' corpus, and approximately ten times as many as make up Malcovati's collection of Republican oratory fragments, most of which in fact consists of testimonia and summaries rather than fragments in proper.[1]

Accordingly, as it is Cicero's writings that dominate this period, instead of hunting for metaphors in the paltry remains of his contemporaries, in this chapter I draw evidence from Cicero himself, specifically from his early works. I choose to focus on the language of Cicero alone for two reasons. First, the evidence thus yielded allows for the most direct and appropriate contrast with Cicero's later usage in the following chapters. And second, this evidence may tentatively be thought to speak for the period as a whole on the following logic – Cicero would have been least likely to innovate as a youth at the start of his career, and thus the metaphors that appear in these early works represent, in rough fashion, the language and usage common in the early first century BCE. The point at which I divide Cicero's corpus is 63 BCE, the year of his consulship, considered by many scholars a landmark within his career.[2] Henceforth I consider chronology of key importance, for as my ultimate goal is to argue for innovation in Cicero's later metaphors and usage, the time at which a term first appears is vital to this examination.

In this chapter I survey the specific terms found in select works of Cicero that predate 63 BCE. I include all letters that belong to these years, which admittedly are few (only the first eleven letters from Book One of the *ad Atticum* collection, i.e. *Att.* 1.1-11) as well as *De Inventione*, the only treatise that conceivably predates Cicero's consulship, thought to have been penned by Cicero in the late 90s or early 80s.[3] Although the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium* is generally considered contemporary to *De Inventione*, I exclude it from the survey proper on the mere principle of comparing Cicero only to Cicero himself.[4] From the speeches in this period I have selected to examine the following: *Pro Quinctio* (81 BCE), *Pro Roscio Amerino* (80 BCE), *Divinatio in Caecilium* (70 BCE), *In Verrem* (70 BCE), and *Pro Cluentio* (66 BCE).[5] I choose *Pro Quinctio* as it is Cicero's earliest extant work; *Pro Roscio Amerino*, *In Verrem*, and *Pro Cluentio* for their particular tendency toward invective; and *Divinatio in Caecilium*, in addition to its obvious ties to *In Verrem*, as an especially rich source of evidence – since the speech's occasion is to determine who will prosecute Verres, Cicero, in arguing that Caecilius is not up to the task, makes a great number of references to oratory throughout the speech.[6] Since the dates given above designate the years in which these speeches were delivered rather than published, and since in this investigation I account so much weight to chronology, I note here that Cicero is generally thought to have circulated his speeches soon after their delivery.[7] Thus, the evidence presented by their written, circulated forms – particularly that of *Pro Cluentio*, the latest of the works examined here – still likely falls within the chronological scope of this chapter.

---

[1] Powell 2013: 44 speaks of the "gross imbalance" of Cicero's corpus as compared to that of contemporary writers of literary prose. Excluding introductory pages, Cicero's *OCT* volumes contain 5,004 pages; those of Livy, 2,570 pages; those of Plautus and Terence together, 1,464 pages; those of Tacitus, 826 pages; and Malcovati's *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta* (3rd ed.) 568 pages.

[2] Cf. e.g. Habicht 1990: 31, Dugan 2005: 13, Steel 2005: 17, 49. James May likewise views Cicero's consular year in this fashion, pinpointing it as the time at which Cicero obtained and began to exploit his ethos of *auctoritas* (May 1988: 50-51, 69, *et passim*).

---

[3] The dating of the *De Inventione* is admittedly uncertain; Cicero's own description of it as a 'youthful' work that 'slipped from his notebooks' (*de Orat.* 1.5) does not provide the surest footing; cf. Steel 2005: 37, who refers to this statement as "disingenuous, an attempt to raise one's profile within a small and relatively close-knit elite." But still through a combination of factors, most scholars place the work's composition at ca. 90 BCE; cf. Kennedy 1972: 107-110, suggesting 91-89 BCE, Corbeill 2002: 33, fixing its composition at or before 91, and Steel's more hesitant stance, placing it between 91-81 (Steel 2005: 36, cf. 39). For a summary of scholarship on this issue, see Corbeill 2002: 33 n. 36.

[4] On the relationship of *De Inventione* to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, including rhetorical and intellectual background, content, and cultural context, see Corbeill 2002: 29-41.

[5] Note that the *Divinatio in Caecilium* and *Verrines* on their own comprise some 400 *OCT* pages and thus prove a substantial source of evidence for this period.

[6] I return to discuss some of these speeches' invective elements, specifically their abusive epithets and characterizations, in the body of this chapter.

[7] On Cicero's practice of publishing his orations soon after their delivery, cf. McDermott 1972: 278-80; cf. too Frazel 2004: 132-4 on Cicero's swift circulation of the *Verrines* after the suspension of the trial. The notable exception is of course Cicero's consular speeches, which from the evidence of *Att.* 2.1.3 are generally thought to have been published as a revised collection in 60 BCE to bolster his political image;

As previously, my concern here is with those verbs that refer to actions roughly describable as *ad hominem* and whose grammatical object is a person. I include within this category oratorical and generally verbal action; judicial action in particular, by which I mean actions whose agents are either the courts themselves at large or individual components of them, whether witness testimony, an advocate's arguments, or the jury's verdict, all of which are inherently verbal as well; and finally, actions directed against an individual in a broader context, which often prove at least vaguely political, but occasionally encompass more generalized situations, for instance Cicero's comment in *Pro Quinctio* that Sex. Alfenus 'battled' daily with the gladiator Naevius (*Alfenus interea Romae cum isto gladiatore vetulo cotidie pugnabat*, *Quinct*. 29). Numerous examples of all these types of actions are provided in the first section of this chapter. Though verbal activity remains my focus, for two reasons I also admit instances the verbal nature of which is not explicit. First and foremost, in these works – as in any of roughly similar content, context, and focus – there occur many 'grey' instances in which a verb's referent is not easy to fix decisively. Specifically, at times it can be difficult to determine whether a verb refers to something effected by a person's words or oratory in particular or by his actions at large, some of which may indeed be inherently verbal. For instance, Cicero's concession that Caecilius may have been 'harmed' by Verres (*hic tu si* ***laesum*** *te a Verre esse dices, patiar et concedam*; *Div. Caec*. 58) does not indicate how precisely the harm was achieved – by words or by action. Accordingly, I label such cases as instances of

---

for recent discussion, cf. Cape 2002: 115-120. But for the view that these speeches were actually published in 63, "serially or as a group, probably in December," see McDermott 1972: 284.

generalized political or otherwise situational action. Second, as the first part of this chapter demonstrates, a certain amount of semantic cross-over occurs as well, for some terms are used of more than one type of referent or context; this applies primarily to *opprimo*, but also to such verbs as *laedo* and *perdo*.

In many ways, the ultimate point of this chapter is as much what is *not* found in these works as what is. Since this survey is selective, it cannot and does not claim to include every metaphor from this period. Its goal rather is to document both the main types of imagery and the predominant individual terms that Cicero employed in these years, and in addition the manner in which he employed them, and thereby to illustrate what semantic ranges and manner of usage were common in the early first century BCE. This in turn provides the groundwork for the following chapters and analysis of Cicero's later innovations, that is the '*not*' of just above.

I should emphasize here that this and the following chapters do not present a study of Cicero's style.[8] In fact, the investigations of both this and the following chapters transcend questions of style and genre, spanning not only Cicero's speeches as a collection but also his letters as well as some of his treatises – that is, his corpus writ large. And thus, the trends that I discuss in these chapters cannot be written off as mere matters of stylistic difference either within or among the various categories into which his works may be divided.

---

[8] On Cicero's style, the basic starting point is Laurand 1936-40, the three-volume, fourth edition of Laurand's study. Von Albrecht 2003 provides a modern comprehensive treatment, dividing Cicero's work into five categories (speeches, letters, philosophical treatises, rhetorical treatises, and poetry), and considering their individual chronological development, as well as particularities seen both between and within them. Finally, J.G.F. Powell's chapter on Cicero's style in the 2013 *Cambridge Companion to Cicero* offers the most up-to-date bibliography and provides both helpful overviews of various stylistic aspects as well as more detailed considerations.

In this chapter I work closely from the material in Elaine Fantham's *Comparative Studies of Republican Latin Imagery*, for this still remains by far the most important individual study of Cicero's use of metaphors overall, and furthermore proves fundamental to any examination of imagery in this period. Her specific observations on individual terms and usages I shall reserve for later citation as appropriate. From the outset, however, two remarks about Fantham's study are necessary. First, in her study Fantham delineates the most common spheres of imagery found in Republican usage; one of these she designates 'imagery from warfare and single combat', and this sphere will encompass the majority – though not the entirety – of the verbs I shall discuss.[9] And second, Fantham comments several times that such military and combat imagery was common in the oratory and political discourse of the late Republic, observing for instance that gladiatorial images "were obviously commonplaces of political language" and that "political conflict depicted as physical attack" was "the commonest source of imagery in oratory."[10]

I mention these aspects of her study both to acknowledge that combat imagery in Latin literature is not a new concept or topic of discussion, as well as to distinguish generally my work from Fantham's in this area. Her study is indeed fundamental, but its focus is not Cicero alone. Accordingly, she covers a limited portion of his corpus – his letters, admittedly substantial in quantity themselves, several of his *post reditum* speeches, and *De Oratore*. Moreover, she does not draw distinctions based on chronology or referent as I do. Finally, many of the terms I discuss do not appear in

---

[9] For this title and discussion of the sphere in general, cf. Fantham 1972: 26-33.

[10] Fantham 1972: 31 and 117 respectively; cf. also 155-6 on the imagery of the 'combat' of oratory in the "battlefield of public life" seen in *De Oratore*, where themes of defense and offense were "likely to have been part of the traditional apologia of the rhetorician."

Fantham's study. Thus, this study is distinct in the sources it covers, the specific terms it includes, and the uses to which these terms are put.

Admittedly, the organization and presentation of this chapter's material proves somewhat problematic, for much of it overlaps to a certain extent and could be discussed in detail at several points. For instance, the simple citation of individual terms raises the issues both of semantic category in their definitions and of referent in their specific examples. One could choose automatically to group and discuss terms based either on the larger semantic and image-sphere categories to which they belong or on the types of actions to which they refer, inserting interpretation along the way. This, however, seems to me likely to produce both confusion and a certain sense of pre-selection, and thus I have chosen the following method of execution. I present first a strict exposition, or perhaps more appropriately 'documentation', of the verbs themselves. Based on this I then consider both the semantic groupings and larger imagery categories to which these terms naturally belong, indicating the relationship of both to referent or context type. Lastly, I discuss the manner in which these terms as a whole tend to be used. The key points to this chapter are the individual terms that appear, the particular semantic categories to which these verbs belong, and their typically impersonal and distanced manner of application.

I. Documentation

The aim of this section is simply to document rather than to analyze, as analysis comes in later sections of the chapter. In presentation it is modeled on the types of entry-based word lists found in lexical studies such as Fantham 1972, Henderson 1975 and

1991, and Adams 1982, organized alphabetically by term and presenting information for each term in one or more paragraphs of varying length. Each verb entry provides citations to the works of Cicero surveyed here, along with numerous examples in full. In addition, each entry generally indicates the following: 1) both primary and figurative usage, not only to illuminate the verb's sense in the instances cited, but also to corroborate the term's inclusion in this examination at all, though for verbs whose usage as a metaphor is questionable further justification is provided on an individual basis; 2) other verbs employed in parallel or otherwise close association with a given term in the instances under discussion, especially – but not exclusively – in cases where the two verbs govern one and the same object and are connected simply by an "and" (e.g. ... *ut omnes cives perdiderit et afflixerit*, *S. Rosc*. 33), for this manner of accumulation generally indicates a similarity of meaning and force for the two terms in such usage; 3) the general types of referents or contexts with which the instances considered are associated – verbal action of a general nature; the courts in particular; or broader contexts, political or otherwise; 4) similar usage in previous sources, predominantly Plautus and Terence, as well as in the contemporary *Rhetorica ad Herennium*; where no earlier citations are given, none have been found in similar usage.

For the most part, citations from the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* and the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* appear in-text, and those to other scholarly works in the footnotes. Note again that in this section I do not aim to provide comprehensive coverage, that is a comprehensive listing of every verb that could conceivably be included here, of a given verb's figurative usages, nor again of every instance in these works similar in usage to those cited and discussed.[11] The goal of this section is to document both the primary verbs and the types of verbs potentially considered violent by which Cicero characterizes non-physical actions – particularly those of a verbal nature – directed against people. By this I aim to illustrate the *ad hominem* discourse of the period loosely termed – the specific terms and larger semantic categories that Cicero uses to refer to oratory, verbal action, and general political action.

I.a. Verb Entries

adorior. At its basic level the verb *adorior* refers to hostile motion (cf. *TLL* 1.814.54-816.17) and is proper to military sphere (cf. *TLL* 1.814.68-816.17), but by the time of Terence much of the verb's military associations may have disappeared.[12] Likewise, it is in Terence's comedies that figurative usage of verbal attack is first found, e.g. *Ad*. 404 and *Haut*. 757 (cf. *TLL* 1.816.18-40 and *OLD* s.v. 2). In *Ver*. 2.2.37 Cicero applies *adorior* thus to the action of bringing a lawsuit in particular – *hominemque id aetatis minime litigiosum quam tumultuosissime* ***adoriantur***.

affligo. A verb denoting 'striking' in primary usage (cf. *TLL* 1.1232.70, 1233.56; and *OLD* s.v. 1-3), in the works surveyed here Cicero commonly employs *affligo* in a figurative sense to denote distress caused to or suffered by people, both individually and as a group. Note that in such instances *affligo* accumulates closely with *perdo* and *everto*, suggesting that in such usage *affligo* assumes a nuance of 'to ruin, overwhelm' (cf. *OLD* s.v. 5) (for *perdo*, cf. *perdiderit* *et* ***afflixerit***, *S. Rosc*. 33; *perdiderat* *atque* ***afflixerat***, *Ver*. 2.3.37; and ***afflictam*** *et* *perditam*, *Ver*. 2.3.212, here of a province; for *everto*, cf. ***afflictum*** *atque* *eversum*, *Quinct*. 74). In all instances, *affligo* refers to distress or ruin in a context outside the courts, though the acting agent and particular context is more or less specific at times. In the *Verrines*, for instance, Cicero uses it of the ruin C. Verres caused the Sicilians as a whole through his edicts (*nam eos* (sc. *Siculos*) *superioribus edictis satis perdiderat atque* ***afflixerat***; *Ver*. 2.3.37), while in *Pro Quinctio* it refers more simply to P. Quinctius' distress in the face of so many difficulties (*cum tot tantisque difficultatibus affectus atque* ***afflictus***; *Quinct*. 10). Likewise, compare designation of individual and generalized distress at *Quinct*. 74 and *Clu*. 201. Cicero applies the verb with keen force too at *S. Rosc*. 33, referring to the ruin that Q. Mucius Scaevola's murder brought to the Roman people (*mortem, quae tantum potuit ut omnes cives perdiderit et* ***afflixerit***). For usage of the ruin suffered by provinces and towns, compare also *Ver*. 2.1.95, 2.3.74, and 2.3.212.

---

[11] As a general rule, I have chosen to include verbs that in all usages examined occur at least twice; exceptions have been made for compounds of such verbs and for verbs otherwise related semantically, as one of my goals is again to illustrate the period's predominant semantic categories.

[12] Cf. Fantham 1972: 28, suggesting that due to the verb's "common existence outside the realm of war or combat" in Terence's day, *adorior* may have lost much of its military associations.

armo. In the opening section of *De Inventione*, Cicero depicts the statesman as 'arming' himself with words to fight on his country's behalf – *qui vero ita sese* ***armat*** *eloquentia, ut non oppugnare commoda patriae, sed pro his propugnare possit, is mihi vir ... utilissimus atque amicissimus civis fore videtur* (*Inv*. 1.1).[13] The term, proper to furnishing with weapons (*TLL* 2.617.58-618.51), has been transferred to the realm of oratory and politics, used here of 'equipping' with *eloquentia*. Cicero employs it in a similar fashion in *Pro Cluentio*, though here in a specifically judicial context, portraying Sassia as 'arming' in a variety of manners the accuser she had found for her son – *sed etiam cogitavit quibus eum* (sc. *accusatorem*) *rebus* ***armaret*** (*Clu*. 191).

certo. At its fundamental level, *certo* means simply 'to compete, contend' for superiority in a given field (cf. *OLD* s.v. 1 and *TLL* 3.891.84-85), but it also bears the specialized usages of waging war in a military context (*TLL* 3.897.40-898.74) and of brawling in the courts (*TLL* 3.898.75-899.16). Cicero combines the two in *Divinatio in Caecilium*, employing *certo* in close pairing with *pugno* – and thus at least a *de facto* metaphor – to warn Q. Caecilius Niger that if the latter prosecutes Verres, he will have to do battle with the formidable Q. Hortensius Hortalus – *omni ratione* *pugnandum* ***certandum****que* ***sit***

---

[13] Cf. Fantham's suggestion that contrasting images of offensive and defensive oratory were "likely to have been part of the traditional apologia of the rhetorician" (Fantham 1972: 155-6).

(*Div. Caec*. 44). Likewise, the term appears quite frequently in the *Verrines* proper, used similarly in the context of judicial competition at *Ver*. 2.1.115 and 2.2.39, and of more general political competition at *Ver*. 2.3.9 (*Verrem esse qui cum L. Mummio* ***certet***). In application to 'contending' in arguments or disputes more generally, *certo* appeared relatively frequently before the first-century BCE – compare Enn. *Ann*. 270, Pl. *Truc*. 948 (of threats in particular), Ter. *Ph*. 20, and Lucil. 1233 M.

contendo. The verb *contendo* properly denotes the exertion of effort – of 'stretching' or 'extending' (*TLL* 4.662.61; 4.663.20). Like *certo*, though, *contendo* was used commonly to signify competition and even military battle (cf. *TLL* 4.666.85-668.71). Accordingly, in the works surveyed here Cicero frequently applies the verb to competition or brawling in both the courts as well as more general political contexts (cf. *OLD* s.v. 8e). On the judicial side, compare Cicero's assertion at the start of *Pro Quinctio* that his client Quinctius is forced to go head-to-head in court with a very influential adversary – *P. Quinctius ... cum adversario gratiosissimo* ***contendat*** (*Quinct*. 2). Use of *contendo* to designate contending in court appears also in *Quinct*. 66 and *Ver*. 1.33, and in fact in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (*Rhet. Her*. 4.65; cf. 3.25, 27 of general verbal debate). Political application occurs twice in the first letter of the *ad Atticum* collection (i.e. *Att*. 1.1, SB #10) – *Thermus cum Silano* ***contendere*** *existimatur* (*Att*.1.1.2); *illud ostendi, si ipse unus cum illo uno* ***contenderet*** (*Att*. 1.1.4).

depello. The properly military term *depello* (cf. *TLL* 5.1.564.50-68) appears of 'deterring' or 'repelling' by means of words as early as Plautus (*Trin*. 639; cf. *OLD* s.v. 7b) and is used specifically of judicial oratory in *Pro Quinctio*, as Cicero speaks of his obligation as defense attorney to deflect his opponent's weapons and heal the wounds inflicted by them – *qui tela* ***depellere*** *et vulneribus mederi debeam* (*Quinct*. 8).[14]

dimico. This verb, which in primary usage denotes fighting in battle (*TLL* 5.1.1198.9-1201.68; cf. *OLD* s.v. 1) and is perhaps gladiatorial in origin (*TLL* 5.1.1197.83-84), appears in *Divinatio in Caecilium* again of verbal battling in court – *omni ratione erit* ***dimicandum*** (*Div. Caec*. 72).

---

[14] Cf. *OLD* s.v. 7b, "to rebut, repel (accusations)," though *Quinct*. 8 does not appear among the few instances cited here. Note that the *TLL* offers no appropriate category for this usage.

everto. The sense of 'turning' inherent to *everto* (cf. *TLL* 5.2.1027.19-20) for the purposes of this study translates to a figurative meaning similar to that of *affligo* in its more forceful usage, that is of 'ruining' or 'overturning' (cf. *OLD* s.v. 5). Compare again parallel usage of the two terms in *Quinct*. 74 (*per se afflictum atque* ***eversum*** *propinquum suum*). Besides this instance, in the study at hand the term is found predominantly in the *Verrines*, twice there employed of the political 'overturning' of individuals – of the downfall of Q. Opimius (*tantum dicam, paucos homines ... Q. Opimium per ludum et iocum ...* ***evertisse***; *Ver*. 2.1.155) and of the Rhodians' desire to overthrow their king (*... vix convenire videretur, quem ipsum hominem cuperent* ***evertere****, eius effigiem ... servare*; *Ver*. 2.2.159). More frequently in this set of speeches, however, Cicero uses *everto* to refer to ruin suffered on a larger scale, by cities or provinces (e.g. *sed ne reliquas spes turbetis atque omnes provincias* ***evertatis***, *Ver*. 2.3.219; cf. also *Ver*. 2.2.114 and 2.4.76) or by groups of people as a collective, particularly the Sicilian farmers' complete and utter destruction under Verres' administration (e.g. *aratores funditus* ***evertebantur***, *Ver*. 2.3.77; cf. also *Ver*. 2.3.47, 48, 156, 198, 204, 215, etc.). In both of these usages close pairing with the adverb *funditus* is common – besides *Ver*. 2.3.77, compare in particular *Ver*. 2.2.114; 2.3.47, 48; 2.4.76; and also its appearance in *Quinct*. 53 of the complete ruin of Quinctius' fortunes. For previous use as a metaphor of 'ruining', cf. Enn. *Ann*. 258 (here of ruining plans rather than people).

exstinguo. Signifying in primary usage the diminution of force or strength (*TLL* 5.2.1914.20-21), especially that of fire (cf. Fantham 1972: 10), in this survey *exstinguo* is seen transferred to people – or occasionally to their negative qualities or attributes – in the sense of 'to destroy' (cf. *TLL* 5.2.1917.75-79), as is reflected by its accumulation with the semantically stronger *deleo* (*omnis improbitas ...* ***exstinguenda*** *atque delenda sit*; *Div. Caec*. 26) and *opprimo* (*hominum eius modi ... potentiam ...* ***exstinguere*** *atque opprimere debetis*; *S. Rosc*. 36), with *deleo* and *opprimo* thus forming a rhetorical climax in such instances. Cicero applies the verb in a judicial context in *Pro Roscio Amerino*, urging the judges to quench the power of men like L. Cornelius Chrysogonus and the Roscii (T. Magnus and T. Capito) (*S. Rosc*. 36, given directly above). For usage beyond the context of the courts, compare *Div. Caec*. 26 above, where the recipient of the verb's action is the attribute *improbitas* (for usage with attributes in general, cf. *TLL* 5.2.1920.3-41). Likewise, use in indicating the destruction of larger groups of people can be seen at *Ver*. 2.3.226 (*quid est enim Sicilia ... si aratorum numerum ac nomen* ***exstinxeris****?*) as well as *Ver*. 2.2.52 (for use with collective groups, cf. *TLL* 5.2.1918.12-25, though *Ver*. 2.2.52 appears at *TLL* 5.2.1923.8), and in fact is attested also in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (e.g. *Rhet. Her*. 4.45, and 4.65 in a middle/passive sense; for the latter cf. too Pl. *Ps*. 906).

impugno. Cicero uses *impugno* in *Pro Quinctio* to depict the act of accusation as an attack, complaining that the prosecution has been given ample opportunity to make an attack (*illis autem id tempus* ***impugnandi*** *detur*; *Quinct*. 8) which he, appointed to speak first, will be unable to counter.

invehor. In specialized primary usage, *invehor* denotes a military attack, most commonly a cavalry or naval assault (cf. *TLL* 7.2.133.1-40). In its transferred sense it commonly refers to an attack made in words (cf. *TLL* 7.2.131.83-132.68), though in such usage the verb's original sense of 'being carried against' something seems to have died out. Use in signifying verbal attack is first documented in Plautus (*pergin tu autem? heia! superbe* ***invehere***; *Mer*. 998) and is seen here in the *Verrines* as Cicero stops mid narration of Verres' crimes to ask in rhetorical fashion why he is attacking Verres so fiercely – *sed quid ego tam vehementer* ***invehor****?* (*Ver*. 2.4.8). The verb is used of verbal attack quite frequently in Cicero's later works (e.g. *de Orat*. 1.24, *Sest*. 14, *Flacc*. 38, *Phil*. 2.74), but in fact this instance from the *Verrines* is both the next attested after Pl. *Mer*. 998 and the only found in Cicero's pre-consular works.[15]

---

[15] Cf. Powell 2007: 2, who states that *invehor* as a military term was "well known to Cicero." Though this may certainly be true, what is not clear is how well known to Cicero *invehor* was as a metaphor for verbal attack; from the evidence given here, Cicero appears to be responsible for bringing it into common usage in the second half of his career.

iugulo. A term used of sacrificing animals and of single combat – whether in the arena or the battlefield – *iugulo* properly denotes killing by cutting the throat (cf. *TLL* 7.2.634.83 and *OLD* s.v. 1).[16] By the time of Terence its figurative use was already proverbial in some instances, for example its application to cunning and deceptive speech in *Adelphoe* (*suo sibi gladio hunc* ***iugulo***; *Ad*. 958) and to a clever, harsh retort in *Eunuchus* (*pulchre mehercle dictum et sapienter. papae,* ***iugularas*** *hominem!*; *Eu*. 417), and in such instances the verb's sense is that of 'slaughtering' more generally rather than 'cutting the throat' specifically.[17] The term first appears in a judicial context at *Rhet. Her*. 4.51. Likewise, when the figurative sense of *iugulo* in this survey is clear, it is nearly exclusively of slaughter in the courtroom that Cicero employs it, that is of 'destroying' an individual by means of some sort of judicial action (cf. *TLL* 7.2.636.58-77).[18] Note that in *Pro Cluentio* Cicero closely pairs *iugulo* with *perdo* (*Oppianicum iam perditum et duobus* ***iugulatum*** *praeiudiciis*; *Clu*. 68), and that the same pairing can be observed twice at *Quinct*. 51.

Use to denote judicial slaughter occurs multiple times in a number of the speeches considered here, for instance in Cicero's statement that the Roscii handed Sextus Roscius over to the courts for slaughter when they failed to achieve it themselves (*quem* (sc. *Sextum*) *ipsi ... non potuerunt occidere, eum* ***iugulandum*** *vobis tradiderunt*; *Rosc*. 29), or in his disbelief that Verres would be unable to recognize that he had been slaughtered by the letter just read as evidence against him (*his te litteris ...* ***iugulatum esse*** *non sentis?*; *Ver*. 2.3.126); for this usage compare also *Quinct*. 44, 51, 95; *Ver*. 2.5.166 (in this context potentially a hunting image); and *Clu*. 68. Use of political actions more broadly is found at *Ver*. 2.2.64 (*posteaquam tam multis eum factis decretisque* ***iugulasset***). It is necessary to emphasize here that as the various pieces of evidence cited above indicate, by even the earlier years of Cicero's career *iugulo* appears to have been very common both as a judicial term and as a proverbial expression in general. Its force must therefore be weighed accordingly, and in all likelihood the verb was felt to mean little more than *perdo* in many instances.

---

[16] On *iugulo* as a combat term appropriate to both gladiators and the military, cf. Fantham 1972: 30-31.

[17] Cf. Otto 1890: 154 on Ter. *Ad*. 958 as proverbial; cf. likewise Fantham 1972: 31 n. 19 for the suggestion that Cicero's '*cum illum plumbeo gladio* ***iugulatum iri*** *diceret'* (*Att*.1.16.2) also "seems to be proverbial."

[18] I consider the use of *iugulo* at *S. Rosc*. 13 ambiguous, and potentially *S. Rosc*. 32 as well.

lacesso. Like *adorior* above, the verb *lacesso* was originally proper to the military, in sense 'to challenge to a contest' (*OLD* s.v. 1).[19] By the mid second century BCE, however, much of this flavor had perhaps disappeared, and in comedy especially the verb began to be applied to verbal assailing and provoking (Pl. *St*. 76; Ter. *Eu*. 16; *Ph*. 13, 19; cf. *OLD* s.v. 4b). In the *Verrines*, *lacesso* is used with the term *sponsio* to indicate the issuing of a formal legal challenge (cf. *OLD* s.v. 1b) – *quid? cum palam ... L. Rubrius Q. Apronium sponsione* ***lacessivit*** *...?* (*Ver*. 2.3.132). In *De Inventione* and *Pro Cluentio* Cicero employs it less formally to the general act of provoking one to hostile or retaliatory action (cf. *OLD* s.v. 2a) – *relatio criminis est, cum ideo iure factum dicitur, quod aliquis ante iniuria* ***lacessierit*** (*Inv*. 1.15); *deinde ut intellegere posset Brutus, quem hominem ...* ***lacessisset*** (*Clu*. 141). Very likely this use was common at the start of Cicero's career as it is applied in the same fashion at *Rhet. Her*. 2.29.[20]

laedo. In primary usage the verb *laedo* denotes the 'light' wounding ((*leviter*) *vulnerare*; *TLL* 7.2.86.53) of an object, but it too carried little force as a metaphor by the middle of the second century BCE. For as the first chapter argued, in Terence's prologues *laedo* served as a near synonym of *maledico* (Ter. *Ph*. 11; *Eu*. 6, 18; cf. also Lucil. 1035 M and *Rhet. Her*. 2.19), and in the early first century the verb replaced *vitupero* in the classic 'praise and blame' (*laudo et vitupero*) pairing (cf. e.g. *Rhet. Her*. 4.42).[21] Likewise, in this survey *laedo* is used in a very similar fashion. In judicial contexts it bears two functions – it serves as a *de facto* synonym of *accuso* and denotes the act of accusing or prosecuting – *si quis ... forte miratur me, qui tot annos ...* ***laeserim*** *neminem, subito nunc mutata voluntate ad accusandum descendere* (*Div. Caec*. 1); and less specifically it signifies damage to one's credibility through witness testimony or documentary evidence – *quid metuebat? ne oppugnaretur a perdito, an ne* *accusaretur* *a damnato, an ne exsulis testimonio* ***laederetur****?* (*Clu*. 170); cf. also *Ver*. 2.2.178 for use with documents (*litteris*).

---

[19] Cf. Fantham 1972: 28. Though a *TLL* entry is available for *lacesso*, here I cite the *OLD* exclusively because the distinctions it provides for this verb are finer than those offered by the *TLL*.

[20] Neither *Inv*. 1.15 nor *Clu*. 141 are listed under *OLD* s.v. 2a, but in fact neither do they appear in any of the *OLD*'s categories. I classify them here both because of their general sense and because *iniuria* in *Inv*. 1.15 echoes that of *Rhet. Her*. 2.29, the latter of which is indeed listed under usage 2a.

[21] Again, cf. Fantham 1972: 28 on *laedo* as devoid of much of its military associations by Terence's day.

Outside of the courts, *laedo* denotes the act of slandering – compare its close association with *vitupero* at *S. Rosc*. 142 (*qui et se et causam* ***laedi*** *putet, cum Chrysogonus* *vituperetur*) – as well as that of damaging a person's political standing or reputation more generally, as is seen for instance several times in the *Verrines* at large – e.g. *hic tu si* ***laesum*** *te a Verre esse dices, patiar et concedam* (*Div. Caec*. 58), *tot viri ... ab homine nequissimo ac turpissimo* ***laesi***, (*Ver*. 2.3.30); cf. similarly *Inv*. 1.24, *S. Rosc*. 112 and 116, and in addition a number of instances in which, in apparent metonymy or synechdoche, an abstract noun replaces the target himself as the recipient of the verb's action (cf. *TLL* 7.2.869.33-67; e.g. *statuunt illi atque decernunt ut eae litterae quibus* *existimatio* *C. Verris* ***laederetur*** *removerentur*, *Ver*. 2.2.173; *a me...omnia ...dicentur, ut ... neque cuiusquam aut* *dignitas* ***laesa*** *aut ...*, *Clu*. 118). Thus, in this period *laedo* was a common term in both judicial and more general discourse, and as the quasi-synonyms above indicate, its figurative force remained weak.

noceo.[22] Similar to *laedo*, the verb *noceo* means 'to injure physically, hurt, or damage' (*OLD* s.v. 1), and in figurative usage refers to damage done to someone 'in respect of his circumstances, interests, etc.' (*OLD* s.v. 2). In verbal form it is applied to people in a figurative sense less frequently than *laedo* – though use of the substantival *nocens* was common (cf. *OLD* s.v. *nocens* 1-2) – but still it can be seen used thus at *Quinct*. 1 (*gratia Sex. Naevi ne P. Quinctio* ***noceat****, id vero non mediocriter pertimesco*) and *Ver*. 2.2.96 (*confirmat iis curaturum se esse ne quid ei per filium suum* ***noceretur***).

obruo. The verb *obruo* in primary usage signifies a downward pressing motion (*obiciendo, superiaciendo tegere, premere sim*.; *TLL* 9.2.151.35-36) – one of covering up or over (*OLD* s.v. 1-2b), of burying (*OLD* s.v. 2c-3a), or of crushing (*OLD* s.v. 3b). Accordingly, used as a metaphor it carries a sense of overwhelming (*OLD* s.v. 4-6) or suppressing so as to obscure (*OLD* s.v. 7-9); compare its use in conjunction with the climaxing *opprimo* at *Ver*. 2.1.20 (*deinde ... his criminibus, his testibus sic* ***obrutus*** *atque oppressus est*). The verb is first attested of overwhelming by means of words in Ennius (Enn. *scen*. 421). In this survey Cicero applies *obruo* to people particularly in the context of the courts, of overwhelming someone by means of witness testimony or evidence (*metuit ne hoc vos existimetis;* ***obruitur*** *enim aratorum testimoniis*, *Ver*. 2.2.151; cf. *Ver*. 2.1.20 above), but also of overwhelming with words or arguments more generally, as Cicero fears Hortensius would do to Caecilius should the latter prosecute Verres (*mihi enim videtur periculum fore ne ille ... verbis te* ***obruat***; *Div. Caec*. 46).

---

[22] As of yet, no *TLL* entry is available for the verb *noceo*.

opprimo. The sense of 'pressing' is even more inherent to *opprimo* than *obruo*, as the verb itself is a compound of *ob* and *premo*. In primary usage *opprimo* denotes the act of 'pressing on', often so as to attack, wear out, end, destroy, etc. (*premendo sive tractare sive conficere, consumere vel occupare, invadere*; *TLL* 9.2.784.52-3); once again it too carried military associations at one point (cf. *TLL* 9.2.788.53-789.6).[23] Figurative usage of this verb is wide. In this survey, Cicero again applies it to people most frequently in the context of the courts (cf. *TLL* 9.2.789.7-41) – of 'crushing' by means of a trial (*quo is facilius, quem velit, iniquo iudicio* ***opprimere*** *possit*, *Quinct*. 7; *est quisquam qui ... suspicari possit Oppianicum iudicio* ***oppressum***, *Clu*. 30; cf. also *Clu*. 192), clever argumentation (*numquam ille me* ***opprimet*** *consilio*; *Div. Caec*. 44), questioning (*ac ne subito a me* ***opprimantur****, haec sum rogaturus*; *Ver*. 2.4.150), or again witness testimony (cf. *Ver*. 2.1.20, cited above under '*obruo*'). Cicero uses *opprimo* in broader contexts as well, though, for in the *Verrines* the verb accumulates with *vexo* and is applied to all those who had been tormented and crushed by Verres' abuses *en masse* (*non contumelias quibus vexati* ***oppressi****que erant, conquerebantur*; *Ver*. 2.4.111).

oppugno. Another term proper to the military (cf. *OLD* s.v. 1a), the verb's sense of 'to attack' is transferred frequently in this period both to speech as well as to actions (cf. *OLD* s.v. 2a), both of which are reflected as early as Plautus (e.g. *Bac*. 1171, *Epid*. 163, *Mos*. 683) as well as in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (e.g. *Rhet. Her*. 4.47, 51). In the context of the courts, Cicero employs *oppugno* in the sense of *accuso* at *Clu*. 170 (*quid*

---

[23] Cf. Fantham 1972: 28.

metuebat? ne ***oppugnaretur*** *a perdito, ...* *accusaretur* *... laederetur?*), but elsewhere with it he denotes verbal attack more generally (*quid vis amplius? quid insequeris, quid* ***oppugnas****?*; *S. Rosc*. 145; cf. *Div. Caec*. 23). Note a similar application to verbal attack at *Inv*. 1.1 (*qui vero ita sese* *armat* *eloquentia, ut non* ***oppugnare*** *commoda patriae ...*). For *oppugno* used to characterize *ad hominem* actions on a broader scale – political or otherwise – compare two instances in the *Verrines*, one referring to Verres' actions as quaestor against the consul (*potest ei non inimicus esse qui quaestor consulem suum ...* ***oppugnare*** *ausus sit?*; *Ver*. 2.3.6) and the other to the request of Verres' father that Sthenius' friends and supporters cease attacking his son for prosecuting Sthenius in absentia (*postea senex Verres ... rogat eos atque orat ne* ***oppugnent*** *filium suum*; *Ver*. 2.2.96).

parco. The verb *parco* fundamentally designates the opposite of such terms as *iugulo* and *oppugno*; for instance, in a military context it indicates refraining from wounding or killing an opponent (*TLL* 10.1.333.52-75). Likewise, when used figuratively in a judicial setting, *parco* denotes 'sparing' in the sense of refraining from verbal attack, conviction, etc. (*TLL* 10.1.334.24-43). Cicero applies it to a lack of conviction at *Ver*. 2.1.81 (*huic homini* ***parcetis*** *igitur, iudices ... ?*) and to verbal attack more generally – in the form of harsh oratory in defense of his client – at *S. Rosc*. 95 (*vereor enim ... ne ita hunc videar voluisse servare, ut tibi omnino non* ***pepercerim****. cum hoc vereor et cupio tibi ...* ***parcere****, rursus immuto voluntatem meam*). Previous to Cicero, the verb was used commonly in drama of 'sparing' one's feelings (Pl. *As*. 177, *Rud*. 222; Ter. *Hau*. 43; Acc. *trag*. 137; cf. *OLD* s.v. 4).

perdo. The primary meaning of *perdo* is 'to ruin' or 'destroy', or intransitively 'to bring about ruin and destruction' (cf. *TLL* 10.1.1262.5, *OLD* s.v. 1). Technically speaking, its application to people does not represent a true metaphorical transfer of sense. It is included here, however, for two reasons. First, since *perdo* can be employed in both physical and non-physical senses, instances in which the destruction caused is not physical – e.g. political ruin – feel rather like figurative applications of the verb's primary usage in denoting physical destruction, death for instance.[24] And second, as several of the entries above have already demonstrated, Cicero employs *perdo* in close pairing with verbs whose application is clearly figurative, especially *iugulo* (cf. *Oppianicum iam* ***perditum*** *et duobus* *iugulatum* *praeiudiciis*; *Clu*. 68); compare its pairing with *affligo* as well at *S. Rosc*. 33; *Ver*. 2.3.37, 212. This study is concerned with the verb's application to people in a generally hyperbolic and non-physical sense (cf. *OLD* s.v. 1a, *TLL* 10.1.1262.8-41), that is of 'ruining' someone. As earlier precedents of verbal 'ruining', compare Pl. *Cur*. 335 and *Men*. 839. In works of this survey, Cicero uses *perdo* to denote a person's general ruin most frequently in the form of a perfect passive participle, often accompanied by an ablative of means – Sextus Roscius is ruined by grief (*iste T. Roscius ... hunc miserum, luctu* ***perditum*** *... nudum eicit domo*; *S. Rosc*. 23) and Oppianicus by two previous court verdicts (*Oppianicum iam* ***perditum*** *et duobus iugulatum praeiudiciis*; *Clu*. 68).[25]

Similar usage is found at *Ver*. 2.5.24 as well as *Clu*. 70, in the second of which the participle is used absolutely. As indicated above, however, the agents of such instances tend not to be people but 'things', abstract or concrete. Cicero uses *perdo* to characterize the actions of one person against another far less frequently and typically by means of a finite active verb, employing it thus to accuse Verres of ruining the Sicilians with his edicts (*eos* (sc. *Siculos*) *quidem superioribus edictis satis* ***perdiderat*** *atque afflixerat*; *Ver*. 2.3.37). Note a finite application with an abstract as agent (*mors*) at *S. Rosc*. 33. Of the instances listed here, only two occur in a specifically judicial context (*Clu*. 68, 70).

perverto. Indicating primarily the overturning or knocking down of standing objects, whether people or things (*TLL* 10.1.1860.16-17; cf. *OLD* s.v. 1), in figurative usage *perverto*, like *perdo*, denotes ruin or destruction. Applied to people in particular, it signifies the bringing about of one's downfall – often with the sense of moral corruption – and is seen first in such usage in Plautus (*Poen*. 874, *Truc*. 153; cf. *TLL* 10.1.1860.44-

---

[24] For *perdo* used to signify killing, cf. *OLD* s.v. 1c; for its physical applications in general, cf. *OLD* s.v. 1a-b *passim*, and particularly 1c and 2b.

[25] Such instances are to be distinguished from those in which forms of *perditus* are used as adjectives, common not only in general hyperbole but also as a more specific political designation – the *perditi* as the opposite of the *boni* (cf. Hellegouarc'h 1972: 533-4).

57, *OLD* s.v. 2a). Cicero uses it thus in *Pro Cluentio* when he speaks of the ruin Quinctius caused C. Iunius by achieving the latter's conviction (*itaque ipse postquam Iunium* ***pervertit****, totam causam reliquit*; *Clu*. 108). Compare also *Div. Caec*. 44 where *perverto* appears in parallel with *opprimo* (*numquam ille me* *opprimet* *consilio, numquam ullo artificio* ***pervertet***), suggesting that the two terms, if not direct synonyms, at least belong to a shared imagery domain.

propugno. The verb *propugno* is used as an image of 'fighting in defense' (cf. *TLL* 10.2.2140.11-12) at *Inv*. 1.1 (*qui vero ita sese armat eloquentia, ut non oppugnare commoda patriae, sed pro his* ***propugnare*** *possit, is mihi vir ... utilissimus atque amicissimus civis fore videtur*), where Cicero employs it at the treatise's start to illustrate the contrasting defensive and offensive positions that an orator and statesman can assume.[26]

pugno. In primary usage, the verb *pugno* denotes physical contending (*TLL* 10.2.2552.33, *OLD* s.v. 1) – that is 'fighting' – especially competition in battle, whether general brawling, gladiatorial contests, or a military context more strictly (cf. *TLL* 10.2.2552.39-2554.19). In figurative usage, *pugno* is used of 'fighting' in word, thought, or action (cf. *TLL* 10.2.2555.50-65, *OLD* s.v. 4) and is first attested thus in Lucilius (*verba dare ut caute possint,* ***pugnare*** *dolose, blanditia certare*; Lucil. 1232-1 M). In the works surveyed here, Cicero calls upon such usage quite frequently, overwhelmingly in the context of the courts. For instance, Cicero characterizes Verres as fighting against him at several points during the *First Action* of the *Verrines* (*iste homo amens ac perditus alia mecum ratione* ***pugnat***, *Ver*. 1.15; *nunc, quoniam* ***pugnare*** *contra me instituisti*, *Ver*. 1.33), and in *Pro Roscio Amerino* he mocks C. Erucius as a second-rate *accusator* compared to others, whom both their age and the laws had prohibited from fighting in court (*quos* (sc. *accusatores*) *iam aetas a proeliis avocabat ... sed etiam leges* ***pugnare*** *prohibebant*; *S. Rosc*. 90). Compare similar usage in a judicial context at *Quinct*. 43; *S. Rosc*. 8, 28, 35; *Div. Caec*. 44; and *Clu*. 116, in addition to *Rhet. Her*. 4.2. Usage in a broader political context can be seen at *Quinct*. 29 (*Alfenus interea Romae cum isto gladiatore vetulo cotidie* ***pugnabat***).

---

[26] Cf. again Fantham 1972: 155-6 and p. 74 n. 13 above.

pungo. As defined by the *TLL*, the meaning of *pungo* is "to strike or touch with an object more or less sharp" (*re magis minusve acuta ferire vel tangere*, *TLL* 10.2.2641.18). Its figurative use signifies the causing of distress or vexing (cf. *OLD* s.v. 4 and Pl. *Trin*. 1000, *Truc*. 853) and evokes images ranging from an insect's sting to sword-play.[27] Cicero applies *pungo* to the sting or puncture caused specifically by words in *Pro Roscio Amerino*, explaining to the jury that when he mentioned Chrysogonus' name, Erucius started, and that he then understood what it was that had 'stung' him (*intellexi, quid eum* ***pupugisset***; *S. Rosc*. 60).

repello.[28] In meaning and usage *repello* proves quite similar to *depello* above. Cicero employs *repello* of repulsing something or someone by means of words or arguments (cf. *OLD* s.v. 2c) twice in the *Verrines* – of repelling the plots that Verres had laid against him at *Ver*. 1.3 (*insidiae ... quas partim ... devitarim, partim ...* ***reppulerim***), and of himself repulsed by Verres' argument that Verres had *bought* the statues Cicero accused him of pilfering at *Ver*. 2.4.8 (*verbo uno* ***repellar***. *"emi," inquit*); compare previous usage of verbal repulsing at Pl. *Bac*. 633 and 967.

vexo. Like several of the terms listed above, *vexo* as examined here does not represent a true metaphor. Again, though, as the verb's primary usage refers to physical acts of damage or harassment – the constant application of blows to a body, the ravaging of a country, etc. (cf. *OLD* s.v. 1-3a) – instances in which *vexo* denotes non-physical harassment or injury feel somewhat transferred in sense. That the force of *vexo* in physical applications was substantial is indicated by parallel usage with *lacero* (cf. e.g. *cum ... Hannibal terram Italiam laceraret atque* ***vexaret***, Cato *orat*. 177; *ut ... in eius corpore lacerando et* ***vexando*** *... oculos paverit suos*, Cic. *Phil*. 11.8). In designating non-physical injury, however, *vexo* weakens somewhat in force. Cicero employs the term several times in this survey to refer to the harassment caused to one or more people by abusive speech (*contumeliae*; cf. *OLD* s.v. 5b), in one of which it is rather *opprimo* that parallels the verb – *non contumelias quibus* ***vexati*** *oppressique erant, conquerebantur* (*Ver*. 2.4.111); *multis* ***vexatus*** *contumeliis, plurimis iactatus iniuriis* (*Quinct*. 98). Compare *vexo* used of the harassment of one person by another also at *Ver*. 2.3.101 (*Theomnastus Syracusanus ... qui aratores ita* ***vexavit*** *ut* ...), though here the action is broader in scope (cf. *OLD* s.v. 5a). For instances in which either the verb's agent or object is an abstract noun instead of a person, cf. e.g. *S. Rosc*. 67, 141; *Ver*. 2.5.174.

---

[27] On *pungo* as a 'sting', akin to the Greek κεντέω (specifically in noun form, i.e. κέντρον), cf. Fantham 1972: 100 and 100 n. 5; as evocative of sword-play in some of Cicero's letters, cf. Fantham 1972: 31.

[28] At the time of writing, *TLL* entries cease from this point on.

vinco. Indicating in primary usage the overcoming of an opponent on the military field or in a physical fight (cf. *OLD* s.v. 1-2), *vinco* was fairly common in non-physical and figurative applications even by the early to mid second century BCE; compare its use to denote various types of verbal victory in Ennius, Plautus, and Terence (in non-judicial contexts, cf. e.g. Pl. *Mil*. 190, *Rud*. 1076; Ter. *An*. 892, *Hau*. 644; of court victory in particular, cf. Enn. *scen*. 149; cf. in general *OLD* s.v. 4-5). Here I do not claim to cover Cicero's figurative usage in even a remotely comprehensive sense, for such instances are far too numerous, occurring in the works surveyed here more than thirty times. Instead, I note simply that figurative usage remained common in this period, and that Cicero applied *vinco* quite often to verbal victory specifically, predominantly in a judicial setting in the works surveyed here. Compare his confident assertion at the start of the *Second Action* of the *Verrines* that as far as Cicero is concerned, he has already won his case (*quapropter ego, quod ad me attinet, iudices,* ***vici***; *Ver*. 2.1.21), or likewise *Pro Roscio Amerino*, where Cicero argues that since Erucius can produce no motive in a case of parricide, on this fact alone Cicero should be deemed the victor (*tametsi statim* ***vicisse*** *debeo, tamen de meo iure decedam*; *S. Rosc*. 73). Other instances specific to the courts include *Ver*. 1.16 and 2.3.40, though here abstract nouns serve either as agent or object, and slightly more ambiguously at *Quinct*. 47 and 95. Use of *vinco* to indicate defeat in a situation more broadly – beyond the context of the courts or of words in general – can be seen at *Ver*. 2.4.76.

I.b. Initial Comments

Before turning to interpretation a few initial comments are necessary, the first of which involves frequency. In referring to harsh or accusatory speaking, one common method of intensification seen in these works is the simple addition of certain adverbs or adjectives, most prominently *vehementer*/*vehemens*, but in a few cases such others as *acriter*/*acer* and *aspere*/*asper*. Such instances naturally occur rather frequently, particularly those of *vehementer*/*vehemens*.[29] Yet just as often, perhaps, Cicero chooses amplification through a metaphor. Note that for many of the verbs listed above, more instances are recorded than can be counted on one hand. This is true, for instance, of *affligo*, *everto*, *iugulo*, *laedo*, *opprimo*, *oppugno*, *pugno*, and *vinco*, and again as this study does not claim to include every instance of similar usage for each term, other verbs could be added here as well, and moreover the total number of instances possible for each verb is likely somewhat higher than is reflected in the entries above. Thus, these verbs likewise represent a common means of amplification in this period, occurring with at least moderately high frequency.

Second, as a general mode of discourse these verbs occur *consistently* throughout the works surveyed. Of course the greatest proportion of these works are judicial speeches, but *De Inventione* offers more than a few corroborating instances, and the court speeches themselves are not of a single nature. According to type, within this survey are represented speeches in defense, speeches in prosecution, and a *divinatio* speech. Furthermore, several speeches across these types contain sections of notable invective abuse, as well as abusive epithets and characterizations both within these sections and throughout the speech. In *Pro Roscio Amerino*, for example, Chrysogonus and the Roscii are *sectores*, semantically both 'brokers' and 'cutthroats'; 'assassins' (*sicarii*) and 'gladiators' (*gladiatores*); and are associated by Cicero in general with terms involving 'banditry' and 'plunder', especially the noun *praeda*, but also such others as *latro*, *latrocinium*, and *sicarius*.[30] Likewise, in *Pro Quinctio* Sex. Naevius is an 'auctioneer' (*praeco*) and a 'buffoon' (*scurra*), and Sassia in *Pro Cluentio* is a *mulier* in the pejorative sense – an abhorrent parent and a *meretrix* of unbridled passion, portrayed by Cicero "in contexts of Bacchanalian rhetoric and combinations of modifiers that recall beasts, tyrants, gladiators, pirates, and the criminally insane."[31] Finally, in the *Verrines* Cicero labels Verres a robber, pirate, and leader of fugitive slaves; a tyrant; a conspirator; a beast and monster – an *importunum animal* (2.1.42) more dangerous than Scylla or Charybdis; a boar specifically, living up to his name; and a dog.[32]

---

[29] For *vehementer/vehemens*, cf. e.g. ***vehementissime*** *restitit* (*Ver*. 2.2.88), ***vehementius*** *dixerit* (*Ver*. 2.2.149), *vituperatio* ***vehemens*** (*Inv*. 2.178); in combination with *graviter*/*gravis* as well, *contio* ***vehemens*** *et* ***gravis*** (*Clu*. 77), ***graviter vehementer****que dixerint* (*Ver*. 2.2.156), *dici* ... ***graviter*** *et* ***vehementer*** (*Ver*. 2.1.86). For *acriter*/*acer*, cf. e.g. *minari* ***acerrime*** (*Ver*. 2.4.66), ***acerrima*** ... *criminationis* (*Inv*. 2.84), ***acrior*** ... *accusator* (*Ver*. 2.4.70); and for *aspere*/*asper*, ***asperius*** *dicta recitasset* (*Clu*. 140).

Thus, the epithets and labels in these works are many, and in many cases are tailored semantically to suit the context. The verbs listed above, however, neither correspond to nor reflect such tailoring. Cicero applies them in a consistent fashion in these works, regardless of the particular invective characterizations he employs. Accordingly, these verbs may tentatively be considered a standard and consistent type of discourse that represents both Cicero's individual usage in his pre-consular career as well as common usage more generally at this point in the Republic.

---

[30] On Chrysogonus and the Roscii as *sectores* and the semantic play in this term, cf. Vasaly 1985: 16, Imholtz 1972: 228-30; as assassins and gladiators, May 1988: 22-23; 26; 30; associated with terms involving banditry and plunder, Vasaly 2002: 79 and 79 n. 14.

[31] On Naevius characterized as an auctioneer and buffoon, cf. May 1988: 15-18; on Sassia as a lustful, beast-like *meretrix*, cf. Santoro L'Hoir 1997: 40-43 (43 for quote).

[32] On Verres as a robber, pirate, and slave leader, cf. Vasaly 2002: 100, noting that these terms are "particularly resonant within a Sicilian context;" cf. Frazel 2009: 71-124 on Verres as a robber, thief, and general violator within a sacred context; on Verres as a tyrant, cf. Dunkle 1967: 160-62 *et passim*; Vasaly 1993: 117, 212-15; May 1995: 151 n. 25 for instances within the *Verrines*; cf. also Frazel 2009: 125-86; a conspirator, Spencer 2010-2011: 121-141; a beast and monster, May 1995: 143-4; cf. e.g. *Ver*. 2.1.42, 2.5.146; a boar, Corbeill 1996: 91-95; and a dog, e.g. *Ver*. 2.3.177; 2.4.31, 40, and 47.

II. Categories by Meaning and Sphere

Having established that the verbs listed above represent a standard mode of discourse, this chapter now proceeds to analysis. This first section categorizes these verbs first by meaning and then by imagery sphere, and thus it indicates both the general semantic groups that comprise this discourse as well as the larger spheres or types which they represent.

II.a. Categories By Meaning

This section begins by categorizing these verbs by meaning. Although a variety of combinations is possible if one accords greater weight to certain nuances over others, prioritizing basic meaning in many cases neutralizes such dilemmas and yields clear and appropriate categories. Thus, these verbs are organized below according to their sense in primary – or physical – usage (as cited from the *TLL* and *OLD* in the previous section), and to further validate these categories, for each are listed nouns of corresponding meaning that occur in these works.

1. 'compete, contend, combat, skirmish' (*certo*, *contendo*, *dimico*, *pugno*, *propugno*)

This category, along with the following, represent the two most prominent seen here. Of the verbs listed above, those that comprise this category are *contendo*, *certo*, *dimico*, *pugno*, and *propugno*. Compare in addition the following nouns denoting ‘combat’ or ‘competition’ that appear in these works: *certamen* (*Div. Caec*. 37), *proelium* (*S. Rosc*. 90), and *pugna* (*S. Rosc*. 17; *Div. Caec*. 47).[33]

2. ‘attack’ (*adorior*, *impugno*, *invehor*, *oppugno*)

In this category fall *adorior*, *impugno*, *invehor*, and *oppugno*, all of which denote ‘attack’ in the sense of a hostile motion directed toward or at an object. For nouns and noun phrases of corresponding meaning, compare *impetus* (*Quinct*. 8; *Ver*. 2.3.40, 142), *bellum* X (with *infero*, *Div. Caec*. 62), and *caput* X (with *peto*, *Quinct*. 29; with *oppugno*, *Quinct*. 40).

3. ‘challenge, arouse to hostile action’ (*lacesso*)

4. ‘arm, equip’ (*armo*)

The verb *armo* naturally falls here, as do the nouns *arma* (Quinct. 45) and *telum* (*Quinct*. 8; *Clu*. 50; with forms of *iacio* in particular, *Quinct*. 8 (x2), *Quinct*. 52). Besides *vulnus*, which appears in a category below, *telum* is the most prominent noun found in these works, an unsurprising fact given the traditional association of long-range weapons with speech.[34]

---

[33] Somewhat appropriate to this category too are *concursatio* (*Ver*. 2.1.75) and *prolusio* (*Div. Caec*. 47), for the latter properly indicates a preparatory stage of battle or competition (cf. *TLL* 10.2.1840.20-35) and through the former was a common political term used in reference to the ‘steps’ taken in a trial or of securing votes in the senate (cf. Hellegouarc’h 1972: 211-2, and 212 n. 3 for *Ver*. 2.1.75 as representing ‘trial’ usage), still it potentially carried combat overtones in Cicero’s day as the term at least by the time of Livy was also used to represent *in re militari* ‘thronging together’ in light-armed skirmishing (cf. *TLL* 4.113.77-85).

[34] For other similar instances of *arma*, especially in *De Oratore*, cf. Fantham 1972: 156-7. On the frequent and traditional use of long-range weapons in representing utterance, cf. Fantham 1972: 157; on the Greek side, cf. the similar use of βέλη ἀφίημι e.g. in Plato’s *Symposium* (*Smp*. 219b3; cf. Chapter One, p. 39 n. 44).

5. ‘defeat, stand victorious’ (*vinco*)

Signifying ‘victory’ and ‘defeat’ are not only the verb *vinco* but also the noun *palma* (*S. Rosc*. 17, 84), the latter of which designates both the prize awarded for victory in a variety of contests as well as the victory achieved itself.[35]

6. ‘spare’ (*parco*)

7. ‘push away’ (*depello*, *repello*)

8. ‘harm, wound, harass with blows’ (*laedo*, *noceo*, *vexo*)

To this category belong the verbs *laedo* and *noceo*, both of which signify light to moderate – i.e. non-mortal – harm or injury, and *vexo*, indicating the application of physical blows or some other means of damage to a target. Of similar meaning is the noun *vulnus* (*Inv*. 1.30; *S. Rosc*. 91; *Quinct*. 8; *Ver*. 2.5.174; *Clu*. 58), which again, besides *telum*, is the most frequently occurring noun found here (cf. category 4 above).[36]

9. ‘slaughter, kill’ (*iugulo*, *perdo*)

This category comprises verbs that in primary (or physical) application signify ‘slaying’ or ‘killing’. The verb *iugulo* denotes slaughter by killing the throat specifically, and *perdo* too indicates actual killing on a more general level, though this sense may not predominate among the verb’s primary usages as it does in the case of *iugulo*.

10. ‘(over)turn, press upon’ (*everto*, *exstinguo*, *obruo*, *opprimo*, *perverto*)

The third most prominent category of this analysis, five of the verbs listed above apply here, signifying at their fundamental level a motion of turning or pressing so as to destroy, end, etc. – *everto*, *exstinguo*, *obruo*, *opprimo*, and *perverto*, all but one of which appear in close pairings with at least one other of these verbs, as the documentation section has indicated.[37]

---

[35] On *palma*, cf. Fantham 1972: 34, 85; *TLL* 10.1.144.8-23; and *OLD* s.v. 5-6.

[36] For *vulnus* used in representing political ‘wounds’, particularly those inflicted upon the state, cf. Fantham 1972: 128-9 and generally Walters 2011.

11. ‘strike, puncture’ (*affligo*, *pungo*)

Applied properly, two verbs of this survey denote ‘striking’ an object: *affligo* and *pungo*. The noun *aculeus* (*Ver*. 2.3.95) bears similar meaning in primary use; moreover, it parallels κέντρον as an image of ‘stinging’ abuse – compare such usage also in Plautus (e.g. *Trin*. 1000; cf. also *Bac*. 63) – and thus it is further connected to *pungo* in particular.

II.b. Categories By Sphere

From the semantic categories detailed above two distinct groups or spheres emerge. First is that of physical combat or competition. This grouping comprises the first nine categories above – though categories eight and nine are more loosely related to combat than the first seven – and accounts for twenty of the twenty-seven total verbs.[38] For the most part, specific references to oratorical and judicial action are found here, though occasionally these verbs refer to broader action as well.[39]

The remaining seven verbs of this survey – semantic categories ten and eleven – can be grouped under the sphere of ‘affliction’, the sense of which is easily extended to any of the seven and in fact echoes explicitly one of them (*affligo*).[40] Though the semantic unity of this assemblage may seem rather rough, in fact all of these verbs are connected to one another through parallel usage and thus form a cohesive group. Here follows a chart that lists each of the seven 'affliction' terms and the verbs with which they appear in such pairings, as previously indicated in the documentation portion of this chapter.

---

[37] The exception is *everto* which, though it is not used in parallel with the other verbs listed in this category, does appear thus with *affligo* (see above s.v. *everto*).

[38] I.e. *adorior*, *armo*, *certo*, *contendo*, *depello*, *dimico*, *impugno*, *invehor*, *iugulo*, *lacesso*, *laedo*, *noceo*, *oppugno*, *parco*, *perdo*, *propugno*, *pugno*, *repello*, *vexo*, *vinco*. Fantham 1972: 28 considers *laedo* original to the military too.

[39] For combat and competition verbs applied to political action more broadly conceived, cf. e.g. *certo* at *Ver*. 2.3.9; *contendo* at *Att*. 1.1.2, 4; *laedo* at *Div. Caec*. 58, *Inv*. 1.24, etc.; and *oppugno* at *Ver*. 2..2.96, 2.3.6.

Table 2: 'Affliction' Verbs in Cicero's Pre-Consular Works

Semantic Category	Verb	Synonyms
'turn, press upon'	everto	affligo (as ppp)[41]
	exstinguo	**opprimo**, deleo
	obruo	**opprimo**
	opprimo	exstinguo, obruo, perverto, vexo
	perverto	**opprimo**
'strike, puncture'	affligo	everto; perdo (esp. as ppp)
	pungo	(none)

As this chart indicates, the verbs in this category are paired nearly exclusively with other 'affliction' verbs; in fact, only one of the seven (*pungo*) does not accumulate in this manner with another from the chart. Moreover, such pairing crosses semantic boundaries, for *everto* of the 'turning, pressing upon' category accumulates with the 'striking' verb *affligo*. Through parallel usage and accumulation, then, the semantic groupings of the ‘affliction’ category display internal accord and are also linked with each other, and the category’s unity is thereby affirmed.

---

[40] I.e. *affligo*, *everto*, *exstinguo*, *obruo*, *opprimo*, *perverto*, *pungo*.

[41] Note that 'ppp' stands for 'perfect passive participle'.

Now, unlike the verbs of the combat and competition sphere, these ‘affliction’ verbs refer primarily to both political and general situations as well as to states of being, the latter particularly in perfect passive participle forms. Exceptions to this breakdown are found in *perverto*, *obruo*, and *opprimo*, all of which predominantly refer, either explicitly or at least potentially, to acts of oratory as well as to judicial action. In fact, though, *opprimo* may serve as a hinge term for the ‘affliction’ category. As the verb’s entry indicates, it too was originally a military term whose force as such, though perhaps diminished by Terence’s day, still is visible even in the works of this survey (cf. *Inv*. 1.69). In this way it is linked and even somewhat proper to the combat sphere. On the other hand, it is the predominant parallel of the ‘affliction’ verbs, appearing in tandem with three of the other four verbs in its semantic group (*exstinguo*, *obruo*, and *perverto*) – that is, with roughly half of the terms in the chart above. The verb *opprimo*, therefore, is firmly grounded in the ‘affliction’ sphere as well and thus functions as a cross-over term both between the ‘combat’ and ‘affliction’ categories as well as within the latter.

At this point, from the semantic groupings and larger categories presented above the following takeaway points can be observed.

1. In these lists no verbs of ‘breaking’, ‘cutting’, or ‘drawing blood’ in some fashion appear. The verb *iugulo* of course proves the exception, but again, usage of this verb was already proverbial by the time of Terence, and its force, as indicated by its pairing with *perdo*, was in all likelihood relatively weak. Compare likewise that in all

but a few cases, the terms detailed above do not entail the actual harming or wounding of the target.

2. Rather, these verbs center semantically on the exertion of force or motion in an antagonistic or hostile fashion – they indicate the act of competition and combat, but not its deadly results, as again the nouns for each category reflect as well. Thus, these terms display continuity within the categories of metaphors seen in the previous chapters with no real outliers in semantics or imagery sphere, for on the Greek side were found primarily terms of competition and combat – especially in the realm of athletics – in addition to verbs of 'striking', 'trampling', and 'thrusting' in comedy in particular; and on the Roman side pre-Cicero, terms strictly proper to the military, in addition to those more specific to Plautus and Terence, a good number of which have been observed here (e.g. *aculeus*, *invehor*, *iugulo*, *laedo*, *opprimo*).

3. In late Republican discourse, there seems to have existed two different categories of quasi-violent metaphors for '*ad hominem*' actions. The first encompasses verbs of 'afflicting' in primary usage and was typically used in a more generalized sense, that is of actions more broadly conceived. The second, terms involving competition and combat, was most frequently associated with oratory and verbal activity, though some overlap exists.

4. Finally, activity within the court forms the most frequent context of the combat and competition terms. Now, one could argue that judicial action plays such a pronounced role here because court speeches dominate both Cicero's early career and indeed the group of speeches selected for this survey. Yet association of the courts with combat terms is natural, for the courts represented a potential venue for politics and

inimicitiae to be played out. As Elaine Fantham states, “The courts were an obvious site for verbal duels, whether we consider civil lawsuits, where lack of audience might damp down potential wit, or the criminal courts, which were often politics conducted by other means.”[42] Cicero himself frequently draws connection between *inimicitiae* and prosecution, whether in motives, specific positioning of judges or advocates, or otherwise.[43] In addition, as a realm of activity, the courts are particularly apt to combat metaphors. From the simple standpoint of roles, the respective members of the defense and prosecution stand as inherently opposed participants or combatants in a competition in which one side will necessarily be declared the victor. This natural stance as opposed combatants is in fact echoed by the verbs proper to the action of each side, for the prosecution is represented by *accuso* and the defense by *defendo*, a term that in primary usage denotes the warding off of physical objects, force, or attack.[44] Note that native English speakers too tend toward such terms, as Fantham’s choice of the word ‘*duels*’ in the quote above illustrates.[45]

---

[42] Fantham 2004: 197-8. The fundamental study of the Roman courts as a venue in which political conflicts were played out is Gruen 1968, who, working from a prosopographical approach, gleans evidence for the period’s political alliances from the criminal trials that took place. Among the various scholarly reactions to Gruen’s work, and perhaps one of the most extreme, is Epstein 1987, arguing rather for the pervasive role of personal *inimicitiae* both in the courts and in Roman society in general (Epstein 1987: 90-99); on Roman *inimicitiae* in general, see Brunt 1988: 361-81, esp. 368-76. This is not to say, however, that the Roman courts did not function to determine innocence and guilt nor that Roman juries were uninterested in the truth, as Riggsby 1997 has demonstrated.

[43] In the *Second Action* of the *Verrines*, for instance, there occur numerous occasions on which Cicero links *inimicitiae* and status as an *inimicus* with the motivation to prosecute; cf. e.g. *Ver*. 2.2.92, 94, 109; 2.3.1, 130, 162.

[44] For this usage of *defendo*, cf. *TLL* 5.1.294.9-63.

[45] Cf. Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 4-5, who use the conceptual metaphor ‘argument as war’ to illustrate their thesis that in a given society, certain metaphors can prove so fundamental as to shape that culture’s conception of something; in this case they argue that ‘war’ is so inherent to English speakers’ concept of argument that war terminology naturally emerges in reference to this subject.

Moreover, Cicero makes several references to a specific language or discourse of the courts, one associated especially with prosecutors. He deems the general discourse of the courts one characterized by *severitas*, *asperitas*, and even the term *aculeus* in particular, as in *De Oratore* he alludes to the 'barbs' common in judicial language (*sententiarum forensium* ***aculeis***; *de Orat*. 2.64).[46] Furthermore, Cicero indicates that for prosecutors specifically there exists a *lex ... quaedam accusatoria* (*Mur*. 11) dictating *what* a prosecutor might say in terms of material and content, which in this instance consists at least of standard invective *topoi* that the prosecution has failed to employ against his client L. Licinius Murena in anything other than rote form, thus indicating Murena's upright character and inherent innocence.[47] But Cicero too refers to a common *manner* of speech used by prosecutors, dubbing this manner '*accusatorie loqui*' (*Ver*. 2.4.2), by which he signifies a prosecutor's use of amplification and hyperbole, both in language and in charges (*verbi neque criminis augendi causa*) – that is, amplification of the manner and language with which a prosecutor might handle his material.[48] For all these reasons, then, it seems quite natural that the courts should be associated both with general hyperbole – the root of all the metaphors listed above – and with quasi-violent combat metaphors in particular.

---

[46] For the *severitas* proper to the courts, compare Cicero's acknowledgement in the *Verrines* that that the jokes involving wordplay on Verres' name do not suit the severity of the courts (*quae ego non commemorarem – neque enim ... hac* ***severitate*** *digna sunt*; *Ver*. 2.1.121) as well as his advice to Q. Catulus that in making his charge, Catulus should assume the severity of a judge (*iudicis ...* ***severitatem*** *in hoc crimine ... suscipere debes*; *Ver*. 2.4.69). For the full context of *aculei*, as well as of *asperitas*, cf. *sine hac* ***iudiciali asperitate****, et sine sententiarum* ***forensium aculeis*** *persequendum est* (*de Orat*. 2.64).

[47] For the view that the Romans did actually consider character a fixed entity and thus a valid means of argument in court, cf. Riggsby 2004: 165, 177-9. Cf. Corbeill 1996: 17, who suggests that the word '*lex*' in this phrase "attests to the frequency and, presumably, efficacy of such tactics."

[48] Cf. in full – ***non*** *enim* ***verbi neque criminis augendi causa*** *complector omnia; cum dico nihil istum eius modi rerum in tota provincia reliquisse, Latine me scitote,* ***non accusatorie loqui*** (*Ver*. 2.4.2); cf. a similar reference to amplification at *Ver*. 2.4.124 (*vereor ne haec qui non viderunt omnia me nimis* ***augere*** *atque arbitrentur*).

III. Application

Having detailed the individual verbs, semantic categories, and image spheres of the period's discourse, this section turns to consider Cicero's application of these terms, that is the manner in which these terms tend to be used in the works surveyed here. Its goal is to show that, standard though this may seem, these terms in general evoke clear, distinct images and sit at a distance from the discourse at hand. Indeed, Cicero describes metaphors in precisely these terms. Metaphors, in his definition, are words that are 'transferred' (*transferentur*) and placed in a 'foreign' context (*alieno in loco*), and thereby are proper to a separate context or plane (3.149).[49] In addition, among their primary functions is to add vivid clarity, as Cicero emphasizes several times throughout *De Oratore* 3.155-8. For instance, he explains that metaphors serve to make clear (*illustrat*) that which cannot be conveyed fully by a *verbum proprium*, again deeming the metaphor itself 'foreign' (*alieno*) (3.155) as he continues to do throughout his discussion of metaphors as a whole (cf. forms of *alienus* also in 3.157, 159, and 165).[50] And slightly later on he argues that those words which should be transferred are those that either add deeper significance or lend greater, more vivid clarity (*clariorem faciunt*) (3.157-8).[51] Thus, in these passages are highlighted both elements mentioned above – that metaphors properly belong to a separate, foreign context or plane from which they are transferred, and that among their main functions is to create a clear, vivid image in the reader's mind.

---

[49] I.e. *eis quae* ***transferuntur*** *et quasi* ***alieno in loco*** *collocantur* (*de Orat*. 3.149). Of course *transfero* and *translatio* served as the technical terms for 'metaphor' in Latin up to the time of Quintilian; cf. also *Rhet. Her*. 4.45 and *OLD* s.v. *transfero* 5b-c and s.v. *translatio* 4a-b.

[50] I.e. *quod enim declarari vix verbo proprio potest, id translato cum est dictum,* ***illustrat*** *id quod intellegi volumus eius rei quam* ***alieno*** *verbo posuimus similitudo* (*de Orat*. 3.155); cf. *illustrat orationem* also in Quint. *Inst. Or*. 8.6.14.

[51] I.e. *sed ea transferri oportet quae aut* ***clariorem faciunt*** *rem, ... aut quo significatur magis res tota sive facti alicuius sive consilii* (3.157-8); cf. Mankin's comment that '*clariorem faciunt*' here means "more vivid" rather than simply "more clear" (Mankin 2011: 243-4 *ad loc*.). Cf. too that the creation of a vivid picture is the first of the six functions of metaphors listed in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (*ea* (sc. *translatio*) *sumitur rei* ***ante oculos*** *ponendae causa*; *Rhet. Her*. 4.45).

Returning to the material of this chapter, this section aims to demonstrate that these terms and their usage bear three particular characteristics: 1) specificity as images, both to and within the realm of warfare and single combat; 2) frequent appearance in concentrated clusters of metaphors; and 3) infrequent personal verb forms – especially those in the first-person – and indirect phrasing and application. In consequence, the terms surveyed here are distinct and reinforced as metaphors, and they sit at a remove from the discourse at hand, marked and separated out as distanced, impersonal, and 'other'. Natural though these observations may seem, they require discussion in some detail here, for ultimately they provide a basis for contrast with the material of the third chapter.

III.a. Specificity of Imagery

To begin, many of the terms found in this chapter – nouns as well as verbs – specifically evoke various aspects of warfare and single combat. That is, the images they conjure are specific both to this realm and, for the most part, within it. Now, the 'to' part of this statement has already been demonstrated in the previous sections of this chapter; that these terms are also specific *within* the sphere of combat and competition is seen in their evocation of two main image categories – the weaponry of combat, and the types and phases of combat encounters.[52] To start with the first, several of the terms surveyed above denote ‘weapons’ or the process of arming at a general level. For example, Cicero employs the noun *arma* at *Quinct*. 45 while asking Hortensius if the two of them can just ‘lay aside their weapons’ (*depositis* ***armis***) and discuss the matter without endangering anyone’s fortune, and he uses the verb *armare* in like fashion at *Inv*. 1.1, urging the statesman to ‘arm’ himself with oratory (*qui vero ita sese* ***armat*** *eloquentia*) in order to fight on his country’s behalf.[53] Moreover, several others terms specify long-range weapons in particular. The most common of course is the javelin or spear, *telum*, which Cicero accuses Naevius of hurling against Quinctius in all varieties (*in eum ... omnia* ***tela*** *coniecisti*; *Quinct*. 52). But indeed the noun *aculeus*, if one reads it as ‘arrow’ rather than ‘sting’ as Berry suggests, also indicates such a weapon type, embodying the shafts cast by reproachful abuse (*habet enim quendam* ***aculeum*** *contumelia*; *Ver*. 2.3.95).[54] And so several of the nouns and verbs listed above evoke images of weaponry with varying precision.

---

[52] A third category could potentially be added here – that of the occupations or roles of combat, specifically those proper to the arena. For in the works surveyed here, Cicero applies the terms *gladiator* and *lanista* in a figurative sense on several occasions to denote the specific roles appropriate to each term; cf. Cicero's use of the terms 'gladiator' (*gladiator*) and 'trainer' (*lanista*) in *Pro Roscio Amerino* to refer to the

More strikingly, though, these terms describe various types and phases of combat actions beyond simple references to ‘competition’ or ‘battle’ (*certamen*, *pugna*, *proelium*; *certo*, *contendo*, *pugno*). In the list provided at this chapter’s start are found metaphors that denote: preparatory skirmishes (*prolusio*, *Div. Caec*. 47); the actual onset of attack,

---

respective roles of the two Roscii (*alter ...* ***gladiator*** *habetur, hic ... se ad eum* ***lanistam*** *contulit*; *S. Rosc*. 17; cf. also *S. Rosc*. 118, though here *lanista* is replaced with *discipulus*); cf. the noun *gladiator* in *Pro Quinctio* too as an insult applied to Naevius (*Quinct*. 29, 69). Yet at a fundamental level these instances are indeed just insults, for both *gladiator* and *lanista* served as common terms of abuse in the political discourse of the late Republic (cf. Opelt 1965: 136, 209). Thus, the evocative power of these terms on their own would have been weaker and less specific compared to those in the other two categories discussed here (though cf. again Imholtz’s argument that in *Pro Roscio Amerino* Cicero plays with such terms as *gladiator*, *lanista*, and *sector* for specifically evocative purposes, to conjure up images of butchery and cutting; Imholtz 1972: 228-30).

[53] For other similar instances of *arma*, esp. in *De Oratore*, see Fantham 1972: 156-7.

[54] Cf. *OLD* s.v. *telum* 1-2 for *telum* used of a spear or other long-range, missile weapon; cf. again Fantham 1972: 157 on the common association of long-range weapons with speech, and Berry 1996: 226 *ad* 47.3 on *aculeus* as properly depicting arrows.

both in a non-specific sense (*adorior*, *Ver*. 2.2.37; *impugno*, *Quinct*. 8; *oppugno*, e.g. *Clu*. 170) and of a cavalry attack in particular (*invehor*, *Ver*. 2.4.8); the process of fighting out the battle (*dimico*, *Div. Caec*. 72); repelling an opponent's attacks (*depello*, *Quinct*. 8; *repello*, e.g. *Ver*. 1.3); sparing one's enemy (*parco*, e.g. *S. Rosc*. 95); or finally defeating him (*vinco*, e.g. Ver. 2.3.40) and, especially in the case of gladiators, obtaining a palm branch of victory (*palma*, e.g. *S. Rosc*. 84). Thus, given the relative specificity of the terms given here, I cannot concur with Fantham that Cicero confines himself only to the most general aspects of warfare.[55] On the contrary, the images he evokes with these terms are distinct within the realm of combat, and in metaphorical application these terms therefore convey a certain precision that boosts their rhetorical efficacy.

III.b. Tendency to Cluster

In addition to this specificity, the terms surveyed above frequently appear in concentrated clusters of metaphors. In fuller explanation, these nouns and verbs often occur in close proximity to one or more additional metaphors which evoke related and often similar images. In many cases these terms are of multiple parts of speech and fulfill different syntactic functions; at times too, though, these terms function simply as near synonyms of one another and appear in groupings of like part of speech. To distinguish such clustering from allegory, the latter, as outlined in Roman rhetorical theory, employs not a transfer but a duality of sense, and moreover functions to obscure, whereas the terms within these clusters remain metaphors and still act to clarify.[56] For in such clusters, the presence of each additional metaphor first makes clear that the surrounding terms are indeed meant as images, and second reinforces the meaning and sphere of the other metaphors present. Thus, *en masse* such metaphors assume a group status that distances them from the surrounding discourse.[57]

---

[55] Cf. Fantham 1972: 30 for this suggestion.

[56] On the function of allegory as obscuring meaning, cf. Cic. *Att*. 2.20.3; cf. Quint. *Inst. Or*. 8.6.14 on the excessive use of metaphor bringing obscurity and leading to allegory, and 8.6.52 on allegory that is particularly obscure as constituting an *aenigma*. On the duality of word and sense in allegory, cf. Quint.

This is best illustrated by example, and here follow two, the first of which comes from the opening passage of *De Inventione*, the earliest example found in this survey and in Cicero's works as a whole. As Cicero urges the pursuit of oratory at the start of this treatise, he states that the one who 'arms' himself with eloquence in order to 'fight on behalf of' his country, rather than 'attack' it, seems to all the most useful and amicable man:

> qui vero ita sese **armat** eloquentia, ut non **oppugnare** commoda patriae, sed pro his **propugnare** possit, is mihi vir et suis et publicis rationibus utilissimus atque amicissimus civis fore videtur (*Inv.* 1.1)

Clustered here are the verbs *armo*, *oppugno*, and *propugno*. In this case all three terms are of the same part of speech, but their forms and syntactic function vary, for the finite *armat* proves the verb of the relative clause, whereas the infinitives *oppugnare* and *propugnare* appear in parallel purpose clauses. Each term occurs within only a few words of another, and in this proximity, the presence of each bolsters the meaning and status of the others as images. To choose one of the three verbs around which to orient this discussion, the following exposition focuses on *oppugnare*. Now, as a term

---

Inst. Or. 8.6.44 – *allegoria, quam inversionem interpretantur, aut aliud verbis, aliud sensu ostendit, aut etiam interim contrarium*.

[57] Note that Fantham observes a similar phenomenon, commenting at various points on what she dubs Cicero's use of interrelated metaphor systems, networks of imagery, and imagery motifs (cf. e.g. Fantham 1972: 136, 152-3); unlike the present study, however, Fantham locates such phenomena specifically in highly elevated contexts – *Pro Sestio* and *De Oratore*.

indicating political and oratorical attack, *oppugno* appears quite frequently in this period, as this chapter has already shown.[58] Proper to the sphere of combat, *oppugno* on its own naturally carries a certain amount of military overtones, but since the verb appears frequently in the works of Cicero examined here – and thus likely was common in late Republican discourse – its force and status as a specific military metaphor are diminished somewhat. The addition of forms of *armo* and *propugno*, however, both confirms and strengthens the reading of *oppugnare* as a military metaphor, for both belong properly to the sphere of warfare and are likewise used in a transferred, figurative sense, and furthermore both too are used far less frequently – each appearing only here in this survey – and thus bear a keener force. In preceding *oppugnare*, *armat* establishes a clear military context that is then carried over to *oppugnare* as well as to *propugnare*, and *propugnare* both reconfirms and focuses the meaning of *oppugnare*, echoing its stem but refining the sense through a change in prefix. Through its clustering with *armat* and *propugnare*, then, *oppugnare* is confirmed and bolstered in meaning, force, and status, and the same in fact could be shown for *armat* and *propugnare* as well. As a group, therefore, each reinforces and strengthens the other as an image. And where one image would sit somewhat removed from the discourse at hand, the three together occupy a much more definite and distinct plane and thus assume a discourse status of 'other'.

To be sure, such clustering can be found in all the speeches surveyed here in addition to *De Inventione*, and thus it represents a general tendency, not a phenomenon characteristic of or observed in one work.[59] Furthermore, such clustering is not limited merely to combat imagery but in fact likely characterizes most metaphors in general – all but those of the third chapter, that is. Even in the works surveyed here one finds metaphors from other spheres clustered with those surveyed above.[60]

---

[58] See pp. 81-82 above.

[59] For an example from the speeches, and one containing nouns rather than verbs, cf. the clustering of *palma*, *gladiator*, *lanista*, and *pugna* at *S. Rosc*. 17 – *alter plurimarum* ***palmarum*** *vetus ac nobilis* ***gladiator***

Consider for instance a passage of highly concentrated clustering in *Pro Quinctio*, where metaphors from combat (indicated by boldface) are used in conjunction with those from the overlapping sphere of medical imagery (indicated by underlining).[61]

> ita fit, ut ego, qui **tela depellere** et **vulneribus** mederi debeam, tum id facere cogar, cum etiam **telum adversarius** nullum **iecerit**, illis autem id tempus **impugnandi** detur, cum et vitandi illorum **impetus** potestas adempta nobis erit et, si qua in re, id quod parati sunt facere, falsum crimen quasi venenatum aliquod **telum iecerint**, medicinae faciendae locus non erit (*Quinct*. 8)

In metaphorical terms, Cicero states here that it is his task to repel his adversary's weapons (*tela depellere*; *adversarius*) and heal the wounds (*vulneribus*) inflicted by them even before they are cast (*cum etiam telum ... nullum iecerit*), and in addition to make allowances for the fact that the enemy will have ample time to make and prepare and attack (*impugnandi*), while he will have none for preparing a resistance (*vitandi ... impetus*), nor to find an antidote (*medicinae*) for the poison (*venenatum*) his shafts will bring (*telum iecerint*).[62]

---

*habetur, hic autem nuper se ad eum **lanistam** contulit, quique ante hanc **pugnam** tiro esset, quod sciam, facile ipsum magistrum scelere audaciaque superavit.*

[60] For an example whose terms are drawn completely from a separate sphere, cf. a passage from the *Verrines* in which a number of hunting metaphors cluster, with Cicero, as Verres' prosecutor, likening himself to a hunter pursuing and trapping his prey – *nun tibi ego ullam salutem, ullum **perfugium** putem, cum te **implicatum** severitate iudicum, **circumretitum** frequentia populi Romani esse videam? Si mehercule, id quod fieri non posse intellego, ex his te **laqueis** exueris ac te aliqua via ac ratione **explicaris**, in illas tibi maiores **plagas** incidendum est in quibus te ab eodem me superiore ex loco **confici** et **concidi** necesse est* (*Ver*. 2.5.151).

[61] On the overlap of medical imagery with that from warfare and wounding, cf. Fantham 1972: 128.

[62] For *vulnus* as overlapping these two spheres, cf. Fantham 1972: 128.

This example features the interplay not only of two different and frequently overlapping spheres of imagery but also of multiple parts of speech, as this combination of nouns and verbs comprises both combat metaphors and images from the medical realm. And in fact here too appears a term related to the list above – *adversarius*, a word that, although common in political discourse in a generalized sense akin to *inimicus*, still is also a metaphor appropriate to the sphere of combat.[63] Finally, one may note the sheer number of metaphors that have accumulated here, a total of thirteen instances of individual terms that occur in nearly every clause.[64] This is clustering on a grand scale; as the metaphors mount, so too does the emotion, and the heightened rhetorical effect reflects Cicero's outrage as he expounds the injustices the praetor has inflicted upon Quinctius, and therefore upon Cicero himself. The imagery is abundant, concentrated, and powerful, and at the same time is also precisely just that – imagery, distinct in status from the larger discourse. In general, therefore, this rather typical feature of clustering amplifies the imagery of individual metaphors – confirming their meaning, sphere, and status, and thereby bolstering their force and rhetorical effect – and in doing so, it marks them as a group that properly belongs to a separate plane of discourse.

III.c. Verb Forms and Application

Finally, the verbs listed at the start of this chapter are only rarely employed in personal forms. More specifically, few first-person active verb forms occur, and those that do appear are tempered in force and indirect in application, lacking explicit accusative objects and therefore too a sense of direct combat between object and agent. Thus, the discourse as a whole assumes an air of distanced and impersonal remove. Most importantly, however, this manner of discourse directly contrasts with Cicero's application of his post-consular verbs, as the following chapter will make clear, for beginning in 63 BCE, such verbs typically govern an explicit accusative object, and in all but the final years of Cicero's life and career they appear in first-person active forms nearly exclusively.

---

[63] For this general political sense of *adversarius*, cf. Hellegouarc'h 1972: 191. For usage of the term both properly and figuratively of warfare, cf. *OLD* s.v. 2a-b.

[64] I count *iaceo* a combat image in and of itself due to its close and frequent semantic association with *telum* as seen in the various examples above; cf. Fantham 1972: 157 on the association of the similar verbs *emittere* and *iactare* with utterance. Likewise *vito* in the passage above could potentially be considered a combat image as well through the influence of the surrounding metaphors, a term in its proper sense used first and foremost of avoiding weapons (cf. *OLD* s.v. 1a).

Within the instances cited previously in this chapter, first-person verb forms occur a total of seven times – six in the active voice, and one in the passive. And of the active instances, only one takes a person as its direct object. This lone instance occurs in *Divinatio in Caecilium*, where Cicero opens with an apology for his current desire to serve as prosecutor, acknowledging that in the past he had spent his energy in defending clients and had 'harmed' no one:

> si quis ... forte miratur me, qui tot annos in causis iudiciisque publicis ita sim versatus ut defenderim multos, **laeserim** neminem, subito nunc mutata voluntate ad accusandum descendere (*Div. Caec.* 1)

In this passage the action of the metaphor is indeed applied directly to a personal object. This object, however, is not a named or specified individual but rather the universally negative *neminem*. Moreover, again by the mid to late Republic, in force *laedo* was equivalent to *maledico* and *accuso*, as in fact this passage illustrates in the case of the latter. Despite the directness of application seen here, then, the tone of this statement is neither forceful nor intimate.

As to the remaining instances, in numbers two through four – all from the *Verrines* – first-person metaphors are applied only indirectly to their target (*Verres*). In the first of these passages, Cicero speaks of 'repelling' the plots that Verres had laid against him on land and sea; in the second, he declares to the judges that as far as he is concerned, his case has already 'won' the day; and in the third he boasts to the judges that he will 'be victorious' in proving that Verres made a great deal of money out of his tithe-collection abuses in Sicily.

> cum multae mihi a C. Verre insidiae terra marique factae sint, quas partim ... devitarim, partim ... **reppulerim** (*Ver*. 1.3)
>
> quapropter ego, quod ad me attinet, iudices, **vici**: non enim spolia C. Verris sed existimationem populi Romani concupivi (*Ver*. 2.1.21)
>
> docebo cepisse maximas, omnesque eas iniquitates de quibus antea dixi sui quaestus causa constituisse **vincam** ... (*Ver*. 2.3.40)

Though Verres is the ultimate target of these remarks, in none is he the actual object of the verb. In the first instance, it is the abstract noun *insidiae* that *repello* governs, and in the second and third, Cicero employs *vinco* purely intransitively, depicting himself not as directly 'conquering' anything or anyone, but simply as victorious, though of course victory over Verres is implied in both statements and, in the case of the second, confirmed by the phrase *spolia C. Verris* which follows. With such usage Cicero stands triumphant *opposite* Verres but not *over* Verres. Now, inasmuch as Cicero identifies himself as the explicit agent of the verbs *reppulerim*, *vici*, and *vincam*, in each of these three some amount of personal sentiment is present. But again, though Verres proves the ultimate object and recipient of Cicero's actions, in these instances Cicero does not position himself in direct opposition to Verres, as directly combating *him*. That is, Cicero does not repel and conquer Verres himself, but rather Verres' case, lines of argumentation, and general attacks, and the tone of these statements therefore tends toward the oblique and even the detached.

The fifth instance, found in *Pro Roscio Amerino*, is similarly indirect. In it Cicero speaks of 'sparing' Magnus, or more properly of his fear that in striving to his fullest to protect Sextus, he may seem to have spared Magnus not a whit – *vereor enim ... ne ita hunc videar voluisse servare, ut tibi omnino non* ***pepercerim*** (*S. Rosc*. 95). In conceptual terms, Magnus forms the 'direct' object of *pepercerim*, yet the verb *parco* by default governs only indirect objects in the dative case, and in meaning, moreover, it denotes not the application of but rather abstention from force and violence. This statement's tone thereby is inherently muted and to a degree again oblique, and thus in none of these five instances are the metaphors applied directly to their targets in a forceful, personal manner.[65]

It is the remaining two instances that come closest to positioning Cicero and his opponent as direct, personal combatants. The two occur back-to-back in *Ver*. 2.4, where Cicero has been occupied with narrating Verres' plundering of various valuables and works of art, here specifically C. Heius' statues. Cicero stops suddenly from his narration and asks, in rhetorical fashion, why he is bothering to 'attack' Verres so violently when he will be 'driven back' with just one utterance from Verres, "I bought them" – *sed quid ego tam vehementer* ***invehor****? verbo uno* ***repellar****. "emi," inquit* (*Ver*.

---

[65] Contrast to these instances the direct, personal, and violent force in the threats of Cicero's contemporary Catullus to his critics Furius and Aurelius: *pedicabo ego vos et irrumabo* (Cat. 16. 1, 14), where the threats (*pedicabo*, *irrumabo*) are delivered in the first-person – the personal agency in fact emphasized with the inclusion of *ego* – and their objects (*vos*) form the direct and explicitly stated recipient of the verbs' actions; on the hermeneutics of these threats for the reader, especially the poem's targets, see Krostenko 2001: 277-81.

2.4.8). Like the instances above, the images evoked are military in sphere. Here, however, the context is clearly that of a battle proper – specifically a cavalry assault – with Cicero first leading the charge against Verres (*invehor*) and then finding himself repelled (*repellar*). And in this instance Cicero battles Verres directly, for Verres is the implied object of *invehor* and agent of *repellar*. Yet Cicero is not explicit about this. He does not supplement *invehor* with, for instance, '*in Verrem*' to specify Verres as the precise target of his attack, nor does he qualify *repellar* with a phrase such as '*a Verre*' to denote Verres' agency, nor again does he choose to reverse the latter construction, making Verres the verb's active agent and himself its accusative direct object, '*Verres me verbo uno repellet*'.[66]

To put it briefly, then, in the passage cited above, Cicero avoids direct and explicit *syntactic* opposition of himself and Verres. The two square off in concept, but not in the words of the text. Yet still these two instances mark the closest Cicero comes in this survey to positioning himself and his target as engaged in direct combat, and in this regard, just as Cicero's prosecution of Verres marked a turning point in his career, so too this passage in particular – as well as the *Verrines* as a whole – may represent somewhat of a landmark in Cicero's use of such metaphors.[67] For not only does this final passage contain the first documented application of *invehor* to verbal attack outside of Plautus, furthermore, five of the seven total first-person instances given above appear specifically in the *Verrines*, and this in and of itself is suggestive of the hitherto unprecedented amount of personal involvement and attack Cicero invested in these speeches.[68] In spite of this, though, the language of this passage still is not as explicit, forceful, personal, or violent as the first-person statements that the fourth chapter will present – e.g. *eos nondum voce volnero* (*Cat*. 1.9), *Clodium praesentem fregi in senatu* (*Att*. 1.16.8), or *Vatinium ... arbitratu nostro concidimus* (*Q. fr*. 2.4.1) – where both agent and object appear directly in the text and are positioned in immediate syntactic opposition to each other, the former explicitly performing the action of a verb that directly governs the latter.

---

[66] For '*in*' followed by the accusative as the proper objective complement of *invehor* in such usage, cf. the instances cited at *TLL* 7.2.132.5-63, e.g. *ille ...* ***in me*** *esse invectus* (*Sull*. 35); *cum igitur vehementius inveheretur* ***in causam*** *principum consul Philippus* (*de Orat*. 1.24); *maxime* ***in consularem imperium*** *... invehebatur* (Liv. 3.9.2).

[67] On the *Verrines* as a career turning-point for Cicero, cf. e.g. Vasaly 2013: 153, calling Cicero's prosecution of Verres "the defining moment of his early career," and Steel 2005: 25, dubbing it more generally "his breakthrough as an orator;" cf. similar emphasis on the boon to Cicero's career and image that his prosecution of Verres brought at Vasaly 2002: 104; 2009: 115, 120-8, 133-4.

Thus, first-person verb usage in this discourse may generally be characterized as not only infrequent but also as indirect in all senses of the word. And in fact, very few second-person verbs occur as well – again a mere seven in total.[69] By default, therefore, third-person forms comprise the bulk of this survey's evidence, along with participles – mostly passive – and passive constructions of obligation or necessity.[70] Accordingly, as indirect as the few first-person instances above prove, through the complete removal of Cicero's will and agency the third-person brings, this discourse as a whole takes on an even greater sense of distance and remove. In sum, then, the metaphors in this period serve as distinct and reinforced imagery – precise in their evocations, confirmed in their sense, and distanced in their application – and thus theirs is properly a separate plane of context, the 'other' of the discourse at hand.

---

[68] By 'speeches' I refer to the *Verrines* in both their delivered and circulated form, for no matter to what extent these may have differed – particularly in the case of the *Second Action* – still both represent a great personal investment on Cicero's part. On the publication and circulation of the *Verrines* in general, see Frazel 2004. Though Kennedy 1972: 165 dubs the *Verrines* as published a literary rather than a persuasive exercise, most scholars believe that Cicero intended to present them as orations still, for instance continuing to address Verres as though present at the *actio secunda*; cf. e.g. Vasaly 1993: 208, Innocenti 1994: 365. In fact, Frazel argues that the *Second Action* was largely composed in draft form by the time the trial began and that the speeches were circulated swiftly after the completion of the trial (Frazel 2004: 132-4). For the highly contentious view that the *Second Action* as we have it represents a complete fiction, a script of a trial in which Cicero won his case by means of *eloquentia* rather than documentary evidence, cf. Butler 2002: 71-84; for a critical discussion of Butler's views, see Frazel 2004: 138-41.

[69] I.e. *evertatis* (*Ver*. 2.3.219); *exstinxeris* (*Ver*. 2.3.226); *exstinguas* (*Ver*. 2.5.174); *laedas* (*Inv*. 1.24); *oppugnas* (*S. Rosc*. 145); *parcetis* (*Ver*. 2.1.81); *pugnas* (*Quinct*. 43). Note too that in *laedas* of *Inv*. 1.24, the 'you' addressed by Cicero is the reader of the treatise, not a specific or named addressee.

[70] Though examples of such forms and constructions are scattered throughout this chapter, here I provide several of each for ease of reference. For third-person forms, in the active voice cf. *contenderet* (*Att*. 1.1.4), *pupugisset* (*S. Rosc*. 60), *armaret* (*Clu*. 191), *noceat* (*Quinct*. 1), and *adoriantur* (*Ver*. 2.2.37), and in the passive voice cf. *laesus ... esset* (*S. Rosc*. 112), *obruitur* (*Ver*. 2.2.151), *pugnatur* (*S. Rosc*. 8), *obrutus atque oppresus est* (*Ver*. 2.1.20), and *oppugnaretur* (*Clu*. 170); for perfect passive participles, cf. *afflictum atque eversum* (*Quinct*. 74), *vexatus* (*Quinct*. 98), *laesi* (*Ver*. 2.3.30), and *perditum* (*S. Rosc*. 23); and for passive

IV. Conclusion

To summarize the chapter as a whole, the '*ad hominem*' discourse of this period, represented by the early works of Cicero examined here, is characterized by metaphors from two primary categories: 1) that of competition and combat, associated particularly with the courts; 2) and that of 'affliction' as a semantic unifier. Both sets of terms generally signify only the exertion of force or motion in an antagonistic or hostile fashion, leaving unspecified the results of their action on the object against which their force is directed. And of special significance, among them no verbs of 'breaking', 'cutting', or 'bloodying' are found except *iugulo*, the use of which had long been proverbial. In usage, these terms function as distinct imagery. They evoke specific images within the realm of combat and competition, tend to occur in clusters, and appear primarily in indirect phrasing, lacking especially first-person verb forms and a direct syntactic opposition of agent and object. And as a result, these metaphors – both verbs and nouns – occupy a distinct and separate plane from their surrounding context and thereby assume a sense of 'other' which, in turn, both reinforces and highlights their

---

constructions of obligation and necessity, cf. *exstinguenda ... sit* (*Div. Caec*. 26), *pugnandum certandumque sit* (*Div. Caec*. 44), *erit dimicandum* (*Div. Caec*. 72), and *eum iugulandum ... tradiderunt* (*S. Rosc*. 29).

figurative status. Now, this is not to say that metaphor usage in such fashion ceases as of 63 BCE, for certainly this is not the case. Rather, these characteristics – as well as the semantic groupings above – prove the standard that Cicero’s post-consular metaphors will defy, as the next chapter will argue.

CHAPTER 3

Post-Consular Cicero: An Innovative Posture

The previous chapter examined the terms and usage found in Cicero's pre-consular corpus, and it derived from them the types of metaphors commonly applied to oratory and general political activity at the start of Cicero's career. This chapter covers the second half of Cicero's life and activity, but instead of surveying his metaphors at large from 63 to 43 BCE, it proceeds chronologically and presents a story of innovation, tracking Cicero's novel use of certain verbs over these twenty years. For with only slight exception, the verbs this chapter covers are applied directly to verbal activity nowhere in Latin literature before Cicero's consulship.[1] And as Cicero's pre-consular activity spans nearly thirty years, counting from the early *De Inventione*, the sudden appearance of these verbs from 63 to 60 seems best explained not by the paucity of surviving works from Cicero's contemporaries but by a shift in semantics and usage instigated by Cicero himself. Of course the combat and 'affliction' metaphors of the last chapter continue to appear in these decades, and in fact some of the verbs that are discussed here found occasional and disparate figurative application in Cicero's pre-consular corpus.[2] In the pages that follow, however, I focus on the new and the *ad hominem*, endeavoring to uncover the subtle change in Cicero's characterization of harsh and powerful oratory – his own, primarily – that develops over these years.

---

[1] The exception is *concido*, which, besides its use at Pl. *Ep*. 488, appears of verbal activity once in a fragment of Ennius (*vocibus concide*, Enn. *scaen*. 421) and once in the *Verrines* (*confici et concidi necesse est*, *Ver*. 2.5.151); the context of the former is almost completely lacking, however, and moreover represents verse usage, while the latter is so deeply ensconced in a cluster of hunting imagery that its force and usage are tied specifically to this context; for further discussion of these two instances, see p. 135 and 135 nn. 40-41 below.

[2] E.g. *perfringo* at *Ver*. 1.3, involving the 'shattering' of the judges' conscience and honesty, but not od the judges themselves; and *lacero* at *Quinct*. 50, applied here to the dissolution of property and livelihood much akin to the usage seen in comedy (cf. e.g. Pl. *Mer*. 48).

Here again I offer a survey of sorts, for though I include every relevant instance of these verbs that I have unearthed, I allow that others still may remain, and further that within the works of these years additional verbs and semantic categories perhaps exist in similar usage. In this chapter I trace three semantic strands in particular – verbs of 'wounding', 'breaking', and 'cutting'. The primary aim of this chapter is the exposition and analysis of individual instances of these verbs from Cicero's consulship on, with broader interpretation reserved for the final chapter. In it too, though, I argue that Cicero's particular manner of applying these verbs – in first-person form and governing a target directly as accusative object – represents a means of self-positioning, a means of linguistically rendering himself a superior orator and statesman by 'breaking' and 'cutting down' his opponents. As of 60 BCE such verbal self-positioning had crossed generic bounds, appearing several times in both his oratory and his personal correspondence; thus, at this point I shall formally deem and define this usage as an *ad hominem* 'posture'. Indeed, the cross-generic nature of this posture will continue to emerge over the course of this examination, for in later years its reach extends to Cicero's treatises as well. Throughout this chapter I demonstrate that Cicero assumes this posture gradually and carefully, contextualizing novel usage at its introduction with familiar metaphors and linking new semantic categories to those previously established. And over the course of this examination it will become apparent that major moments of innovation correspond to major moments of invective, whether these occur in the midst of a speech itself or in recollection of a speech, for instance in a letter to Cicero's brother

Quintus or to the ever dear T. Pomponius Atticus. These moments in turn correspond to significant points in his political career, and they thereby afford further opportunity for self-positioning.[3]

In this examination I present and discuss the evidence in a chronological fashion from 63 to 43 BCE, and where this chapter's coverage lapses, so too does Cicero's usage. The divisions I have made within this span reflect the nature of the evidence at different periods, and in Chapter Four they will serve to illuminate the deeper relationship between Cicero's use of these verbs and his own position as a figure of authority. As my focus in this chapter is the presentation and analysis of individual instances of these verbs, in it I provide only what political context is necessary for the discussion at hand, reserving broader treatment for the final chapter.[4]

I. 63-58 BCE (The Consular Years and Exile)

In 63 BCE the senator L. Sergius Catilina and a band of fellow conspirators undertook to overthrow the Republic, and in the course of their final preparations in the city of Rome itself, they planned to assassinate Cicero in the early hours of November 7. Cicero learned of the plot in advance and thus was able to stymie the attempt by placing armed guards outside his house, and the next day at a meeting of the senate held in the symbolic Temple of Jupiter Stator, Cicero delivered the first of four denunciations against Catiline and his associates.[5] In this speech, the *First Catilinarian*, Cicero makes public declaration of Catiline's crimes against both Rome and himself and urges Catiline to leave the city, and within it Cicero's innovations in syntax and semantics first appear.

---

[3] Cf. the observations of Corbeill 2002: 198 – "It is notable that the orator employs his most angry invective at those key points in his career at which he needs to shape new aspects of his public identity: as a righteous young prosecutor (*Against Verres*), as an elected head of state (*Against Catiline*; *On the Agrarian Laws*), as a former exile reestablishing authority (*Against Vatinius*; *Against Piso*), and as an elder statesman exercising that authority for the last time (*Philippics*)."

[4] The schema I employ derives in large part from the chronological divisions and titles found in May 1988, but they have been adjusted to accord with the usage and development of the specific verbs considered in this chapter. The divisions I use in this chapter are thus: 63-58 BCE, 57-55 BCE, 54-45 BCE, and 44-43 BCE. In this as well as the following chapter I devote particular space to the earlier years in order to draw out more clearly the various significant features that mark Cicero's posture in its initial stages.

From the opening sections of the *First Catilinarian* Cicero addresses Catiline directly, condemning both the man and his actions and declaring that death has long stood as his just desserts.[6] And as he enters into the details of Catiline's actions – for instance his meeting with co-conspirators the previous night at the house of M. Porcius Laeca – Cicero exclaims that in fact some of these rogues are present right then and there in the senate, consulting with Cicero on affairs of state – men who, desiring the destruction not only of Rome but of the known world, themselves deserve slaughter by the sword. And yet in saying this, Cicero notes that he has not yet even begun to 'wound' these men:

> hic, hic sunt in nostro numero ... qui de nostro omnium interitu, qui de huius urbis atque adeo de orbis terrarum exitio cogitent. hos ego video consul et de re publica sententiam rogo, et quos ferro trucidari oportebat, eos nondum voce **volnero** (*Cat.* 1.9)[7]

Now, Cicero's choice of the verb *vulnero* here in some respects causes little surprise, flowing naturally from the multiple references to death and execution that occur in the previous sections.[8] But with this verb Cicero refers to speech, not physical actions, employing *vulnero* in explicit contrast with *ferro trucidari* of the previous clause. Indeed, in this first part of the oration Cicero has been shown to co-opt speech for himself, silencing Catiline and magnifying his own voice as authority past, present, and future.[9] Cicero becomes the mouth of Rome herself, his voice her *auctoritas*. And through his use of *vulnero* in this passage, Cicero renders his speech Rome's protector too, endowing his own tongue with a deadly power equal to that of the conspirators' weapons.

---

[5] For a full treatment of the course of Catiline's conspiracy, see Stockton 1971: 109-42. Vasaly 1993: 49-75 explores the significance of the *First Catilinarian*'s symbolic location.

[6] Cf. e.g. *ad mortem te, Catilina, duci iussu consulis iam pridem oportebat* (*Cat.* 1.2).

[7] Note that throughout this examination I use the spelling '*vulnero*' rather than '*volnero*' when referring to this verb except when quoting this passage directly, employing in the latter instances '*volnero*' of the text as given in the *OCT* edition as well as in most others.

More importantly, however, this passage marks the start of a new trend in metaphor usage. First, note that the syntactic opposition is direct – Cicero is the first-person agent of *vulnero*, and the conspirators themselves mark its object (*eos*). The two are separated in fact only by the instrument with which Cicero may 'wound' his targets – his voice (*nondum voce*), and thereby too is the verbal nature of the action clear. That is, in contrast to the instances examined in the previous chapter, here Cicero positions himself and the conspirators, Catiline included, as direct combatants. Moreover, the verb *vulnero* signifies not the mere hostile or antagonistic motion typical of Cicero's pre-consular metaphors, but rather the results of an actual encounter. As objects of *vulnero*, the conspirators will inevitably come away damaged in some fashion; with *nondum* Cicero simply allows their wounds to loom for the time being. Finally, the application of *vulnero* to verbal action is in itself new, being the first documented instance of any such usage.[10] The metaphor is fresh, wielding the full force of its transferred meaning and in this instance perhaps even a bit more, as it follows on the heels of its contrasting parallel *trucidari* in the preceding clause.

---

[8] In the eight sections of the speech that precede *vulnero* of *Cat*. 1.9, cf. additional references to execution, death, or slaughter at *Cat*. 1.5 (*interfici*, *interficiere*), 6 (*caedis*), and 7 (*caede*). Cf. too that Vasaly 1993: 51 notes the occasional presence of military metaphors in the early sections of the speech (e.g. *Cat*. 1.2, 4, 15, 16), though these tend to depict 'combat' at the level of the state rather than the individual (e.g. *habemus enim eius modi senatus consultum, verum inclusum in tabulis, tamquam in vagina reconditum*; *Cat*. 1.4) and again sit naturally within the general discourse of execution and death that occupies these sections – note that '*quo ex senatus consulto confestim te interfectum esse ... convenit*' cited previous follows directly upon ... *vagina reconditum* above.

[9] Cf. Batstone 1994: 237-43, who from the unusually high number of references to speech in these opening sections in particular detects a persuasive tactic whereby Cicero relegates silence to Catiline and co-opts speech for himself, rendering his own speech "the revelation of the past, guardian of the present, and guarantor of the future" (237). Cf. also Cape 2002: 145, who connects this and other passages to the power that Cicero's voice wields against Catiline in place of arms.

Yet in terms of semantics, Cicero does not stray too far from the discourse examined in the previous chapter, for *vulnero* is linked to this discourse in two different respects. First, recall that of the combat-related nouns listed in the previous chapter, the generic *vulnus*, along with *telum*, appeared most frequently. This noun, then, provides one semantic anchor for Cicero's use of *vulnero* here. In addition, *vulnero* finds precedent in the 'harming' category of verbs surveyed previously, *laedo* and *noceo*. But though in meaning *vulnero* is related to these verbs, in force it surpasses them. For Quintilian, in discussing the effects of oratory, provides an explicit contrast between *laedo* and *vulnero* in which *laedo* clearly functions as a lower-intensity sibling of *vulnero*, here representing the results of 'diminished' speech (*oratio minuitur, cum eum, qui vulneravit, laesisse dicimus* (Quint. *Inst*. 8.4.1).

And so in *eos nondum voce volnero* of *Cat*. 1.9 Cicero begins to diverge from the standard discourse, employing both a new verb and a newly direct syntactic opposition of agent and object. He innovates to enhance – at least in linguistic terms – his position against Catiline and his followers, but still he ensures that his usage remains grounded in more familiar discourse. And henceforth when Cicero introduces new terms, he will follow this pattern, making sure to contextualize and therefore soften their use through both semantic tie-ins and the presence of loosely related terms or imagery in the surrounding context at large.

---

[10] Cf. that the earliest instance listed in the *OLD* of *vulnero* in any figurative usage is *Cat*. 1.17 (*OLD* s.v. 2).

The following year (62 BCE) found Cicero acting in defense of P. Cornelius Sulla, nephew of the dictator, who stood accused of political violence under the *lex Plautia de vi*, specifically of conspiring with Catiline in 63 as he had three years previously in the course of the year's consular elections.[11] Cicero's surviving speech (*Pro Sulla*) is of great significance to this analysis, for in it the other new semantic categories originate.

Throughout the speech Cicero battles the young L. Manlius Torquatus as prosecutor, and at several points, as is common, he turns to address him specifically at some length. It is during one of these intervals that two new verbs appear – sections 46 through 50, in which Cicero both defends himself for taking up Sulla's case and bullies Torquatus as the inexperienced and inferior advocate.[12] In section 46, in fact, he issues Torquatus an explicit and severe warning, boasting that 'no one had ever bound him with the slightest suspicion whom he himself had not overturned and shattered':[13]

> nemo umquam me tenuissima suspicione perstrinxit quem non perverterim ac **perfregerim** (*Sul*. 46)

---

[11] See Berry 1996: 4-10 on the events leading up to Sulla's prosecution in 62 BCE, and 14-16 on the charge *de vi* as specific to the *lex Plautia* rather than the *lex Lutatia*.

[12] Cf. James May's comment that in these sections, "the consular orator, veteran of the courtroom, and leading pleader of Rome takes advantage of his position to bully and humiliate Torquatus under pretext of being merciful to him" (May 1988: 74).

[13] Berry glosses '*perverterim*' as "'grazed,' figuratively", citing *OLD* s.v. 2b (Berry 1996: 225 *ad loc*.), but I find this translation underwhelming here, failing to capture the verb's intensity especially in light of its coupling with *perfregerim*.

And in this warning Cicero innovates once again, for its force depends on *perfringo*, a verb previously unattested in signifying verbal attack. Notice how Cicero takes full advantage of its novelty and saves it for the final position, leaving the verb to resonate in the space between the end of this period and the start of the next. Here again occurs direct agent-object opposition, but in this instance Cicero pits himself against not one or several specific individuals, but indeed an anonymous opponent (*nemo ... quem*), and thus by extension anyone foolish enough to provoke him. Moreover, here too the new verb is linked semantically with the discourse of the period, for in this passage Cicero employs it as an emphatic synonym of *perverto*, one of the more common verbs seen in the previous chapter.[14]

Of course Cicero may have found the phrase *perverterim ac perfregerim* attractive for the ease with which it rolls off the tongue, and one could point out in addition that it reflects Cicero's propensity for *per*- compounds in his early career.[15] Yet still in this phrase lies both an ardent boast and a fierce threat in which Cicero, in first-person usage, gloats of absolute supremacy as an orator and advocate, threatening to 'shatter' Torquatus, just as he had every other opponent. Note that Cicero follows this declaration with additional intimidation in the next section, warning that even now he remains merciful in speech as the 'barbs' of his oratory (*aculeos orationis meae*) still lay sheathed.[16] Thus, by way of an afterthought Cicero again anchors the novel to the familiar, and he makes clear to both Torquatus and all other listeners and readers that his ability to shatter his adversaries through his oratory is ever intact.

---

[14] For the readings '*perverterim*' and '*ac perfregerim*', see Berry 1989: 404.

[15] On Cicero's tendency to favor compounds with *per*- in his early speeches, cf. Laurand 1936-40: 3, 272.

[16] In full, *tu quoniam minime ignoras consuetudinem dicendi meam, noli hac nova lenitate abuti mea, noli* ***aculeos orationis meae****, qui reconditi sunt, excussos arbitrari, noli id omnino a me putare esse amissum si quid est tibi remissum atque concessum* (*Sul*. 47).

Now, in these sections of *Pro Sulla* there appears too the first instance of *lacero* applied loosely to personal attack. Cicero asks Torquatus what more he aims to get from Sulla when Torquatus' father already stripped the consulship from him; indeed, Torquatus himself has come here to court decked out in Sulla's own spoils to finish him off:

> honos ad patrem, insignia honoris ad te delata sunt. tu ornatus exuviis huius venis ad eum **lacerandum** quem interemisti, ego iacentem et spoliatum defendo et protego (*Sul.* 50)

The passage overflows with battle imagery.[17] Cicero describes Torquatus as 'decked out in spoils' (*ornatus exuviis*) and come to 'mutilate Sulla' (*ad eum lacerandum*), whose prostrate and despoiled body (*iacentem et spoliatum*) Cicero himself 'defends and protects' (*defendo et protego*).[18] Thus, while *lacero* in this passage does indeed refer to personal and verbal attack, the verb is so ensconced in battle imagery here as to be felt more in its primary sense than as a metaphor for oratory. Note that even the *TLL* categorizes the instance thus, including it as an example of broader *proprie* usage rather than of *translate* usage.[19] In the *Pro Sulla*, then, Cicero undertakes two new semantic threads, venturing tentatively into 'cutting' verbs with *lacero* (*Sul.* 50) and embracing those of 'breaking' with full vigor through *perfringo* (*Sul.* 46).

---

[17] On this passage as extended 'battle' imagery, cf. Berry 1996: 231 *ad loc.*

[18] As Berry describes the passage, "Comparison of the *insignia* to *exuviae* ... enables Cicero to introduce an image drawn from battle in which Torquatus is presented as a merciless attacker who, not content with killing and despoiling his adversary, is fighting to mutilate his corpse" (Berry 1996: 231 *ad loc.*); cf. forms of '*spoliatus*' also at *Sul.* 79, 89, and 91 (Berry 1996, ibid.).

[19] Cf. *TLL* 7.2.825.82-83, *latius, passim per imaginem*.

In fact, one more passage from this speech may be mentioned briefly. In section 15, Cicero refers to Sulla as 'broken' and 'ruined' by his conviction of *ambitus* in 66 BCE, so broken indeed that there remained of his previous *dignitas* only what he had kept through *modestia*:

> hic se ita **fractum** illa calamitate atque afflictum putavit ut nihil sibi ex pristina dignitate superesse arbitraretur, nisi quod modestia retinuisset (*Sul*. 15)

Here too a 'breaking' verb is used of Sulla directly, and though the voicing is passive and the context one of more general emotional distress, still this too marks an innovative usage, for it is the first documented instance in which *frango* in figurative sense governs a person directly, albeit in view of his mental or emotional status in particular.[20] Finally, observe that here again Cicero yokes this new verb to the standard discourse, coupling it with *affligo* as its synonym (*fractum ... atque afflictum*). The *Pro Sulla* thus represents a truly pivotal moment in Cicero's metaphor usage in which he paves the way for the verbs that later will define both his own discourse on invective and that of writers under the Empire.

The next phase of development occurs in Cicero's private correspondence, for here *frango* in uncompounded form is first applied to verbal action. In a letter dated to early July of 61 (*Att*. 1.16), Cicero relates to Atticus his own part in the trial of P. Clodius Pulcher for violation of the Bona Dea rites. After describing several heated debates in which he 'battled' Clodius and others (*proeliatus sum*; *Att.* 1.16.1), Cicero boasts that he

---

[20] I.e. *TLL* 6.1.1249.29-83 (*spectat ad animum*) versus 6.1.1246.19-64 (*de animo*).

'broke' Clodius in person in the senate, first in a weighty and impressive set speech and then in an *altercatio*:

> Clodium praesentem **fregi** in senatu cum oratione perpetua plenissima gravitatis tum altercatione eius modi, ex qua licet pauca degustes (*Att.* 1.16.8)

This instance displays many of the same features as those of *eos ... volnero* (*Cat.* 1.9) and *quem ... perfregerim* (*Sul.* 46) above – direct agent-object opposition, including a first-person active verb form (*Clodium ... fregi*); explicit reference to verbal action (*oratione ... altercatione*); and contextualization of various sorts.[21] The last of these comes in two forms.

First, striking imagery pervades this letter, including images drawn from battle. In addition to *proeliatus sum* given above, in the first section alone occur such terms as *concursus*, *pugnas*, *strages*, *impetus*, and *pugnarum* as Cicero boasts of his oratorical attacks against both Clodius as well as his fellow senators L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus and the younger C. Scribonius Curio (*Att.* 1.16.1).[22] In fact, in this letter Cicero has been seen to portray himself in mock-heroic terms specifically, thereby painting Clodius' acquittal as his own victory.[23] Indeed, in 1.16.7-8 Cicero continues to talk about the debate in the context of a 'victory', slipping into these sections such terms as *victoria*, *victrix* (1.16.7), and *victoriae* (1.16.8). Cicero's boast '*Clodium ... fregi*' (1.16.8) thus is preceded by an array of military and combat terms that serve to ready the reader for the violence of *fregi* when the verb comes. And second, like *perverterim ac perfregerim* of *Sul*. 46, contextualization occurs here too by means of repeated sound. For in this passage *fregi* caps off a string of first-person perfect verbs, all but the first of which end their respective clauses (***recreavi*** *afflictos animos bonorum, ... παρρησίαν* ***eripui****, ... Syriam* ***ademi****, ... senatum ...* ***revocavi*** *atque ...* ***excitavi****, Clodium praesentem* ***fregi*** *...*; *Att*. 1.16.8). And as the final verb in this string, *fregi* contains an extra rhetorical wallop that renders all the more decisive Cicero's triumph over Clodius. In this letter, therefore, Cicero's use of *fregi* to boast of oratorical victory is powerful and bold, but one too that flows rather naturally from the contexts of these verb forms and images.

---

[21] Of course it is natural to use a first-person verb form when recounting one's own activities, whether in personal correspondence or elsewhere, but since such forms will continue to typify Cicero's use of both *frango* as well as the other verbs treated by this chapter, I highlight the first-person form here.

[22] I.e. *ego enim, quam diu senatus auctoritas mihi delenda fuit, sic acriter et vehementer* ***proeliatus sum*** *ut clamor* ***concursus****que maxima cum mea laude fierent. quod si tibi umquam sum visus in re publica fortis, certe me in illa causa admiratus esses. cum enim ille ad contiones confugisset ... quas ego* ***pugnas*** *et quantas* ***strages*** *edidi! quos* ***impetus*** *in Pisonem, in Curionem, in totam illam* ***manum*** *feci! ... saepe ... te non solum auctorem consiliorum meorum verum etiam spectatorem* ***pugnarum*** *mirificarum desideravi* (*Att.* 1.16.1). Cf. Shackleton Bailey 1965: 314 *ad* 1.6 on *proeliatus sum* and *concursus* specifically; cf. Fantham 1972: 30 on the military metaphors in *Att.* 1.16.1 in general. On the fragmentary *In Clodium et Curionem* published from this exchange without Cicero's permission, cf. Crawford 1994: 233-69 and, from the standpoint of the speech's incorporation of comic material, Geffcken 1973: 57-89.

When he deploys *fregi* again of 'breaking' Clodius in *Att*. 2.1 (60 BCE), however, no such contextualizing elements can be found. As Cicero turns in the letter to the topic of Clodius, he confirms that Clodius does indeed intend to become tribune of the plebs, and disgusted at Clodius' deplorable ambition therein, he assures Atticus that when the matter came up in the senate, Cicero 'broke' him and reproached him for being after the tribunate at Rome just as he had been after inheritances in Sicily, using the pun to emphasize Clodius' cupidity in both instances:

---

[23] On Cicero's mock-heroic posturing, cf. Shackleton Bailey 1965: 314 *ad* 1.10-11, and more generally Hutchinson 1993: 443-8 on Cicero's self-made victory through the heroic and martial elements he employs in the letter, including his use of the verb *frango* at 1.16.5 (*fractus reus*) and 1.16.8 (*Clodium ... fregi*).

> ille autem non simulat, sed plane tribunus pl. fieri cupit. qua <de> re cum in senatu ageretur, **fregi** hominem et inconstantiam eius reprehendi qui Romae tribunatum pl. peteret cum in Sicilia hereditatem se petere dictitasset (*Att*. 2.1.5)

Here *fregi* appears apart from any mock-heroic or military imagery and apart too from any rhetorical devices aside from the pejorative *homo*.[24] Its use seems as comfortable to Cicero as that of *reprehendi* a few words later, needing nothing of preparatory imagery or devices with which to qualify its force. Cicero simply lets fly with the metaphor and immediately moves on to wordplay with *peteret ... petere*.[25] At *Att*. 2.1.5, then, Cicero stands more confident in this usage of *frango*, applying it in the same form (*fregi*) as its appearance at *Att*. 1.16.8, to the same subject matter (the oratorical defeat of Clodius), and in the same context (a senate debate), but with none of the elements that contextualized its use in the earlier letter.

In sum, then, by 60 BCE Cicero has employed the same specifics of syntax and semantics in two very different types of output – oratory, both senatorial and forensic, and private correspondence – and nearly simultaneously at that, for after *eos ... volnero* of *Cat*. 1.9 (63 BCE), there follows from the 'breaking' category first *quem ... perfregerim* of *Sul*. 46 (62 BCE), then *Clodium ... fregi* of *Att*. 1.16.8 (61 BCE), and finally *fregi hominem* of *Att*. 2.1.5 (60 BCE). As Cicero's letters otherwise differ markedly from the speeches in style and diction, this type of language must derive from Cicero the man at large rather than Cicero as channeled in any one genre.[26] Such usage represents an innate discourse in this period, a first-person 'posture'. By deploying one of these verbs, Cicero creates a hostile encounter in which he meets an enemy and triumphs violently over him. On the level of syntax, the direct opposition of agent and object makes this a face-to-face conflict, and a first-person active verb form lends it a distinctly personal tone. His animosity aroused, Cicero pits himself directly against a target, first-person subject against accusative direct object; and through the violent semantics involved, the results stand decidedly in his favor – he strikes down his opponent and thus presents himself as victor. With this posture, then, Cicero renders himself an orator and statesman of formidable power, capable of laying low his enemies when provoked. And thus in full precision this is an *ad hominem* posture, for Cicero applies it specifically to instances marked by personal animosity – that is, in the context of 'invective', whether in its course or in later reflection. And since this posture is indicative of Cicero's own self-positioning, henceforth it continues to emerge in contexts where first-person reference is occasioned – his speeches and his letters. In the latter these metaphors may hardly be noticed even by their intended recipients, let alone a wider audience, but still in Cicero's mind each verb marks a chance to affirm his own supremacy by crushing his opponent.

---

[24] On the pejorative, abusive connotations of *homo* in rhetorical and political contexts, see Santoro L'Hoir 1992: 9-28 (esp. 21-28) on Cicero's usage particularly, and 63-76 on usage in Livy as well as in Latin prose literature more generally.

[25] The particular inheritance to which Cicero refers is unknown; on the wordplay here and on the passage as a whole, cf. Shackleton Bailey 1965: 346-7 *ad* 5.4.

In 59 and 58 BCE these verbs and associated posture temporarily disappear, as Cicero's decision to execute Roman citizens without a trial during the Catilinarian conspiracy left him facing the threat of exile, which in 58 he saw realized. Both re-emerge upon his return in 57, however, and the three semantic classes initiated in the pre-exile period – ‘wounding’ (*volnero*, *Cat.* 1.9), ‘breaking’ (*perfringo*, *Sul.* 46; *fregi*, *Att.* 1.16.8, 2.1.5), and ‘cutting’ (*ad eum lacerandum*, *Sul.* 50) – continue to see further development.

---

[26] Again, Laurand 1936-40 remains the starting point for study of the distinctive features of Cicero's letters, for instance their high proportion of Greek terms (Laurand 1936-40: 1, 70-71) and looser syntax (Laurand 1936-40: 1, 110-15, esp. 113); the fullest recent treatment of the style and diction of the letters is found in von Albrecht 2003, especially 52-71, 94-95, and 118-9.

II. 57-55 BCE (The *Post Reditum* Years)

After spending the bulk of 58 BCE in exile, Cicero returned to Rome on 4 September 57. Likewise, he returned swiftly to his new and violent metaphors in the speech *Post Reditum in Senatu*, but their use is cautious and indirect. The verbs are the same, but Cicero’s personal voice and agency hide in the background.

A speech both of thanks to the senate and of praise of himself, Cicero’s main purpose in *Post Reditum in Senatu* is not direct personal attack. Yet even here he cannot refrain from invective, for in sections 10 through 18 in particular he descends into virulent abuse of the odious Piso and A. Gabinius, the consuls of 58 who failed to aid Cicero in the face of Clodius’ legislative threats, and thus the recipients of much abuse from Cicero in the *post reditum* speeches.[27] Cicero’s strategy, however, is one of namelessness. In these sections he refuses to dignify either target with a name, and in fact he avoids names throughout the speech as a whole, whether in reference to Piso and Gabinius, Cn. Pompeius Magnus, the Catilinarian conspirators, or his old enemy Clodius.[28] And it is in fact this last enemy that elicits from Cicero renewed use of his violent *ad hominem* metaphors.

---

[27] For historical background, see Nisbet 1961: vi-xiv. For instances of Cicero’s abuse against Piso and Gabinius throughout the speeches of this period, cf. Corbeill 1996: 18-19, 133-5, 166-7, 169-73.

[28] Cf. e.g. avoidance of Clodius’ name, as well as the names of Piso and Gabinius, at *Red. Sen.* 3 (*eum tribunum plebis*; *iis consulibus*), and at *Red. Sen.* 4 Clodius again (*meus inimicus*) as well as the Catilinarian conspirators (*ii, qui haec paene delerunt*) and Pompey (*princeps ... civitatis*). On Cicero’s use of namelessness as an invective strategy in the post-exile speeches of 57-56 BCE, cf. Steel 2007.

The first instance occurs in the opening sections of the speech as Cicero praises the senate for recalling him. In section 3 he mentions L. Ninnius as the particular author of the motion that led to his return, and he applauds the senate for persisting in this course even when a certain tribune stood in the way, one who, though deterred in his path, seeks in general to mutilate the state:

> postea quam vobis decernendi potestas facta non est per eum tribunum plebis, qui cum per se rem publicam **lacerare** non posset, sub alieno scelere delituit, numquam de me siluistis, numquam meam salutem non ab iis consulibus, qui vendiderant, flagitavistis (*Red. Sen*. 3)

Now, this instance does not represent the full-fledged posture as it has appeared thus far; Cicero himself is not the agent of *lacerare*, nor is the verb's object a target with whom he wages direct syntactic battle. Rather, the phrase *rem publicam lacerare* here marks a transferred expression of Cicero's animosity toward the unnamed Clodius. In the *post reditum* works in general Cicero tends to identify himself with the state, and here the state shares Cicero's exile directly, as Clodius' attacks against Cicero betoken assaults against Rome herself.[29] Yet the verb *lacero* was not a regular part of Cicero's metaphorical vocabulary. In fact, before its use here it appears in at least a semi-figurative sense only at *Sul*. 50, discussed previously, and *Att*. 3.8.2 (*meus me maeror cotidianus* ***lacerat*** *et conficit*), where it signifies the extreme grief and distress Cicero's exile has caused him.[30] The choice of the verb *lacero* thus marks for Cicero exceptionally impassioned emotion, and in accusing Clodius of seeking to mutilate the state, Cicero discharges upon Clodius his own hatred and longing for Clodius' destruction, as the latter's actions against Cicero and Rome herself inherently call for just requital.

---

[29] On Cicero's propensity to identify himself with the state in the *post reditum* speeches in particular, cf. May 1988: 93-94, "His wounds are the wounds of the state, his exile her exile, his recall and return her recall and return, his *causa* the *causa rei publicae*." Cf. also Fantham 1972: 94-95 for metaphors of the state as a "wounded or afflicted body" in *Pro Sestio*.

[30] Note that the *TLL* accordingly lists *Att*. 3.8.2 under the subheading *affliguntur animantia* (7.2.827.34).

The second instance of *ad hominem* metaphors within this speech occurs as Cicero emerges from his abuse of Piso and Gabinius (*Red. Sen*. 10-18). He resumes his praise of those whose loyalty to Rome – and thereby to Cicero himself – has remained constant, and here Cicero singles out T. Annius Milo as the one who recognized that Clodius must be stopped, preferably by legal means, but by force if necessary:

> quid ego de praestantissimo viro, T. Annio, dicam? ... qui cum videret sceleratum civem aut domesticum potius hostem, si legibus uti liceret, iudicio **esse frangendum**, sin ipsa iudicia vis impediret ac tolleret, ... vim vi esse superandam, primo de vi postulavit (*Red. Sen*. 19)

In particular, Cicero states that Milo saw the need for Clodius to be 'broken' – *esse frangendum*. Again, this statement does not embody a personal and open declaration against Clodius on Cicero's part, but by now it should be clear that such circumlocutions are characteristic of this speech. And still here is found the clear syntactic opposition of agent and object. Clodius the unnamed 'enemy' (*hostem*) must be broken; with the periphrastic construction it is not one single person but rather Rome at large that must act as agent. Thus, while the phrases *rem publicam lacerare* (*Red. Sen*. 3) and *hostem ... esse frangendum* (*Red. Sen*. 19) do not project the explicit and bold front of *Clodium praesentem fregi in senatu* (*Att*. 1.16.8), still at their roots lie both the general *ad hominem* sentiments and the specific verbal indicators that mark Cicero's posture overall. Moreover, note that both are slipped into the discourse by means of *qui* clauses (*qui cum* in both cases) and occupy the initial and emphatic sub-clause slot of each. These, then, are clear echoes of the posture that heretofore has appeared more directly; their allusive nature simply reflects Cicero's rhetorical strategy in the speech at large. And more generally, these instances point to Cicero's growing comfort with and broader application of these verbs – *frango* in particular – a trend which will be confirmed below.

In March of 56 BCE, P. Sestius was tried in the criminal courts under the *lex Plautia de vi* for his actions as tribune the previous year, though the precise charges are unclear. Sestius had acted as the catalyst for Cicero's return from exile in 57 BCE, and so to fulfill his debt of obligation Cicero spoke in Sestius' defense.[31] Over the course of the trial, P. Vatinius – an affiliate of Caesar – gave evidence as a hostile witness; Cicero himself was a partisan of Pompey in this period and thereby an opponent of Caesar and Vatinius, and consequently he abused Vatinius so thoroughly in his cross-examination (*interrogatio*) that subsequently he wrote up his remarks as the free-standing *In Vatinium*.[32] Cicero's assault against Vatinius brought him back to more open political attack, and with it too came the return of his first-person posture in full. One instance each of all three semantic categories are found in connection with this attack, and once again personal animosity breeds innovation.

In the *In Vatinium* itself *frango* occurs almost immediately – the form *frangerem* appears in the second section of the speech. Here Cicero acknowledges that his decision to question Vatinius as a witness may cause surprise given his hatred of the latter, but he assures Vatinius that he grants him this honor only so that he might 'curb his ferocity, break his audacity, and put a stop to his loquacity':

---

[31] Sestius was charged with forming an armed gang, but uncertainty surrounds his intentions in doing so – that is, whether his actions and intent qualify as acting against the interest of the state; on the charges and immediate circumstances of Sestius' trial, see Kaster 2006: 17-21.

[32] Vatinius was responsible for Caesar's command in Gaul through the *lex Vatinia* of 59; see Pocock 1926: 5-7, as well as 9-28 for a fuller treatment of the speech's bearing on the politics of the day.

> quare ne tibi hunc honorem a me haberi forte mirere, quod interrogem, ... nulla me causa impulisset, nisi ut ferocitatem istam tuam comprimerem et audaciam **frangerem** et loquacitatem paucis meis interrogationibus inretitam retardarem (*Vat*. 2)

Now, as *frangerem* occupies the middle position within the tricolon that follows from the *ut* clause (*comprimerem ... frangerem ... retardarem*), the verb's placement here is not particularly emphatic. Indeed, such rhetorically insignificant positioning suggests that by this point in time, the verb's force as an *ad hominem* metaphor had already begun to weaken slightly due to Cicero's continued usage. And yet here too novelty can be found, for though Cicero remains the verb's personal agent, as object he designates not Vatinius himself but rather Vatinius' *audacia*. Of course a target's negative qualities frequently attract ridicule in invective passages, for instance Piso's lust (*Pis*. 70) or Antony's drunkenness (*Phil*. 2.63).[33] As a negative attribute, however, *audacia* is so generalizing and so commonly employed in abusive contexts as to easily stand in for a person himself.[34] Thus, the phrase *audaciam frango* is a natural extension of *frango* as it has appeared thus far – governing first *Clodium* (*Att*. 1.16.8), then *hominem* (*Att*. 2.1.5), and finally *hostem* (*Red. Sen*. 19).[35]

---

[33] On these common *topoi*, see Nisbet 1961: 194-5 and Craig 2004: 190-1. For parallels in Greek invective, cf. Süss 1910: 249-50, 253.

[34] Opelt 1965: 159 notes that the adjective *audax* appeared frequently in insults and typically meant little more than *malus*, *improbus*, or *sceleratus*, observing that it is the peculiarity of the target and the other more precisely defined terms used alongside of *audax* that lend the adjective its sense in political invective; cf. also 210 on the generalized usage of *audax*. In noun form too *audacia* is frequently paired with such terms as *scelus* or *facinus* to denote general wickedness; cf. e.g. *Clu*. 23 (*singulari scelere et audacia*), *Phil*. 3.13 (*Antoni scelus audaciamque*), and in the opposite fashion, denoting the baseness that is *not* present in the accused, *Cael*. 1 (*cum audiat nullum facinus, nullum audaciam ... in iudicium vocari*).

[35] Note too that after *audaciam frangerem* of *Vat*. 2 (as well as *voltu collegae sui* ***libidinem levitatemque franget*** of *Sest*. 20, the *In Vatinium* and *Pro Sestio* being sister speeches deriving from the same trial) Cicero begins to pair other abstract qualities with *frango*; cf. e.g. *hominis ...* ***petulantiam*** *...* ***fregistis*** (*Pis*. 32), *quis* ***cupiditatem*** *vehementius* ***frangere*** *accusando potest?* (*de Orat*. 2.35), and ***dolorem****, si non potuero* ***frangere****, occultabo* (*Phil*. 12.21), and generally *TLL* 6.1.1246.64-1247.19.

Later on in the speech there appears too a 'wounding' reference. In sections 11 and 12 Cicero lambasts Vatinius' terms as quaestor and tribune of the commons, and in pressing Vatinius for admission of his crimes during the latter, he warns him against trying to drag into the matter the most distinguished men of the day.[36] Cicero follows this by emphasizing that through his questioning, Cicero will ensure that harm comes to no one other than Vatinius himself – specifically that Cicero will deal with Vatinius directly, dragging him out of his obscurity and away from the *dignitas* of the splendid Caesar, and will so cast his shafts that they will lodge only in Vatinius' lungs and guts; no one else will be 'wounded' through Vatinius' body:

> ego te quaecumque rogabo, de te ipso rogabo neque te ex amplissimi viri dignitate, sed ex tuis tenebris extraham, omniaque mea tela sic in te conicientur, ut nemo per tuum latus, quod soles dicere, **saucietur**; in tuis pulmonibus ac visceribus haerebunt (*Vat*. 13)

Now, it is difficult to determine the relative novelty of *saucietur* here. On the one hand, this marks the first and only documented instance of *saucio* as an *ad hominem* metaphor.[37] In addition, *saucietur* is heavily contextualized here, preceded by the standard phrase *tela conicio* and followed by the particularly graphic – and thus potentially novel – image of such javelins embedded in Vatinius' organs (*in tuis pulmonibus ac visceribus haerebunt*). And as contextualization has accompanied the introduction of the metaphors examined thus far, both of these factors suggest that Cicero's use of *saucio* here is fresh and innovative.

---

[36] I.e. *ac tibi iam inde praescribo ne tuas sordes cum clarissimorum virorum splendore permisceas* (*Vat*. 13).

[37] The verb is used twice of the 'wounding' caused by words in Plautus' *Bacchides* (*eadem* (sc. *verba*) *... animum fodicant, bona destimulant, facta et famam* ***sauciant***, *Bac*. 64; *non res, sed actor mihi cor odio* ***sauciat***, *Bac*. 213); the context of neither is *ad hominem*, however, as both rather refer to the simple emotional distress accompanying certain remarks.

On the other hand, though, the phrase *quod soles dicere* seems to indicate that in at least part of this passage Cicero quotes Vatinius directly. Whether the phrase refers specifically to *per tuum latus*, to *saucietur*, or to the use of both together is unclear. As a comparandum, when Cicero appears to quote Clodius in *De Haruspicum Responsis*, the similar phrase *quo modo ipse gloriari solet* is placed as an introductory marker, directly preceding the purported quotation (*etiam sua contio risit hominem, quo modo ipse gloriari solet, ducentis confixum senati consultis*, *Har*. 8). Since *quod soles dicere* likewise precedes *saucietur* in the passage above, it seems quite possible that Vatinius had previously used the verb *saucio* in this context, and that at *Vat*. 13 above Cicero quotes Vatinius back to himself. Perhaps too the expression in full was a favored or at least common expression in the late-Republican political milieu. In support of this is a letter from M. Caelius Rufus to Cicero only five years later (*Fam*. 8.8, 51 BCE) in which Caelius uses the adjective *saucius* in a very similar fashion (*sic nunc neque absolutus neque damnatus Servilius de repetundis* ***saucius*** *Pilo tradetur*, *Fam*. 8.8.3). Yet echoes of the phrase *per tuum latus* can be found without the verb *saucio*, whereas again *saucio* as used in this passage is unparalleled.[38] Thus, while there exists a reasonable possibility that with *saucietur* Cicero was in fact quoting Vatinius, the matter cannot be decided with certainty.

Even if *saucietur* did originate from Vatinius, however, at *Vat*. 13 Cicero still turns the expression to his own advantage. The passage as a whole delivers a clear *ad hominem* threat against Vatinius – Cicero's weapons will lodge in Vatinius' guts alone,

---

[38] Cf. the phrase '*per* X *latus*' at Livy 40.9.5 (*itaque si mori tacitum oportet, taceamus, precati tantum deos ut a me coeptum scelus in me finem habeat,* ***nec per meum latus*** *tu petaris*) and Lucan 3.123-4 (*non nisi* ***per nostrum*** *vobis percussa patebunt templa* ***latus***); cf. also Pocock 1926: 92 *ad loc*. and *TLL* 7.2.1025.32-36.

Cicero declares. Yet the actual 'wounding' (*saucietur*) is vicarious, linked not with Vatinius directly but with the universal *nemo*. Thus, Cicero plainly attacks Vatinius – potentially through the latter's own words – but still he can plead innocent to a certain extent, for since in grammatical terms Vatinius does not receive the verb's action here, the attack is somewhat indirect. Cicero leaves the connection between Vatinius and *saucietur* to be completed through the phrase *per tuum latus* rather than through direct agent-object opposition, and thus the relationship is more conceptual than strictly syntactical. Compare again that *frangerem* at *Vat*. 2 above displays a similar method of intense yet indirect attack, for there Cicero proposes to break Vatinius' *audacia* but technically not Vatinius himself (*Vat*. 2). Moreover, by connecting *saucietur* to *nemo* Cicero is able to ensure that one person in particular will not be wounded through association with Vatinius, and this particular 'no one' is the *amplissimus vir* mentioned previously in the passage – Caesar, he himself the fuel behind the fire in this case but left by Cicero to emerge unscorched.[39] Thus, here too Cicero's use of these verbs reflects his strategy in the speech as a whole, that of violently attacking and crushing Vatinius, but *only* Vatinius, carefully distancing Caesar from Vatinius and the abuse he receives at Cicero's hands. And though it is impossible to determine precisely the novelty of *saucietur*, still the verb stands beside *vulnero* and substantiates Cicero's use of this class at large.

The final instance spurred by Cicero's attack on Vatinius comes not in the *In Vatinium* itself but in a letter to Cicero's brother in March of 56 following the acquittal of Sestius (*Q. fr*. 2.4). The news of the acquittal and Cicero's role in the trial form the subject of the opening section, and Cicero boasts to Quintus that in the course of Sestius' defense, with all of heaven and earth lending their applause he 'cut down' Vatinius, thus fulfilling Sestius' own desire:

---

[39] On the reference to Caesar, cf. Pocock 1926: 92.

> nam defendendo moroso homini cumulatissime satisfecimus et, id quod ille maxime cupiebat, Vatinium, a quo palam oppugnabatur, arbitratu nostro **concidimus** dis hominibusque plaudentibus (*Q. fr.* 2.4.1)

In the above statement Cicero returns to the 'cutting' family of verbs, and here occur two innovations within this semantic category. First, *Vatinium ... concidimus* marks the first time direct agent-object opposition appears with a 'cutting' verb, the previous two instances being the image-laden *ad eum lacerandum* (*Sul.* 15) and the allusive *rem publicam lacerare* (*Red. Sen.* 3). Second, in usage outside the theater the verb itself is new.[40] The only figurative prose application that precedes *concidimus* above comes in the *Verrines* (*Ver.* 2.5.151), and in this instance the verb is enmeshed so deeply in the clustered 'hunting' imagery that dominates the passage that its force and meaning are tethered to this context; *concido* simply caps off a long string of hunting metaphors instead of issuing a direct personal attack.[41] In fact, Cicero seems to have been inspired by his usage at *Q. fr.* 2.4.1 above and similarly employs *concido* of courtroom defeat in his next letter to Quintus as well, though there the reference is distanced and third-person.[42] Finally, in the passage above Cicero once again anchors the new metaphor to late Republican discourse, for he places the common *oppugno* only three words before *concidimus* to smooth the latter's way.

---

[40] Besides its appearance at Pl. *Epid.* 488 (discussed in Chapter One), the verb *concido* is attested of verbal action only once before Cicero, found in a fragment of Ennius – *vocibus concide* (Enn. *scen.* 421 = 429 Warmington). The context of this instance is almost completely lacking, however, for it cannot be assigned to any of Ennius' dramas with certainty, and in fact the brief remainder of the line is uncertain enough in its reading to have inspired a number of editorial suggestions (Warmington for instance suggests '*fac iam musset obrutus*' and Ribbeck '*faxis ... musset obrutus*'; see Warmington 1967: 378 *app. crit. ad loc.*). This verb, then, may have been used occasionally of speech in the theater, but again such represents specifically verse usage, and moreover, the speech to which these two pre-Ciceronian instances refer is not (at least clearly) *ad hominem* in nature.

[41] I.e. *nunc tibi ego ullam salutem, ullum **perfugium** putem, cum te **implicatum** severitate iudicum, **circumretitum** frequentia populi Romani esse videam? si mehercule, id quod fieri non posse intellego, ex his te **laqueis** exueris ac te aliqua via ac ratione **explicaris**, in illas tibi maiores **plagas** incidendum est in quibus te ab eodem me superiore ex loco **confici** et **concidi** necesse est* (*Ver.* 2.5.150-1). In addition, observe that the syntactic opposition here is not direct – Verres (*te*) is indeed the explicit object and Cicero (*ab eodem me*) the agent, but the reference is extremely impersonal, as not only is *concidi* passive in voice but also an infinitive dependent on the impersonal *necesse est*.

Thus, Cicero's invective against Vatinius prompts instances of all three semantic ranges within his *ad hominem* posture, and all three at least potentially entail innovation – *audaciam frangerem* (*Vat.* 2) marks the first coupling of this sort, and *saucietur* (*Vat.* 13) and *concidimus* (*Q. fr.* 2.4.1) are both at least possibly new in their usage. Moreover, in *concidimus* too lies the first full and direct application of 'cutting' verbs.[43] Finally, note that these three references provide a clear and convenient means of illustrating the pattern that has been emerging in Cicero's cross-generic application of his posture; in the speeches Cicero issues these verbs predominantly in the form of threats (*audaciam frangerem*, *Vat.* 2; *saucietur*, *Vat.* 13), while in the letters they come as retrospective boasts (*concidimus*, *Q. fr.* 2.4.1).

---

[42] I.e. *ea ipsa in re Pompei offensio nobis obstitit. senatorum enim urna copiose absolvit, equitum adaequavit, tribuni aerarii condemnarunt. sed hoc incommodum consolantur cottidianae damnationes inimicorum, in quibus me perlibente Sevius adlisus est, ceteri* ***conciduntur*** (*Q. fr.* 2.4.6 = S.B. 2.5.4); cf. likewise *Phil.* 12.11.

[43] One other instance of *concido* is found in the *post reditum* years, appearing in a fragment of L. Crassus' oratory in *De Oratore* (*an tu, cum omnem* *auctoritatem* *universi ordinis pro pignere putaris eamque in conspectu populi Romani* ***concideris****, me his pignoribus existimas posse terreri? de Orat.* 3.4). It is difficult to determine whether the use of *concido* here should be attributed to Crassus himself or rather to Cicero; that the object of *concideris* here is an abstract noun (*auctoritatem*) renders the instance a parallel of the *frango*-abstract pairings that Cicero began to employ in *Pro Sestio* and *In Vatinium*, and thus recommends Cicero's hand; indeed, beyond this passage *concido* is applied figuratively to '*res*' nowhere else before Cicero (cf. *TLL* 4.34.73-35.19), and this fact too points to Cicero's influence in its use here. That Crassus himself is responsible for *concideris*, however, is suggested by the word-play on *caedo* featured in the extended quotation, as such ornamentation was typical of Crassus' style (cf. *Brut.* 159, Tac. *Dial.* 18.2) – *concideris* above is followed by *sunt caedenda* and *est excidenda* in the following sentence (*non tibi illa* ***sunt caedenda*** *si Crassum vis coercere: haec tibi* ***est excidenda*** *lingua*; *de Orat.* 3.4).

In the following year (55 BCE) Cicero delivered a fresh wave of attacks against the consuls who three years previously had failed him; Piso bore the bulk of this abuse, but Gabinius received his due share too. That summer Piso returned to Rome from his proconsulship in Macedonia, and a lively exchange in the senate with Cicero led the latter to write up the speech as the *In Pisonem*. Piso then responded in turn with his own pamphlet.[44] One of Cicero's most virulent invectives, the *In Pisonem* seeks to restore Cicero's damaged prestige by tearing down the facade of Piso's respectable image and casting him as the anti-Cicero.[45] Two particular moments of the speech are of interest to this examination as they clearly represent incarnations of Cicero's violent posture. Yet too they stand in contrast to every other instance considered in this chapter, for in these moments Cicero turns to nouns, not verbs.

In the first, Cicero returns from a digression on Gabinius' proconsulship in Syria (*Pis*. 41) to address both Piso and Gabinius again, incredulous that the two would dare disparage Cicero's career and fortunes while extolling their own.[46] And at a peak of rage and disgust, Cicero professes that even should he see them fixed to a cross, he could not possibly find greater joy in the mutilation of their bodies than he does that very moment in the laceration of their reputations:

---

[44] On the circumstances of the speech's delivery, cf. Nisbet 1961: xiv, 199-202; on the speech's published form as it relates to that delivered, Nisbet does not take a firm stance but suggests that as an invective it was liable to expansion beyond all recognition (Nisbet 1961: 202). For Piso's counter-reply, see *Q. fr*. 3.1.11.

[45] Cf. Corbeill 1996: 169-73 on the invective strategies adopted by Cicero against the otherwise venerable Piso, and Dugan 2005: 58-66 on Piso as the anti-Cicero.

[46] I.e. *O di immortales! tune etiam atque adeo vos, geminae voragines scopulique rei publicae, vos meam fortunam deprimitis, vestram extollitis, cum de me ea senatus consulta absente facta sint, eae contiones habitae, is motus fuerit municipiorum et coloniarum omnium, ea decreta publicanorum, ea conlegiorum, ea denique generum ordinumque omnium quae non modo ego optare numquam auderem sed cogitare non possem, vos autem sempiternas foedissimae turpitudinis notas subieritis?* (*Pis*. 41).

> an ego si te et Gabinium cruci suffixos viderem, maiore adficerer laetitia ex corporis vestri **laceratione** quam adficior ex famae? (*Pis*. 42)

As *laceratione* must be assumed with *famae* as well as with *corporis*, here again Cicero turns to 'cutting' terminology to characterize his invective attacks. Of course his choice of a noun rather than a verb renders this reference more oblique than those examined previously, yet still Cicero describes his invective in violent terms, as 'lacerating' Piso and Gabinius while he delivers the speech. Moreover, in broader view this passage further testifies that in these years Cicero was increasingly drawn to 'cutting' terms to signify the destructive might of his oratory, and thus in hindsight it provides all the more reason to detect traces of such usage in *Pro Sulla* (*ad eum lacerandum*; *Sul*. 50) and *Post Reditum in Senatu* (*rem publicam lacerare*; *Red. Sen*. 3).[47]

Cicero's *ad hominem* posture reverberates a second time in noun form just a few sections later (*Pis*. 47) as the subject turns to Piso specifically and his stint as proconsul in Macedonia. Cicero rebukes Piso for disbanding his army without authorization, and he equates so foolish an act with self-mutilation, declaring that mutilating one's body is a small matter compared with wounding one's own life and reputation:

> cruentare corpus suum leve est, maior haec est vitae, famae, salutis suae **volneratio** (*Pis*. 47)[48]

---

[47] Note that the verb *lacerare* too appears in a fragment of the *In Pisonem* where Cicero purportedly advises Piso not to 'lacerate' him, as it was not Cicero but Caesar and Pompey that sent him into exile – *non debes me* ***lacerare****, quia non ego te in exilium misi, sed Caesar et Pompeius* (*Pis*. fr. xx, Nisbet). The formulation *me lacerare* here directly parallels the instances treated in this chapter in syntax as well as semantics, but editors traditionally have not accepted the fragment as genuine – Nisbet, for instance, brackets the fragment in his edition and points to several factors that argue against its authenticity (Nisbet 1961: 57 *ad loc*.), and Clark in his *OCT* text omits it entirely. Thus, this fragment likely testifies not to Cicero's own usage but to that of its source, the fifth-century grammarian Grillius.

[48] Note that while most editors retain *leve est*, Nisbet here omits the phrase; cf. Nisbet 1961: 110 *ad loc*. for an explanation of his reading.

Cicero's use of *volneratio* here of course differs from that of *laceratio* at *Pis*. 42, for instead of Cicero wounding Piso by means of his oratory, here Piso wounds himself through his own actions. But in both passages Cicero contrasts corporeal mutilation with mutilation of reputation; thus, in this regard *laceratione* and *volneratio* stand as parallels, and thus too Cicero's use of the former likely inspired the appearance of the latter just a few sections later. Moreover, *volneratio* here corresponds to the verb *volnero* at *Cat*. 1.9 just as *laceratio* at *Pis*. 42 to the forms of *concido* and *lacero* discussed above. Thus, the two nouns represent offshoots of Cicero's *ad hominem* posture that exhibit both the same general type of application as well as the same specific semantics. Now, my purpose here is not to explain why Cicero chose to use nouns in *In Pisonem* rather than the accusative-active verb formula seen otherwise, though I do offer the basic suggestion that since the speech as a whole is filled with abusive noun epithets, it is unsurprising that Cicero would to turn to nouns in these instances too.[49] Rather, I simply emphasize that *volneratio* and *laceratio* in the passages cited above provide an additional witness to Cicero's growing use in these years of 'wounding' and 'cutting' terms as metaphors for invective.

Here follow further notes on frequency to close discussion of this period. That 'wounding' terminology continued to prove a regular part of Cicero's *ad hominem* vocabulary is reflected elsewhere too. In addition to *saucietur* at *Vat*. 13 and *volneratio* at *Pis*. 47, forms of *vulnero* occur in similar usage in both the speech *De Haruspicum*

---

[49] In the final chapter I will provide an additional suggestion that takes into account Cicero's broader political position at the time of the *In Pisonem*; see Chapter Four, p. 166. On the abusive epithets in this speech, see Nisbet 1961: 194-6 for an overview according to *topos*, and Koster 1980: 359-61 for a full listing.

Responsis as well as the treatise *De Oratore*.[50] In both, however, the verb's voicing is passive and accordingly indicates that the force of *vulnero* as a metaphor was diminishing in this period. In *De Haruspicum Responsis*, *vulnero* is paired with the otherwise unparalleled *trucidatus* and refers to the verbal wounding of the hated Clodius, both by Cicero himself and by P. Servilius Isauricus – *an potest gravioribus a me verbis* ***vulnerari*** *quam est ... a gravissimo viro, P. Servilio, confectus ac trucidatus?* (*Har*. 2).[51] And in *De Oratore*, the verb appears within discussion of *risus* and its proper extent of use – Cicero, in the mouth of Caesar Strabo (C. Iulius Caesar Strabo Vopiscus), advises that the public would prefer that the *facinerosi* be 'wounded' by a power much greater than that of ridicule – *facinerosos* [*enim*] *maiore quadam vi quam ridiculi* ***vulnerari*** *volunt* (*de Orat*. 2.237).[52] In fact, *frango* occurs in the previous section too, as Cicero/Caesar Strabo pronounces *risus* generally fit for orators to provoke due to its capacity to 'break one's adversary', among other functions – *est plane oratoris movere risum; vel quod ipsa hilaritas benevolentiam conciliat ei ... vel quod* ***frangit*** *adversarium* ... (*de Orat*. 2.236).[53] Now, of the various interlocutors in *De Oratore* it is L. Licinius Crassus who is typically viewed as Cicero's mouthpiece, and likewise M. Antonius with whose speech combat metaphors are associated.[54] Thus, that the instances of *vulnero* and *frango* above are delivered by Caesar Strabo may cause surprise. Note, though, that in him John Dugan finds a fitting parallel for Cicero's transgressive humor and general oratorical 'indiscretions', and thus too he seems a suitable vessel for Cicero's new and bold metaphors for oratory.[55]

---

[50] Cf. in addition *vulneraretur* at *Q. fr*. 3.2.2.

[51] Cf. that the only other figurative instance of *trucido* provided by the *OLD* is *Cael*. 42, where it is an abstract noun (*faenus*) that serves as agent (*OLD* s.v. 2b). Note too that in the sentence that follows, Cicero refers both to his own words and to those of Servilius Isauricus as *tela* hurled (*coniecerit*) at an *inimicus*, thereby contextualizing particularly *trucidatus* in its novelty (*non dubito quin ea* ***tela****, quae* ***coniecerit inimicus****, quam ea, quae collega patris emisit, leviora atque hebetiora esse videantur*; *Har*. 2).

[52] On the role of humor as presented in these sections of *De Oratore*, see Fantham 2004: 186-208.

[53] For an in-depth analysis of the deployment of humor in invective, see Corbeill 1996.

[54] On Crassus, see Gunderson 2000: 209-14, and on M. Antonius see Fantham 1972: 156.

In the *post reditum* years as a whole, then, Cicero continues to employ the same three semantic strands that emerged under his consulship. The categories of 'breaking' and 'cutting' each see further exploration and development, but 'wounding' verbs potentially stagnate, and the force of *vulnero* in particular appears to diminish as Cicero now routinely uses it in the passive voice. And though Cicero still applies these verbs to his own oratory and agency as the rhetorical situation allows, he also begins to use them in situations far removed from his own person and interests as the terms themselves – especially *frango* and *vulnero* – enter into the regular rotation of his vocabulary.

III. 54-45 BCE (The Years of Remove)

The decade that followed these years proved highly tumultuous. Relations between Caesar and Pompey cooled with the deaths of Caesar's daughter Julia in 54 and of M. Licinius Crassus in 53; gang violence grew increasingly prevalent and resulted in the death of Clodius in January of 52, and in an attempt to control Rome in the tumult that followed, Pompey was appointed sole consul; Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon in January of 49 signaled the formal onset of civil war; and at the war's end in 46 Caesar assumed the dictatorship. Accordingly, for much of this decade Cicero withdrew from public life and, in fact, from his violent *ad hominem* metaphors. From 54 BCE until Caesar's assumption of the dictatorship in 46 there arise mere traces of the savage posture that thrived at Cicero's pen in previous years, and those that do occur are distanced and impersonal, clustering particularly in the treatises.

---

[55] Dugan 2005: 106; fleshed out in 107-47. Cf. Dugan's particular suggestion that Caesar Strabo "shared many of the qualities that his (sc. Cicero's) detractors (in particular the Atticists) found in Cicero himself: indecorous humor, a theatrical oratorical style, and aestheticism that crystallized in a reputation for being effeminate" (Dugan 2005: 117). Somewhat similarly, Fantham 2004: 187 suggests that Caesar Strabo appealed to Cicero both for his well-known and ready wit as well as for the picture of experience he represented, rather than for mere technical training.

In the speeches, echoes of the *frango*-abstract pairing first seen in *Pro Sestio* and *In Vatinium* begin to appear with some regularity, though again in such situations Cicero abstains from any agency on his own part and the applications lack *ad hominem* tones.[56] Only in a private letter to his brother Quintus (*Q. fr*. 3.2, 54 BCE) does Cicero associate himself with verbal violence, recounting to Quintus his old enemy Gabinius' shameful slinking into the senate upon his return to Rome and his subsequent 'wounding' by Cicero:

> ipso decimo die ... irrepsit summa infrequentia. cum vellet exire, a consulibus retentus est. ... cum a me maxime **vulneraretur**, non tulit et me trementi voce exsulem appellavit (*Q. fr*. 3.2.2)

That invective forms the context of this reference is proved by Gabinius' response – since he was unable to 'bear' Cicero's attack (*non tulit*), he resorted to abusive name-calling and labeled Cicero an 'exile' (*exsulem appellavit*).[57] Yet here again *vulnero* appears in the passive voice; Cicero's agency is thus set at a remove, and the verb's diminished force in this period as an *ad hominem* metaphor, suggested previously by the passive *vulnerari* at *Har*. 2, is corroborated.

---

[56] Cf. e.g. *tu* ***continentiam****, tu* ***industriam****, tu* ***animum*** *in rem publicam, tu* ***virtutem****, tu* ***innocentiam****, tu* ***fidem****, tu* ***labores*** *tuos ...* ***fractos esse*** *et abiectos et repudiatos putas?* (*Planc*. 9); *in spem maximam ... sumus adducti, hunc ipsum animum, hoc ipso summo viro consule, compressa hominum licentia,* ***cupiditatibus fractis****, ... salutarem civitati fore* (*Mil*. 78). For other examples, see *TLL* 6.1.1246.64-1247.19.

[57] The phrase *non tulit* (along with similar variations) in fact appears elsewhere as a signal of invective, indicating a target's inability to 'bear' the abuse and attacks directed his way; cf. e.g. *non tulit* at *Fam*. 12.25.6 and *de Orat*. 3.4; *non ferret* at *Fam*. 12.25.4, and even οὐκ ἤνεγκεν in Dio Cassius (D.C. 46.29.1) of Cicero's response to the invective of Fufius Calenus. Similarly, *fero* in the positive signifies the opposite – jesting, abuse, slander, etc. that one *has* managed to endure; cf. e.g. *non moleste tuli* at *Att*. 9.20.1 and *calumnium ... tulisse* at *Fam*. 8.8.1.

Once Caesar stands as dictator, however, Cicero employs these verbs in his treatises especially. Never do they mark his own words, but rather they empower the speech of others, specifically Roman orators and iconic Greek literary figures of the safely distant past. In the *Brutus* of 46 BCE Cicero twice applies *frango* to oratory and politics of the past. In section 95 he declares that M. Octavius 'broke' Tiberius Gracchus, here by means of his *patientia* specifically – *iniuria accepta* ***fregit*** *Ti. Gracchum* *patientia ... M. Octavius* (*Brut*. 95). Likewise, in section 109 M. Drusus is said to have done the same to the younger Gaius in more general terms – *M. Drusus C. f., qui in tribunatu* *C. Gracchum* *conlegam iterum tribunum* ***fregit*** (*Brut*. 109).[58] The odd pairing of *frango* with *patientia* in the first instance suggests that in this period, the verb's sense as an *ad hominem* metaphor had weakened somewhat, and in fact the phrase *frango patientia* itself recalls Cicero's general pose throughout this period of stomaching Caesar and the loss of liberty he imposed.[59] Moreover, though Cicero uses the same verb *frango* in these passages in the same, direct usage that characterizes his posture overall, in both Cicero himself is completely absent. By transferring this expression to figures of a near century's remove Cicero signals that under Caesar's dictatorship, only those of the past are free to exercise such power with their oratory, and he reminds his readers thereby of what has been snatched from Rome – the power and freedom of their own civic voices.

---

[58] Note that this analysis as a whole corroborates the reading '*fregit*' at *Brut*. 109 rather than '*fecit*' given by the manuscript consensus known as *L*; for these readings and the transmission of *Brutus* in general, see the introductory discussion and *apparatus criticus* in Malcovati's Teubner edition of the text (Malcovati 1965: v-xv and 33 *ad loc*).

[59] On the strategy of cautiously 'stomaching' Caesar adopted by Cicero in these years, see Corbeill 1996: 209-15.

Cicero's use of *concido* and *vulnero* in *De Natura Deorum* (45 BCE) is similarly distanced. In Book One, Cicero *qua* C. Cotta describes Epicurus as 'cutting down' Timocrates in his voluminous writings – *Epicurus ... Timocraten ... totis voluminibus ...* ***conciderit*** (*N.D.* 1.93).[60] And in Book Three he applies *vulnero* – again in the passive voice – to the type of abuse that characterized the Greek iambographers' poetry, deeming Hipponax and Archilochus to have 'harmed' and 'wounded' the targets of their iambics – *quem Hipponactis iambus laeserat aut qui erat Archilochi versu* **volneratus** (*N.D.* 3.91). Though these instances are not applied to oratory or political action specifically – nor even to Rome at all – nonetheless they highlight the verbal license enjoyed by such iconic figures of the past, and thereby too they provide a bitter reminder of what Roman words may no longer do.

In 46 and 45, then, Cicero found alternative and effective use of these verbs under Caesar's dictatorship; removing his own agency, he employed all three semantic strands to mark discreet, third-person protest of the silence forced on himself and others. And though *frango* and *concido* continue to appear in the final two years of his life and career, here the trail of *vulnero* and 'breaking' verbs seems to stop; no more are they are found in such usage. For three reasons, however, such a decline causes little surprise. First, by this point *vulnero* likely wielded little force, having enjoyed nearly twenty years of usage already. Second, in meaning it marked a mere extension of the 'harming' terms of the previous chapter.[61] And third, *frango* had proved ever more comfortable and attractive to Cicero in the previous periods, and thus, though it too inevitably began to weaken in sense, *frango* slowly comes to replace the by now worn-out *vulnero*. In fact, as the final section below will demonstrate, after Caesar's assassination *frango* becomes Cicero's trademark verb and appears in the highest concentration of any term in this survey.

---

[60] For the reference in this statement, see Dyck 2003: 176 *ad loc*.

[61] Note in fact that at *N.D.* 3.91 above *volneratus* is paired explicitly with *laeserat*.

IV. 46-43 BCE (The Final Years)

Caesar's assassination in March 44 brought with it the return of Cicero's first-person voice as well as his taste for violent self-boasting and open attack. In these final two years, the verbs *frango* and *concido* prove his favored means of assault, and with verbal liberty now restored to Rome, Cicero once more employs them – *frango* in particular – to mark personal triumph and glory. The "I" of his posture speaks out in both his letters and the impassioned and at times brutally savage *Philippics*.

Within the letters occur two first-person applications of *frango* that stem from a single event, a meeting of the senate in early April of 43 in which Cicero and P. Servilius Isauricus put forth contrasting motions. In two separate letters Cicero boasts of 'breaking' Servilius in the debate that eventually ensued. The first he writes to L. Munatius Plancus; in this letter he explains that the matter was adjourned to the following day, and that though Servilius came well prepared, Cicero 'broke' him – *venit paratus Servilius ... hunc quemadmodum **fregerim** ... ex aliorum te litteris malo cognoscere*; (*Fam*. 10.12.4, SB #377). The second – penned the same day and using the same terminology – Cicero directs to M. Iunius Brutus, and in relating the incident Cicero simply switches *frango* to the passive voice and renders himself the ablative of agent, thereby emphasizing his own victory from the opposite viewpoint of Servilius' defeat – *in Planci vero causa exarsit incredibili dolore mecumque per biduum ita contendit et a me ita **fractus est** ut eum in perpetuum modestiorem sperem fore*; *ad Brut*. 2.2.3, SB

#3).[62] The verb in fact occurs a third time in Cicero's correspondence of 44 and 43, again in a letter to Plancus, but here Cicero bestows Plancus himself with the verb's might; Cicero congratulates Plancus for the latter's success in all matters, consequently 'breaking' those who stood in envy of him – *omnia summa consecutus es ... eaque es adeptus adolescens multis invidentibus, quos ingenio industriaque* ***fregisti*** (*Fam*. 10.3.2, SB #355). With Caesar dead, the impulse to boost himself through violent boasting returns to Cicero, and in the eagerness with which he embraces *frango* in this period he extends the verb's application for the first time to a contemporary – a friend specifically.

In the speeches known as the *Philippics*, however, Cicero's first-person verbs speak with the greatest passion and boasting.[63] Though each of these fourteen speeches contains its own rhetorical circumstances and its own persuasive goals, as a whole the *Philippics* bear a single overarching theme and a single target – M. Antonius the *triumvir*, enemy of the state and thus of Cicero too, whom Rome must oppose unswervingly to protect and restore the Republic.[64] In whatever format, Cicero's cry throughout remains 'Antony must be stopped'. In fact, though, Antony must be 'broken'; on three occasions within the *Philippics* Cicero applies *frango* to the political and oratorical 'crushing' of Antony, and in two of these he chooses the specific phrase *frango audaciam*.

In the *Third Philippic*, the reference comes as Cicero admonishes the senate at the speech's opening, arguing that if his fellow senators had not delayed in taking action, they would already have 'broken' Antony's *audacia* with great ease through their own authority and the peoples' accord – *auctoritate enim senatus consensuque populi Romani*

---

[62] On these events and the dating of *Brut*. 2.2, see Shackleton Bailey 1980: 228 and Beaujeu 1991: 203-4.

[63] On the title of these speeches, referred to elsewhere as '*Antonianae*', see Manuwald 2007 (vol. 1): 47-64.

[64] A concise summary of the circumstances and persuasive goals of each speech is offered by von Albrecht 1997 (vol. 1): 528-9.

facile hominis amentis ***fregissemus*** *audaciam* (*Phil.* 3.2). The same *frango audaciam* formula that marked Cicero's onslaught against Vatinius reappears here of Antony, and again it signals intention particularly, that is Cicero's – and presumably the rest of the senate's – intention to 'break' Antony. Cicero therefore uses the first-person plural rather than singular – '*we*' would have broken Antony's *audacia*. At the stage of conception, the act remains one of collective agency. But ten speeches later, in retrospect of what progress has been achieved, Cicero claims sole responsibility. For more than half of the *Thirteenth Philippic* (*Phil.* 13.22-48) Cicero is occupied with responding to and refuting, in nearly line-by-line fashion, a letter sent by Antony to A. Hirtius and C. Octavian in which Antony tries to persuade the two to come over to the 'right' side of the fight; and as Cicero methodically refutes Antony's points, he boasts of fulfilling what he argued for back in the *Third Philippic*, the 'breaking' of Antony – *ego ... contudi et* ***fregi*** *adiuvantibus vobis exultantis praedonis audaciam* (*Phil.* 13.29).[65] Cicero specifically is the one who has achieved this; the rest of the senate merely assisted his efforts. But again Cicero chooses *frango* specifically in conjunction with *audaciam* here, and the phrase's status as an invective marker – and a Ciceronian one at that – is thereby cemented.

Through the boast Cicero co-opts for himself what he once had deemed a collective act and thus takes the lion's share of glory in its completion, so to speak. He will not share with the senate in this endeavor; however, he does allow the people to glory in their own role in quashing Catiline two decades earlier to prove the comparison between Antony and Catiline, both of whom are inherently weak and must therefore suffer inevitable defeat.[66] In the *Fourth Philippic* Cicero assures the people that just as they once 'broke' Catiline, likewise they will soon learn of Antony's undoing through Rome's collective efforts – *ut igitur* *Catilinam* *...* ***fregistis****, sic Antoni nefarium latrocinium ... brevi tempore oppressum audietis* (*Phil.* 4.15). Again, though, this personal co-opting is particular to *frango*, and thus *frango* may appropriately be labeled Cicero's trademark verb in these years. Note in fact that in the years 44 and 43 Cicero applies *frango* in a roughly *ad hominem* fashion a total of seven times. Six have been seen so far and in four cases denote Cicero's own actions; the seventh appears in *De Officiis*, where Cicero extends *frango* again to the past to describe the results of C. Laelius' campaign against the Lusitanian Viriatus in 145 BCE – *Viriatus Lusitanus ...* *quem* *C. Laelius ... praetor* ***fregit*** (*Off.* 2.40).[67] Thus, in these years Cicero so heartily embraced *frango* as an *ad hominem* metaphor that in addition to fortifying his own oratorical activities first and foremost, here the verb's reach extends again to his treatises as well despite Rome's renewed freedom after Caesar's assassination.

---

[65] See Shackleton Bailey 2009b: 224-5 on Antony's letter and the pseudo-*altercatio* Cicero creates from it in this speech.

With *concido* Cicero is more generous, however, for twice in the *Philippics* he grants this power to the senate. First, in opposing any concessions to Antony, Cicero in the *Fifth Philippic* reminds the senate that this is the man they 'cut down' with their own decrees on the twentieth of December – *ante diem XIII Kalendas Ianuarias decretis vestris* *eum* ***concidistis*** (*Phil.* 5.28). Cicero bolsters the senate with this verb as a means of exhortation and persuasion. Given the severity of the body's past actions – which amount to declaring Antony a public enemy, as Cicero reminds the senate in the following section (*Phil.* 5.29) – surely to turn soft now would be foolish, a grave contradiction of purpose; thus, Cicero employs the harsh *concidistis* to rouse the senate and recall the body to its former severity.[68] And in fact Cicero uses *concido* to the same end in the *Twelfth Philippic*, again insisting that the harsh measures taken earlier by the senate argue against treating for peace now; concessions may have been thinkable previously, for Antony had not yet been 'cut down' by the senate's harsh criticism and opposition – *nondum* ***erat*** *vestris tam gravibus tamque multis iudiciis ignominiisque* ***concisus*** (*Phil*. 12.11) – but such an option no longer remains.

---

[66] For the comparison between Antony and Catiline, see Manuwald 2007 (vol. 2): 531.

[67] On Cicero's account of the episode, see Dyck 1996: 419-20.

Of course in these statements Cicero's own oratory and personal feeling are present. It is he who has continued to push against Antony in speech after speech; he who renders the senate's actions those of violent 'cutting'; and he whose hatred of Antony is thereby reflected. But still his application of *concido* to the senate fulfills persuasive purposes, and he does not begrudge the senate such a boost, for by this point Cicero had already branded his own oratory with a new verb of 'cutting' – *lacero*, inspired by one of his most vicious personal attacks.

Having only just returned to Rome that morning, on 1 September 44 Cicero chose to sit out a meeting of the senate at the Temple of Concord.[69] For this Antony attacked him, and Cicero responded the next day with the *First Philippic*. Antony offered his own response at a senate meeting later that month – his attacks growing fiercer – and Cicero, not to be outdone, circulated his *Second Philippic* in pamphlet form at the end of October. This pseudo-speech blasts Antony and his career through all the common *topoi*, accusing him for instance of profligate spending, transgressive sexuality, effeminate dress, revolting drunkenness, and sheer cowardice.[70] But though Cicero's abuse is typical, his language is not. In section 86, amidst an array of insults, Cicero stops to declare to Antony directly that if Antony possesses any feeling at all, Cicero's speech is 'lacerating' and 'bloodying' him:

---

[68] For these explicit suggestions, cf. *quid igitur illo die aliud egistis nisi ut hostem iudicaretis Antonium? his vestris decretis aut ille vos aequo animo aspicere poterit aut vos illum sine dolore summo videbitis?* (*Phil*. 5.29).

[69] A helpful chronology of the *Philippics* and surrounding events is provided in Shackleton Bailey's revised edition of the *Philippics* found in the Loeb series (2009a: lix-lxvii). On the circumstances leading up to the *First* and *Second Philippics*, cf. also Ramsey 2003: 1-9.

> quid hoc turpius, quid foedius, quid suppliciis omnibus dignius? num exspectas dum te stimulis fodiamus? haec te, si ullam partem habes sensus, **lacerat**, haec **cruentat** oratio (*Phil*. 2.86)

Now, the verb *lacero* is not foreign to this discussion, for it appeared in a quasi-proper sense at *Sul*. 50 and was used more allusively at *Red. Sen*. 3, and moreover, at *Pis*. 42 the related noun *laceratio* was employed clearly of abusive oratory.

It is Cicero's use of *lacero* at *Phil*. 2.86 that is new, for here for the first time he deploys the verb just as he has others in what I have termed his 'posture'.[71] That is, in the passage above *lacerat* – as well as the reinforcing *cruentat* – serves to position Cicero as Antony's superior. Antony, the verb's explicit object, at that very moment is mutilated by Cicero himself personally and directly. In this case, though, it is Cicero's oratory personified that deals the blow, and thus this action is inextricably intertwined with Ciceronian oratory now and forevermore, as the final chapter will show. Moreover, since the semantic class and specific verb had already been established to a degree, Cicero gives the reader only slight preparation for the metaphor. In the previous sentence he asks Antony whether the latter is waiting for the rest of Rome to 'goad' him (*num exspectas dum te stimulis fodiamus?*), but in thought this question follows directly from the sentence that precedes it in which Cicero proclaims Antony's oratorical performance clothed as a Lupercus 'worthy of every sort of punishment' (*quid hoc ... suppliciis omnibus dignius?*).[72] Thus, there stands a conceptual break between *num exspectas ...* and *haec te ... lacerat*, a shift in thought and sphere that allows the latter a certain amount of independence and lends the violent declaration an almost metatheatrical quality. Building on the violence of *stimulis fodiamus* but autonomous in sense, *lacero* in the passage above thus brandishes its full might, shocking in the suddenness of its appearance as well as its unparalleled directness – note that Cicero declares himself lacerating not a 'him' or a 'them' or even a '*hunc*', but 'you', a direct address of Antony in the second-person. And so this passage marks not only the formal inauguration of the most forceful verb of Cicero's posture but also the most direct and brutal application of this posture – a second-person attack, the graphic and bloody nature of which Cicero reinforces with *cruentat* in the statement's second *bracchium*.

---

[70] For examples of these *topoi* in the *Second Philippic*, cf. respectively *Phil*. 2.44 (Antony is already bankrupt before he adopts the *toga virilis*); 2.44-45 (Antony assumes the subordinate role in an unbridled relationship with Curio); 2.76 (Antony dons Gaulish slippers and a cloak); 2.63 (Antony drinks so much wine at Hippias' wedding that he vomits in public the next day); and 2.70-75 (Antony fails to follow Caesar to various engagements in the Civil War). For an overview of the invective charges and abuse found in the *Second Philippic*, cf. Ramsey 2003: 159-60 and Koster 1980: 129-33; for a thematic analysis of the charges of sexual impropriety and effeminacy in particular, Corbeill 1996: 105-6, 148-50.

[71] Cf. that in the *TLL*'s category of figurative usage '*vituperando, detrectando*' (*TLL* 7.2.827.52-828.8) *Phil*. 2.86 is the first instance listed; and in fact the related category '*dicta, scripta sim*.' (*TLL* 7.2.827.3-21) contains only instances dating to the first century CE or later.

So direct and brutal a blow is never again to be found in Cicero's extant corpus, though as witnessed above the *Philippics* at large contain several other incarnations of this posture. And in fact *lacero* appears in similar usage only once more; in the *Eleventh Philippic* Cicero employs it of the verbal laceration C. Trebonius received in preparation for his physical mutilation, both the products of P. Cornelius Dolabella's extreme cruelty – *verborum contumeliis optimum virum incesto ore* ***lacerasset*** (*Phil*. 11.5). And though *lacero* in this instance is applied strictly to verbal action, its larger context is one of physical torture and injury, and thus the verb resonates too in the physical and literal sphere.[73] That is, *lacerasset* at *Phil*. 11.5 represents a conceptual mash of physical and verbal mutilation, and Cicero's use of *lacero* to indicate the latter likely extends from the intensity of the former. Cicero himself would not stoop to such abhorrent acts of torture, and so the verb's agency is found elsewhere. Yet still, Cicero's association of *lacero* with injurious words here demonstrates the force he felt the verb to bear at *Phil*. 2.86, and it suggests further that had he lived beyond this year, other targets would now stand 'lacerated' by his words.

---

[72] Although in Plautus' comedies *stimulus* functions as a metaphor for harsh speech in a manner akin to *aculeus* (cf. Fantham 1972: 100), the reference here is specific to slave punishment – cf. Ramsey 2003: 287 *ad loc.*; Shackleton Bailey 2009a: 138 n. 104; and *OLD* s.v. *stimulus* 1b, where *Phil.* 2.86 is explicitly listed.

V. Conclusion

To summarize this chapter's investigation, from the time of his consulship on, Cicero initiates a semantic shift in *ad hominem* discourse, experimenting with three new categories of terms – those of 'wounding' (*vulnero*, *saucio*), 'breaking' (*perfringo*, *frango*), and 'cutting' (*concido*, *lacero*). 'Wounding' verbs are the first to appear, amplifying the intensity of Cicero's denunciation of Catiline and his co-conspirators (*volnero*, *Cat*. 1.9), and their use continues with regularity throughout the *post reditum* period and early years of remove, though their consistently passive voicing suggests a decline in force during these periods (*saucietur* (potentially), *Vat*. 13; *vulnerari*, *Har*. 2; *volneratio*, *Pis*. 47; *vulnerari*, *de Orat*. 2.237; *vulneraretur*, *Q. fr*. 3.2.2). In the years 46 and 45 BCE one instance of *vulnero* can be found (*volneratus*, *N.D*. 3.91), but by this period the verb and class appear largely to have been superseded as metaphors for powerful oratory as the other two semantic categories rise to the forefront.

---

[73] Note the explicit and graphic nature of the physical violence in the passage at large – Trebonius is beaten and tortured, his neck is broken, his head is cut off and carried around on a pike, and his body is 'lacerated' (*laniatum*) and tossed into the sea – *cum verborum contumeliis optimum virum incesto ore lacerasset, tum verberibus ac tormentis quaestionem habuit pecuniae publicae, idque per biduum. post cervicibus fractis caput abscidit, idque adfixum gestari iussit in pilo; reliquum corpus tractum atque laniatum abiecit in mare* (*Phil*. 11.5).

Like 'wounding' verbs, those of 'breaking' also make their entrance in the consular years as Cicero employs *perfringo* to issue a simultaneous boast and threat of his oratorical prowess to Torquatus in *Pro Sulla* (*perfregerim*, *Sul*. 46), and in designating Cicero's oratorical victory over Clodius, their use is confirmed and formalized (*fregi*, *Att*. 1.16.8; 2.1.5). And too like those of 'wounding', 'breaking' verbs – specifically *frango* – remain in use throughout the years following Cicero's return (*hostem ... frangendum*, *Red. Sen*. 19; *frangit adversarium*, *de Orat*. 2.236), in this period beginning to govern a target's *audacia* as direct object (*audaciam frangerem*, *Vat*. 2) in addition to a named target proper. But while verbs of 'wounding' seem to have died out by 44 BCE, echoes of the attribute-*frango* formula are found in the otherwise silent years of remove (e.g. *cupiditatibus fractis*, *Mil*. 78), and Cicero regularly employs both varieties of *frango* at the end of his career and life, in all instances but the final continuing to use it in the active voice (*fregit*, *Brut*. 95, 109; *fregissimus audaciam*, *Phil*. 3.2; *Catilinam ... fregistis*, *Phil*. 4.15; *fregi ... audaciam*, *Phil*. 13.29; *quem ... fregi*, *Off*. 2.40; *quos ... fregisti*, *Fam*. 10.3.2; *fregerim*, *Fam*. 10.12.4; *a me ita fractus est*, *ad Brut*. 2.2.3). And so as an individual term, *frango* proves the most common in this study overall, and by Cicero's final years it serves as his trademark metaphor for *ad hominem* speech, particularly his own.[74]

But though *frango* and the 'breaking' category predominate in frequency, in force it is verbs of 'cutting' and *lacero* in particular that stand supreme. Hints of this category first appear in the *Pro Sulla* in an instance whose usage is more proper than figurative (*ad eum lacerandum*, *Sul*. 50); *lacero* then occurs several years later in an allusive reference in *Post Reditum in Senatu* (*lacerare rem publicam*, *Red. Sen*. 3). But it is not until Cicero boasts to his brother of having 'cut down' Vatinius that the category is truly inaugurated (*concidimus*, *Q. fr*. 2..4.1), and once established *concido* appears several more times in both the *post reditum* period (*conciduntur*, *Q. fr.*. 2.4.6; *concideris*, *de Orat*. 3.4) as well as the last three years (*conciderit*, *N.D.* 1.93; *concidistis*, *Phil*. 5.28; *erat ... concisus*, *Phil*. 12.11). Concordantly, in the years after Cicero's return appears the noun *laceratio* of the damage wrought to the reputations of Piso and Gabinius (*laceratione*, *Pis*. 42), confirming that it is to this period that the rise of 'cutting' terms belongs. The most powerful and representative verb of this category, however, receives full, direct application only in 44 BCE (*te ... lacerat*, *Phil*. 2.86, *lacerasset*, *Phil*. 11.5), and its use is prompted by and specific to the ferocity of Cicero's attacks against Antony. And through the near singularity of its application at *Phil*. 2.86 – the verb appearing again only at *Phil*. 11.5 (*lacerasset*, *Phil*. 11.5) and there straddling both the verbal and physical realms –

---

[74] Note in fact that only four of the *TLL*'s twenty-one total figurative usages predate Cicero, appearing specifically in the related genres of comedy and mime (II.B.1 and II.B.3-5, the first three attested first in Plautus and the fourth in Laberius), while eight are first documented in Cicero's surviving works (II.A.1, 2a, 8; II.B.2 and 5, *in argumentatione et oratione*; II.C.1-3). Two facts are thereby illustrated – first, that Cicero played a significant role in the development of this verb's metaphorical usage; and second, that the origins of this verb as a metaphor lie in the diction of comedy and related sources.

lacero will stand side-by-side with *frango* as emblematic of invective and verbal abuse in writers under the Empire.

Moreover, in this post-consular period a shift in syntax occurs as well. Accompanying these verbs is a direct syntactic opposition of agent and object heretofore unseen in prose usage, where the verbs' performers and targets are positioned as personal and immediate combatants. And as this full complement of innovations is found in a variety of genres – the speeches and letters predominantly, but treatises of various sorts as well – a widespread tendency is indicated, a 'posture' as I have deemed it, whereby Cicero in first-person voice positions himself the victorious party in a deadly face-to-face encounter. Cicero develops this posture gradually over his post-consular career, systematically linking new terms and new semantic categories with those previously established, in each case moving from contextualized to stand-alone usage. Its semantics are specific – limited to two verbs each of 'wounding', 'breaking', and 'cutting' – and its deployment is triggered consistently by invective situations, whether in the course of abusive attacks as they are delivered or in later reference to such attacks.

Finally, these verbs appear primarily in the context of senatorial rather than forensic oratory (as was true of the terms of Chapter Two), again both in the course and context of abuse as it occurs (e.g. *laceratione*, *Pis*. 42; *haec te ... lacerat*, *Phil*. 2.86) and in later reference (e.g. *fregi*, Att. 1.16.8, 2.1.5; *concidistis*, *Phil*. 5.28; *a me ita fractus est*, *ad Brut*. 2.2.3). Of course some association with the courts continues, but such instances are few and correspond primarily to Cicero's attack on Vatinius, the supreme and only example of forensic invective in the form of cross-examination of a hostile witness (*interrogatio*).[75] Outside of references within the treatises, the only other instance discussed above specific to the courts is that of *lacero* in *Pro Sulla* (*ad eum lacerandum*, *Sul*. 50), but again this instance is so heavily contextualized by imagery as to feel nearly literal in sense, and thus it cannot be considered representative of this posture. That these verbs and this posture should be associated with the senate is natural, however, for 'invective' is most properly located in this context – among Cicero's senatorial peers.[76] And in fact other stylistic features of senatorial oratory align with this association, for instance its greater tendency toward satire, irony, and hyperbole.[77]

Thus, through innovations in syntax and semantics Cicero created a violent posture of 'wounding', 'breaking', and 'cutting' a direct and personal target; and through the application of his first-person posture, in moments spurred by animosity Cicero was able to position himself – linguistically, at least – as his opponent's superior and vanquisher. With these innovations Cicero truly rendered his words a powerful weapon;

---

[75] Cf. Powell 2007: 5, 11-14, who argues that the *In Vatinum* survives due to the outstanding nature of its content rather than the existence of a true genre of *interrogatio* invective. In connection with Cicero's cross-examination of Vatinius are found *concidimus* at *Q. fr*. 2.4.1, the use of which likely inspired *conciduntur* later in the speech (*Q. fr*. 2.4.6) – again in a forensic context – and *audaciam frangerem* at *Vat*. 2.

[76] For a good summary of the context and features of senatorial oratory, see Ramsey 2007: 123-35, especially 130-4 for stylistic and linguistic considerations. There exists a great consensus within scholarship that senatorial rather than forensic oratory is the true and proper context of invective; in general terms, cf. Powell 2007: 4-5, arguing that 'invective', especially as a free-standing entity, was characteristic particularly of senatorial, not forensic, oratory. Often it is the distinct relationship between speaker and fellow senators that is seen as fostering invective attacks, as Roman statesmen were more open to delivering and witnessing lively abuse among their senatorial peers (cf. Laurand 1936-40: 3, 310; Achard 1981: 354), though it has also been suggested that as fellow senators represented one's most critical listeners, a speaker might hesitate more to lower his guard in this context (Mack 1967: 124). Note too that Roman invective bears a didactic function aimed specifically at controlling the behavior of the senatorial elite (cf. Corbeill 2002: 198, 210-11 and generally Corbeill 1996); thus, its political sentiments are appropriate to delivery in the senate.

[77] On the use of satire, cf. von Albrecht 2003: 26 and Laurand 1936-40, 3: 310. Uría 2007: 60 finds a greater use of such invective devices as sexual innuendo, irony, and hyperbole in Cicero's speeches before the senate than those before the people; for a fuller consideration of the features of senatorial oratory versus those delivered to the people, see Mack 1967.

that they proved so is attested most powerfully by Antony's efforts to quell them, for on his orders Cicero's tongue was forever silenced and his hands stilled on 7 December 43.[78]

---

[78] Cf. Plutarch *Cic*. 48.6-49.2 on the nailing of Cicero's hands and head to the *rostra* following his execution; on this act as symbolic of the power of Cicero's eloquence as a weapon against Antony, cf. the reflections of James May – "That such a weapon proved more than a passing threat, that it could deal more than a glancing blow, the orator's severed head and hands nailed to the Rostra eloquently, if somewhat gruesomely, came to testify" (May 1988: 149).

CHAPTER 4

Novus Homo Self-Fashioning and an Imperial Legacy

This chapter steps back from the focused examination of Chapter Three and considers the broader implications of Cicero's post-consular language on invective. To begin, in the material of the previous chapter novelty is clearly found. For whereas both Cicero's pre-consular works as well as the Greek and Latin prose sources surveyed previously all employ two specific sets of terminology in signifying *ad hominem* attack and abuse – combat metaphors and non-figurative verbs such as "to accuse", "to slander" – Cicero's letters, speeches, and treatises from 63 BCE on display a new range of verbs in such usage and a new manner of syntax to boot. Beginning in his consular year, Cicero 'wounds' (*vulnero*, *saucio*), 'breaks' (*perfringo*, *frango*), and 'cuts up' (*concido*, *lacero*) his political and oratorical opponents in personal, face-to-face conflict, the latter reflected in the direct opposition of agent and accusative object that attends these verbs. That both such semantics and such syntax are previously unattested bespeaks significant innovation in and of itself.

Consider too, though, that at a more general level, the features characteristic of Cicero's early discourse do not apply to his post-consular innovations – that is, unlike the verbs of Chapter Two, Cicero's metaphors of 63 BCE on do not evoke specific images and do not sit at a distance from the surrounding discourse. First, the images conjured by these post-consular verbs are not specific to or within a certain sphere. To be sure, their meaning is clear, and several of them at least on occasion appear alongside of military terms. Individually, however, they do not evoke images specific to combat or the military and do not properly and specifically belong to this sphere. Note for instance that Fantham includes none of them anywhere in her discussion of imagery from warfare and single combat.[1] Second, once established these verbs stand apart from other surrounding imagery or contextualizing elements, and thus in these instances their full force is intact. In simpler terms, that is, unlike the metaphors of Chapter Two, these verbs do not cluster. Third and finally, at least as often as not they occur in personal, first-person forms. Such forms are particularly common when the metaphor still retains a certain freshness, for it is to bolster the might of his own oratory that Cicero coins these usages.

Thus, that Cicero innovated seems quite clear. Through his post-consular posture, invective attacks attained new heights of brutality – now such assaults 'mutilated' their targets in direct, first-person clashes rather than simply 'attacking' from a distanced and third-person vantage point. What remains to discuss is *why* Cicero adopted this novel posture during these years, and it is this that occupies the first two portions of this chapter. The third then considers what became of these verbs in the early Empire.

I. Post-Consular Self-Fashioning

To a degree the question of why has already been treated – this posture allows Cicero to engage in personal combat with a target and inevitably emerge victorious. In a given instance, Cicero funnels his immediate animosity into an object-verb weapon with which he cuts down his opponent and builds himself up. At the level of individual instances, this is a tool of self-positioning. By employing this posture Cicero empowers himself at the expense of his target and shapes the narrative of events to match his desires, rendering even Clodius' acquittal in 61 his own 'victory'. Thus, his audience receives a super-Cicero, an orator and statesman of supreme might whose words lay low any in his path. And his use of this posture in his published texts ensures that such slaughter is continuously replayed, for with each successive reading Cicero re-performs his 'breaking' and 'lacerating' of such targets as Clodius, Vatinius, Piso, and Antony.[2]

---

[1] As one example, Fantham examines the military imagery found in *Att*. 1.16.1 (Fantham 1972: 30) but makes no mention of *fregi* later in the same letter (*Att*. 1.16.8).

Yet such self-positioning extends beyond the realm of discrete expressions of hostility and triumph. At the broader level it represents a means of self-fashioning in the post-consular period overall, a tool by which Cicero boosts his own *auctoritas* and public image as a statesman and orator in periods where he most actively seeks to rebuild and re-exert his *dignitas* and *auctoritas*. For as the following section will demonstrate, its introduction and phases of development correspond with the ebb and flow of Cicero's post-consular career. His faltering position after the Catilinarian conspiracy inspired its first appearances in the pre-exile years, and his shrinking autonomy in the years after his return brought renewed use and innovation until subservience was ensured and withdrawal was prudent. Only the death of Caesar and the emergence of a new public enemy recalled Cicero to its use, and the fight against Antony in fact produced what later generations would see as the capstone and culmination of this posture.

---

[2] On the publication of Cicero's correspondence, see Introduction, p. 5 n. 8. On the extent to which Cicero revised his speeches for publication, scholars have often taken vastly different positions. The classic contrast of viewpoints is Humbert 1925 and Stroh 1975: 31-54, the latter arguing strongly against Humbert's notion of a sharp divide between delivered and published versions of speeches due to the exigencies of forensic procedure (though on the frequent misrepresentation of Humbert's position, cf. Powell and Patterson 2004: 56-57); for a review of these positions, see also Vasaly 1993: 8-10 and Craig 2002: 515-7. A general consensus seems to be emerging, however, that the published versions represent reasonably accurate and faithful depictions of the delivered versions; cf. e.g. Morstein-Marx 2004: 26 and Powell 2010: 24, 35-36.

To begin, with their initial introduction and development these verbs serve as a means of reaffirming Cicero's *auctoritas* amidst and after the events of 63 BCE. At the point at which *volnero* of *Cat*. 1.9 appears, Cicero was at the peak of his career. As a *novus homo* he had attained the consulship, and in successfully suppressing the Catilinarian conspiracy he achieved a victory that to him equaled that of Rome's greatest generals – dubbing himself in the process Rome's *dux togatus* – and by which thereafter he would continually define himself and his career.[3] Indeed, as a gesture of gratitude he was granted a *supplicatio*, the first ever for a non-military victory, and received the title of *pater patriae*, this too a first for Rome.[4] At the end of 63, then, Cicero held great *auctoritas*. Yet even as he began to denounce Catiline in the *First Catilinarian*, this *auctoritas* was not without need of a boost, for Catiline was a patrician and he himself still a *novus homo*, and as much *auctoritas* as the consulship inherently conferred upon him, it was only after Catiline had fled Rome and the remaining conspirators were either checked or executed that Cicero received his full accolades.[5] Thus, the *First Catilinarian* represents a pivotal moment for Cicero, one in which he calls upon his *auctoritas* as consul to shame Catiline into leaving Rome but still seeks to bolster that same *auctoritas* in the process. And it is here that the innovative *eos nondum voce volnero* occurs (*Cat*. 1.9), as Cicero stood emboldened by his consular position yet uncertain enough in his *auctoritas* to seek a means by which to reinforce himself and quash his foe, as the syntax of this statement reflects.

---

[3] On Cicero's election to the consulship bringing him "supreme *auctoritas*," cf. May 1988: 50; cf. also Cape 2002: 143, Habicht 1990: 31. For Cicero's labeling of himself as the *dux togatus et imperator*, see esp. *Cat*. 2.28; cf. also 3.15, 23, 26; 4.5, 21, 23. On his portrayal of his efforts against Catiline and his supporters as a 'war' generally, cf. e.g. Vasaly 1993: 51-52 on the *First Catilinarian*, and May 1988: 52-54 on the *Second Catilinarian*; cf. also McDonnell 2006: 346-53, highlighting the role of a renegotiated '*virtus*' in Cicero's presentation. For Cicero's consulship as the moment by which he would constantly define his career and ethos even as an elder statesman, cf. esp. Steel 2005 (e.g. 7, 19, *et passim*) and Dugan 2005 (e.g. 13 *et passim*), as well as McDonnell 2006: 353 on his consular activities as a 'war' in particular in Cicero's retrospect.

[4] On the *supplicatio*, cf. e.g. *Cat*. 3.15, 23; 4.5; *Sul*. 85; *Pis*. 6; for the title '*pater patriae*', cf. *Sest*. 121, appearing also as '*parens patriae*' at *Pis*. 6. It was suggested as well that Cicero receive another military honor, the highly prestigious *corona civica*, though this ultimately was not granted; cf. *Pis*. 6 and McDonnell 2006: 351. For citation of these accolades in general, cf. Habicht 1990: 32, Cape 2002: 113, and Gelzer *RE* 7.1.884.

[5] Batstone 1994 argues that Cicero's true persuasive goal in the *First Catilinarian* was simply to construct and affirm his own consular *auctoritas*; cf. too Konstan 1993 on Cicero's 'crisis of legitimacy' in the *First Catilinarian*, and Cape 2002: 148-9, who suggests that it is the first and second of the *Catilinarians* in particular in which Cicero works to fashion his *auctoritas*.

The next developments in metaphor usage come the following year as Cicero found himself vulnerable to political attack for sentencing Roman citizens to death without a trial, albeit under the authority of a *senatus consultum ultimum*. In fact, the onslaught had commenced even before Cicero left office, for the tribune Q. Metellus Nepos began to attack Cicero on precisely these grounds just days after the execution, and though generally rebuffed by the senate and nobility, he succeeded in limiting Cicero only to swearing the formal oath when stepping down from his consulship, robbing him of the customary address to the people.[6] The year 62 thus brought Cicero a crisis of *auctoritas*, and accordingly in this and the following years one finds him "testing the validity of his consular claims and the power of his consular *auctoritas* as he relies increasingly upon his consular prestige to sway the jury."[7] Cicero's defense of Sulla proves no exception. He devotes more than a third of *Pro Sulla* (*Sul*. 3-35) to defending himself for choosing to represent Sulla, as the latter had been accused of taking part in the conspiracy, and for generally abusing his own power as a '*rex peregrinus*'.[8] In response, Cicero takes a greater stride in expanding the discourse of and on his own oratory. In *Pro Sulla* he experiments predominantly with ‘breaking’ verbs – *perfregerim* (*Sul*. 46) and *fractum* (*Sul*. 15) – but he includes too a hint of the verb that will eventually represent the full might of his oratorical power: *lacero* (*ad eum lacerandum*; *Sul*. 50).

---

[6] Cf. Cicero's account of Metellus' actions in *Fam*. 5.2.6-7, there deemed an *iniuria* and *impetum ... crudelissimum* (*Fam*. 5.2.6); cf. also Plut. *Cic*. 23.1-3 and Habicht 1990: 38-39.

[7] May 1988: 69.

[8] Cf. May 1988: 70 on the speech's general tone of defense, and Berry 1996: 174-8 on the charges of *regnum* and *rex peregrinus* in particular. On Cicero's political motivations for accepting the defense of Sulla, see Berry 1996: 26-33.

Clodius’ acquittal the following year signaled further uncertainty for Cicero, and from 60 to 59 Cicero’s position proved increasingly tenuous, for much of his power-base crumbled with the establishment of the extra-constitutional ‘First Triumvirate’, and in trying to steer a neutral course he alienated or offended both Pompey and Caesar as well as the *boni* in general in their opposition to the *tres viri*.[9] And still too Clodius pressed on, posing an ever greater threat to Cicero. Accordingly, in these years Cicero innovates again, shifting from *perfringo* to *frango* (*Att*. 1.16.8; 2.1.5), and by *Att*. 2.1.5 confident enough in his use of the verb to allow it to stand free of any contextualizing elements. As he boasts to Atticus of crushing Clodius in the senate, Cicero presents himself as he wishes to be – the formidable statesman brandishing his *auctoritas* to vanquish his foe. The years 63 to 60, then, brought Cicero trials on a number of fronts, and it is precisely in this period that two – if not all three – semantic strands emerge and undergo initial development. Thus, in the pre-exile years lies the foundation of Cicero’s *ad hominem* posture as he calls upon new verbs, new semantic ranges, and a newly personal and direct syntax to reaffirm his freshly gained and now threatened consular *auctoritas*.

Likewise, in the early *post reditum* years this newly forged posture assisted Cicero in rebuilding his identity and resituating himself within the present political landscape. At the impending threat of exile Cicero seems temporarily to have abstained from employing these verbs, deeming such violent threats and boasts imprudent in the current political climate. On the heels of his return, though, comes their renewed use as well as their maturation, for Cicero's glorious re-entry of Rome on 4 September 57 signaled a restoration of his legal status but not necessarily of his political standing or security, and thus violent self-fashioning once again proved a useful tool. Broadly speaking, now more than ever Cicero found himself faced with opponents on two levels – those within the *tres viri*, specifically Pompey and Caesar, and those on more equal footing with Cicero himself, whether henchmen of the triumvirs or not.[10] And Cicero's decision to support Pompey as the rift between the latter and Caesar grew only led to further conflict on the more humble tier, shaping for instance his impassioned attack against Vatinius in March of 56.[11]

---

[9] Cf. Habicht 1990: 43-46.

When the bonds of the triumvirs were renewed at Luca the following month, however, Cicero was forced into an about-face, and his tone changed to one of support. In the speech *De Provinciis Consularibus*, for instance, Cicero is found acting as Caesar's champion, arguing for Caesar's retention of both of his provinces (Transalpine and Cisalpine Gaul) while seeking to strip the hated Gabinius and Vatinius of theirs.[12] Indeed, in the period that followed he would lend his services as an advocate even to the likes of Vatinius and Gabinius – as well as other familiars of the *tres viri* (e.g. Cornelius Balbus in *Pro Balbo*) – and the insult to his *auctoritas* was thereby increased.[13]

---

[10] Cf. generally Habicht 1990: 54-57.

[11] Cf. again Pocock 1926: 5-7.

[12] Cf. Cicero's own references to this 'discreditable' change in position in several letters to Atticus (*Att*. 4.5, 4.6.2), lamenting the bind in which he finds himself, doomed to condemnation whether he speak out or remain silent – *ego vero, qui, si loquor de re publica quod oportet, insanus, si quod opus est, servus existimor, si taceo, oppressus et captus, quo dolore esse debeo?* (*Att*. 4.6.2). On the conference at Luca, the *De Provinciis Consularibus*, and the tone of submission generally forced upon Cicero in this period, cf. Stockton 1971: 208-16.

[13] Cicero's defense of Vatinius and Gabinius are reflected in the *Pro Vatinio* and *Pro Gabinio*, both of 54 BCE; on these speeches, cf. respectively Crawford 1994: 271-80 and 1984: 188-97.

The *post reditum* years presented a further challenge to Cicero's *auctoritas*, therefore, and despite occasional moments of glory – most notably the acquittal of M. Caelius Rufus in early April of 56 (*Pro Caelio*), marking a political victory over Cicero's longtime foe Clodius and his sister Clodia Metelli – his identity generally spiraled into a deeper state of crisis.[14] Accordingly, in the works of this period – from blistering invectives to the masterful *De Oratore* – Cicero seeks to regain and reconstruct the identity, *auctoritas*, and *dignitas* of his pre-exile, consular self, and as he does so he turns once again to the violent bolstering of his *ad hominem* posture.[15]

His trend in usage matches the curve of events given above. Newly reinstated to Rome in 57 BCE, Cicero found self-enhancement at the expense of others enticing and even necessary, but with it he chose to err on the side of caution, deploying these verbs in a tempered manner that reflects an overarching strategy of namelessness in the *post reditum* years. In 57 he tests the waters with impersonal and allusive jabs against Clodius in his speech of thanks to the senate, relying upon pre-exile verbs (*frango* and *lacero*) in their roughly established usages and framing them in a safely indirect fashion – one an impersonal suggestion against a nameless enemy (*hostem ... frangendum*, *Red. Sen.* 19) and the other an allusive declaration of this same enemy's hostile intent against Rome and thereby Cicero himself (*rem publicam lacerare*, *Red. Sen.* 3). Cicero begins the process of rebuilding his image of power, but he does so carefully and judiciously, abstaining from open and personal assaults. As he found himself caught between

---

[14] For an introduction to the *Pro Caelio* and its circumstances, charges, and participants, cf. Austin 1933: vi-vii, 114-20; for fuller discussion, see Wiseman 1985: 54-91.

[15] On Cicero's general quest to reconstruct his identity and *auctoritas* in this period, cf. May 1988: 89 and Steel 2005: 63; cf. also Dugan 2005: 80-81 on the *De Oratore* in particular as a means for Cicero to transcend the political pettiness of the moment and recoup his *dignitas*.

Pompey, Caesar, and their associates, however, and his identity and authority lay increasingly dependent on political subservience, Cicero's language shifts course, displaying a renewed openness and, what is more, renewed innovation. Again Cicero turns to direct attack, and more active and novel image-shaping thus ensues. His targeting of Vatinius in 56 yields potentially innovative incarnations of all three semantic ranges – *frango* with a personal object is revitalized to *audaciam frangerem* (*Vat*. 2), and *saucietur* (*Vat*. 13) and *concidimus* (*Q. fr*. 2.4.1) are both the first of their kind to appear.

Cicero's attacks did not cease after Luca, but in personal and violent assaults once more he exercises caution, and thus too with his posture he exhibits reserve. In the *In Pisonem* of 55 his invective against Piso and Gabinius is dubbed a *laceratio* (*laceratione*, *Pis*. 42) and *volneratio* (*Pis*. 47) of these hated ex-consuls' reputations. The semantics of these nouns – especially that of the former – bespeak Cicero's animosity in this oration, but that it is nouns that Cicero chooses rather than the related verbs signals a reluctance on his part to openly figure himself in violent political conflict. Cicero continues to fashion himself as 'mutilating' his targets, but with the substitution of nouns for verbs his active and personal agency is suppressed in this speech, and in fact it remained thus henceforth. For the last appearance of any such verb in active voicing for nearly a decade comes in *De Oratore* of the same year, where Cicero describes the ability of *risus* in oratory to 'break' its target (*frangit adversarium*, *de Orat*. 2.326).

After Luca, verbs of 'wounding', 'breaking', and 'cutting' grow increasingly infrequent and impersonal in application. In fact, from 54 to 47 they all but vanish, popping up in a handful of passive and otherwise distanced applications that merely perpetuate established verbs and established usage (e.g. *vulneraretur*, *Q. fr*. 3.2.2;

cupiditatibus fractis, *Mil*. 78). But the absence of such verbs matches Cicero's reserve in these years overall, for as the previous chapter has indicated, this was a decade of remove for Cicero. His career saw two periods of political inactivity within this span, first from 54 to 51 amidst the turbulence of domestic politics, and then again from 46 to 44 as Caesar's dictatorship and command over the courts left little room for his own political or forensic participation. In these periods Cicero devoted himself to literary pursuits, penning the bulk of his philosophical treatises as well as such major rhetorical treatises as *Brutus* and *Orator*.[16] And what years intervened were occupied by Cicero's governorship in Cilicia and the civil war between Pompey and Caesar. Thus, though Cicero the orator and statesman does not completely disappear in this decade, his political and forensic activity was necessarily limited, and to engage in the type of intense personal attack characteristic of other portions of his career would have marked the height of imprudence. In terms of violent self-fashioning, these years present a case of 'dare not' rather than 'need not'.

Accordingly, the few instances that do occur are found in the treatises primarily and build up not Cicero's own speech but that of others, and his remove is thereby cautiously maintained. And, interestingly enough, it is in the years of Caesar's dictatorship particularly that these references cluster. The *Brutus* of 46 and *De Natura Deorum* of the following year each contain two relevant instances; in the former, Cicero twice describes a past Roman statesman as 'breaking' his adversary (*fregit*, *Brut*. 95, 109), and in the latter he portrays such iconic Greek figures as Epicurus and Archilochus as 'cutting' and 'wounding' their targets (*conciderit*, *N.D.* 1.93; *volneratus*, *N.D.* 3.91).

---

[16] Cf. e.g. Habicht 1990: 3, 57, 71; Steel 2005: 43; and Stockton 1971: 217-26, 269-70.

Thus, in 46 and 45 Cicero seems to have found the application of his posture to speech of the far enough past a clever yet careful means of civic defiance; by continuing to emphasize the power and importance of free expression, Cicero fights to retain some shred of this in the Rome he now faces. At stake in these years are not only Cicero's own voice and identity but that of Rome as a whole, yet careful distance remained necessary.

Caesar's assassination in March 44 removed these constraints, however, drawing Cicero back to active political life as well as to open and personal posturing. For the brief remainder of his career and life, Cicero's glory of old returned as the fight against Antony allowed him to re-exert his *auctoritas* and *dignitas* in full measure. Indeed, in the *Philippics* he goes so far as to paint himself and Antony as diametrically-opposed embodiments of patriot and *hostis*, of good and evil. By the end of 44, then, Cicero once again stood as Rome's leading figure, the symbol of the Republic herself in his vehement opposition to Antony.[17]

And just as Cicero's sense of authority is renewed, so too is his violent self-fashioning. With a public enemy to attack Cicero again assumes a first-person stance, reasserting his own power by declaring himself – at times along with the senate – to have 'broken' Antony (*fregissemus audaciam*, *Phil*. 3.2; *fregi ... audaciam*, *Phil*. 13.29). This re-found freedom for personal agency bleeds back into his personal correspondence as well; in 43 he describes his oratorical triumph over Servilius Isauricus in the same terms of personal 'breaking' in two separate letters (*hunc ... fregerim*, *Fam*. 10.12.4; *a me ita fractus est*, *ad Brut*. 2.2.3). Indeed, the high frequency with which Cicero deploys *frango* in this short time span – a total of seven times in fewer than two years – reflects the vigor with which he threw himself back into the political fray and renders *frango* his personal trademark, and amidst such zeal he extends the verb's use to second-person applications too (*Catilinam ... fregistis*, *Phil*. 4.15; *quos ... fregisti*, *Fam*. 10.3.2) as well as to his treatises again despite his politically active status (*fregit*, *Off*. 2.40).

---

[17] For this period in general, cf. Habicht 1990: 79-85. On Cicero's ethos in this period, see May 1988: 128. For the polarization of Cicero's presentation of himself and Antony in the *Philippics*, characteristic of crisis rhetoric, cf. Wooten 1983: 58-59, 168 and May 1988: 129, 149.

Antony, enemy of Rome, drew out of Cicero the verbs and the man of the past. With first-person 'breaking' verbs comes the return of Cicero the consular, the man who first broke Clodius nearly twenty years previously (i.e. *fregi*, *Att*. 1.16.8; 2.1.5). Likewise, in using *concido* to buttress the senate in its continued opposition to Antony (*concidistis*, *Phil*. 5.28; *erat vestris ... iudiciis ignominiisque concisus*, *Phil*. 12.11), Cicero recalls his own boasts as an unsteady former exile, emboldened in and for violent personal attack against Caesar's affiliate Vatinius (*concidimus*, *Q. fr*. 2.4.1). But faced with Antony a new Cicero emerges as well – the statesman and orator of restored glory who in his scathing attacks once more finds the *auctoritas* to innovate, as *te ... lacerat* of the ruthless *Second Philippic* (*Phil*. 2.86) stands unprecedented in both its second-person object and its exceedingly direct application of *lacero*. In this the crowning moment of his *ad hominem* posture, Cicero, supposedly face-to-face with Antony, both announces and thereby performs a verbal blow symbolic of the speech's aim and content as a whole.[18] With this simple statement Cicero empowers himself to slay his enemy, and in so doing he once again fashions himself savior of Rome.

The fight against Antony gave Cicero a final opportunity to reassert his *auctoritas* and rebuild his identity, and the enthusiasm with which he embraced it is seen both in the unmatched concentration of *frango* and verbs of 'cutting' in 44 and 43 as well as in the brutal double innovation of *te ... lacerat* at *Phil*. 2.86. These are the years of culmination, bringing both the reassertion and concentration of the violent vocabulary by which he had shaped his *auctoritas* for the past twenty years, but too the final innovation by which Cicero's posture returned to its beginnings. For a threat to Rome in the form of Catiline spurred its first appearance, and the public enemy Antony incited its final incarnation. With both *eos nondum voce volnero* of *Cat*. 1.9 and *haec te ... lacerat ... oratio* of *Phil*. 2.86 Cicero bolsters himself to deliver a direct and personal attack against an enemy of Rome, and as this enemy is crushed Cicero's own image is magnified.

---

[18] On the element of performance in the *Philippics* more broadly considered, see Manuwald 2004.

In sum, then, these specific verbs and associated first-person posture afford Cicero a means of boosting his image in the face of increasing political challenges, allowing him to continually present himself as a powerful figure as he spends the second half of his career seeking to recapture his consular identity. Such self-fashioning occurs particularly in periods marked by Cicero's open and public assertion of his *auctoritas*, whether at its zenith in 63 or in later years of insecurity; the greater the push to exert this *auctoritas*, the more forceful the usage and the more frequent the innovation. When Cicero's political voice is active and independent, so too is his posture, for its tone is personal and its innovations are regular. Likewise, when he withdraws from the public sphere, his use of these verbs retreats to the infrequent, the established, and the distanced. By 'wounding', 'breaking', and 'mutilating' his opponents Cicero fashioned himself the orator and statesman he ever longed to remain after his glorious consulship. And again, as this posture appears in the published versions of these speeches and texts, its efficacy for self-promotion is all the greater.

Cicero's innovations in both semantics and syntax represent a move that is at once subtle yet bold, and one that accordingly would have been striking at the pen of Cicero, but unthinkable in the mouth of an aristocrat. For its stance is fundamentally that of the underdog, a person of lower status scrapping his way above social superiors. To see this it is necessary to return to the material of Chapter One and Plautus specifically.

II. A *Novus Homo* Perspective

As the previous chapters have demonstrated, Cicero's posture – with its personal tone, extra-combat semantics, and direct syntactic opposition – is paralleled previously only in the theater, comedy in particular. In the comedies of Plautus and Terence occur multiple depictions of words 'injuring' a target in some fashion; in such instances the verb's agent and object are directly opposed as they are in Cicero, and the metaphor generally stands free of any contextualizing elements beyond the hyperbole – both physical and linguistic – that characterizes these comedies overall.[19] But direct comparison between Cicero's posture and similar instances in Roman comedy reveals that the latter proves a model too in psychology.

To begin, in the comedies of Plautus and Terence it is lower-status characters that serve as the verbs' acting agents – *personae humiliores* in the form of slaves first and foremost, but soldiers too.[20] As a concise means of reference, a chart is provided here that lists the ten instances from Plautus and Terence that align most closely with Cicero's posture (discussed in Chapter One), indicating both the specific agent and object of each.

---

[19] While the above is true to an extent of Aristophanes' comedies as well, I focus here on Roman comedy, for in addition to the generally close connection between Cicero and Roman theater – to which I return in the pages that follow – directly comparable instances in Plautus and Terence far outnumber those in Aristophanes, and the comedies of the former will have resonated more strongly both for Cicero and for his audience due to their temporal proximity and continuity of language. Moreover, though Cicero seems to have been familiar with the style and general content of Aristophanes' plays, no direct and specific quotations of Aristophanes survive in Cicero's works (cf. Wright 1931: 81-82).

[20] Note that this aligns with Fantham's observation that vigorous metaphors are more natural to the "uninhibited lower classes," as is reflected particularly in the language of slaves and parasites in drama

Table 3: Agents and Objects in Parallel Instances from Roman Comedy

INSTANCE	LOCATION	USED BY/ACTING AGENT - or - SUBJECT[21]	OBJECT
te concidit	Pl. *Epid*. 488	'Miles' (*mil*.)/Epidicus (*serv*.)	Periphanes (*senex*)
conficiet...te	Pl. *Ps*. 464	Simo (*sen*.)/Pseudolus (*serv*.)	Callipho (*senex*)
eos...contruncabo	Pl. *Bac*. 975	Chrysalus (*servus*)	Nicobulus (*senex*)
te differam	Pl. *Ps*. 359	Pseudolus (*servus*)	Ballio (*leno*)
te...differam	Pl. *Aul*. 446	Congrio (*coquus*)	Euclio (*senex*)
eradicabam...auris	Pl. *Epid*. 434	'Miles' (*miles*)	*hominum auris*
iugularas hominem	Ter. *Eu*. 417	Gnatho (*paras*.)/Thraso (*mil*.)	'hominem'
hunc iugulo	Ter. *Ad*. 958	Demea (*senex*)	Micio (*senex*)
illum tetigi	Pl. *Ps*. 1238	Simo (*senex*)	Ballio (*leno*)
Rhodium tetigerim	Ter. *Eu*. 420	Thraso (*miles*)	'Rhodium'

As the third column indicates, in all but two instances a slave or *miles* is designated to perform the verb's action, whether as its first-person subject or the specified agent in a second- or third-person reference. Slaves in particular dominate this field, making up half of such agents. Moreover, in four cases this role is filled specifically by one of

---

(Fantham 1972: 182; cf. also 75-76); somewhat similarly, Fraenkel observes that military metaphors are particular to the language of slaves in Plautus' comedies (Fraenkel 2007: 159-65). Of course 'status' in comedy is not necessarily a simple matter, and there exists scholarly disagreement as to whose attitudes Plautine comedy for instance reflects; McCarthy 2000 argues on behalf of the elite – the masters and *nobilitas* – and Richlin 2014 in contrast for the motley *humiles* (cf. also Segal 1968 on comedy's 'safety-valve' function in depicting the Saturnalian elevation of slaves). In this admittedly gross oversimplification I use 'lower-status' merely in reference to the contrasting social positions generally involved in speaking agent and receiving object in the instances considered, most frequently that of a non free-born character acting in opposition to one free-born.

[21] Note that the agent of a first-person verb is simply the subject itself, but in the case of second- and third-person references, it is someone other than the verb's user whose agency is indicated; thus, this column indicates agency accordingly, for second- and third-person verbs listing both the verb's user and its acting agent, and for those in the first-person the verb's subject.

Plautus' quintessential *servi callidi* – Pseudolus in two instances, and Epidicus and Chrysalus in one each.[22] Verbs such as *concidit*, *conficiet*, and *differam* are thereby linked with slave agency, and through such associations the instances in Roman comedy listed above assume an air of boldness, for in simplistic view, it is boldness, cunning, and defiance that characterize the slave role in Roman comedy.[23] Indeed, slave-performed verbs tend to occur particularly in the future tense and represent threats; thus, the audacity of their usage is heightened.[24] And though the boastful *miles* delivers such verbs in a manner that aligns with his own nature – as past-tense boasts – in them too lies a certain amount of boldness, for his is the stance and gloating of a "low class upstart," a "*nouveau riche*" braggart seeking to impress the higher-class world around him.[25] In these comedies, therefore, the uttering of such verbs signifies insolence on the part of slaves, vainglory on the part of soldiers, and audacity all around.

Moreover, the attendant boldness of such utterances is amplified when one considers their recipients – in these instances it is not fellow slaves or soldiers that serve as the verbs' objects but rather higher-class, typically free-born characters. Admittedly, greater variation is found here than in the agents; those listed in the fourth column of the chart include the likes of the pimp Ballio, an unnamed Rhodian, and the vague

---

[22] I.e. for Pseudolus, *conficiet ... te* (*Ps*. 464) and *te differam* (*Ps*. 359); for Epidicus, *te concidit* (*Epid*. 488); and for Chryslaus, *eos ... contruncabo* (*Bac*. 975).

[23] On the *servus callidus* in Roman comedy, especially Plautus, the fundamental discussion is Fraenkel 2007: 159-72, arguing that the clever slave represents Roman comedy's distinctive element and emphasizing the predominance in Plautus of the slave role in general; cf. also Duckworth 1952: 249-53 for a briefer sketch of slave traits, and more generally Segal 1968.

[24] Such is found in *conficiet* (*Ps*. 464), *contruncabo* (*Bac*. 975), and the two instances of *differam* (*Ps*. 359, *Aul*. 446).

[25] I.e. in Plautus, *eradicabam* (*Epid*. 434); and in Terence, *iugularas* (*Eu*. 417) and *tetigerim* (*Eu*. 420). Basic exposition of the *miles* character is found in Duckworth 1952: 264-5. For expanded analysis, see Hanson 1965 *passim*, and most directly Sussman 1994: 63-81, applying the typical traits of the *miles* to Cicero's portrayal of Antony in the *Philippics*. The quotes given above are found at Sussman 1994: 77 and 76 respectively, emphasizing the generally low-class position and 'coarse behavior' that typifies the *miles*.

‘*hominem*’. Yet in glancing through this column one finds that a particular figure does predominate – the *senex*, forming the object in half the instances above. It is the *senex* Callipho that Pseudolus will ‘finish off’ (*conficiet*, *Ps*. 464), Nicobulus (among others) whom Chrysalus will ‘hack up’ (*contruncabo*, *Bac*. 975), his master Periphanes that Epidicus has ‘cut down’ (*concidit*, *Epid*. 488), and his employer Euclio that Congrio the cook threatens to ‘shred to pieces’ (*differam*, *Aul*. 446). Thus, there stands a pronounced social disparity in the participants of these exchanges, slaves and soldiers on the one side and free-born, higher-status characters – often *senes* – on the other; and through the use of such verbs, those of the lower-status are able to invert the relationship and triumph boldly and violently over those well above them in station.[26]

Whether through boasts or threats, cunning or abuse, the *personae humiliores* of comedy verbally vanquish their elevated targets. The social scales are tipped, and the *humiliores* thereby stand elevated and ennobled.[27] More particularly, such elevation is predominantly self-uttered, for of the ten boasts and threats listed above, seven are delivered in first-person active form.[28] In the comedies of Plautus and Terence, therefore, these verbs signify and facilitate the self-empowerment of lowly agents in the face of social superiors, rendering them mighty in word if not in standing. Finally, Plautus specifically proves the principal model. Not only do seven of the ten instances above derive from his comedies – again potentially explainable by the disparity in size of surviving corpora – but five of the seven first-person forms come from Plautine mouths, and in addition all of the threats are delivered by his characters.[29]

---

[26] Cf. Segal 1968: 116-23 on the prominence of plot lines involving the overthrow of the master by the tricky slave, seen by Segal as one of many elements of Saturnalian reversal involved in Plautus’ comedies. On the disrespectful speech of slaves to their masters in general, cf. recently Richlin 2014: 187-9. Note that in the chart above, only in the case of Ballio is the object clearly of a lower or at least lowly status himself.

[27] On the ennoblement of such characters – particularly Plautus’ *servi callidi* – through the course of the dramatic plot in general, see Segal 1968: 104-36.

[28] Three of these seven occur in the future tense (*differam*, Pl. *Ps*. 359 and 446; *contruncabo*, Pl. *Bac*. 975), three too in past reference (*eradicabam*, Pl. *Epid*. 434; *tetigi*, Pl. *Ps*. 1238; *tetigerim*, Ter. *Eu*. 420), and one as a present-tense aside (*iugulo*, Ter. *Ad*. 958).

Returning to Cicero, this Plautine model maps neatly onto the posture discerned in the post-consular works. In the world of late Republican politics, Cicero himself was a *persona humilior* – a *novus homo* with no previous military career immersed in a political sea of *nobiles*. And though he rose to the consulship and at one time stood as 'king' of Rome, as some would accuse him, thereafter he struggled to re-empower himself in a landscape dominated by old-seated aristocracy.[30] Indeed, it is conflict with Rome's elite that proves the catalyst for Cicero's posture in its earliest stages – Cicero's words squaring off against Roman pedigree – for *volnero* appears in the face of the patrician Catiline (*Cat*. 1.9), *perfregerim* the nobly-descended Torquatus (*Sul*. 46), and *fregi* in reference to a member of the venerable Claudii, Cicero's perennial foe Clodius (*Att*. 1.16.8; 2.1.5).[31] Thus, as one response to his position the *novus homo* turned to a subtle yet violent means of self-aggrandizement, boldly innovating in semantics and usage to threaten his targets and boast of their defeat.

---

[29] That Plautus rather than Terence proves the predominant model does not surprise, for again Terence's style marks a general departure from the *comoedia palliata* tradition (cf. again the observations of Karakasis 2005 and Wright 1974; see Chapter One, p. 54 n. 74). Recall again too that the three instances from Terence's comedies found in the chart above either directly echo Plautus (cf. *tetigerim* at *Eu*. 420 to *tetigi* at *Ps*. 1238) or are deemed proverbial even by his own day (i.e. forms of *iugulo* at *Eu*. 417 and *Ad*. 958; cf. Otto 1890: 154 for their proverbial nature, and cf. in fact *demisisti gladium in iugulum* (*Mer*. 613) for a Plautine precedent here too).

[30] Cf. McDonnell 2006: 321-9 for a review of previous *homines novi* who obtained the consulship, emphasizing the uniqueness of Cicero's extra-military rise and consequent need to broaden the meaning of the term *virtus* (330-48). In addition to the charges of *rex peregrinus* made by Torquatus in *Pro Sulla* (see above, p. 162 n. 8), compare also Clodius' play on *rex* in his famous *altercatio* with Cicero after his Bona Dea trial, recorded at *Att*. 1.16.8-10 (*quousque ... hunc regem feremus? Att*. 1.16.10); on this *altercatio*, see Crawford 1984: 107-12.

[31] References to Catiline's patrician status can be found within Cicero and Sallust; see Gruen 1974: 417-22 and the citations therein, emphasizing the nobility of Catiline and the majority of his fellow conspirators. For detailed analysis of the Torquati, see Mitchell 1066: 23-21; and on the ancient and noble Claudii, see the handy discussion in Wiseman 1985: 15-26, oriented from Clodia's standpoint. Though Clodius' adoption of the o-form of his *gentilicium* in place of its more traditional au-form has often been linked with his venture into the *popularis* realm, Tatum 1999: 247-8 points out that no evidence for such political motivations exists, and that his elite-leaning sister Clodia, as well as other family members, in fact employed the same spelling too.

In social relationships and self-empowering stance, therefore, Cicero's posture parallels the instances from Plautus nearly exactly. Accordingly, his language and usage convey the same air of boldness and defiance projected by such Plautine slaves as Epidicus, Pseudolus, and even the cook Congrio. Just as Epidicus 'cuts down' his aged master Periphanes (*concidit*) and both Pseudolus and Congrio threaten to 'shred' respectively the pimp Ballio and Congrio's employer Euclio (*differam*), so too does Cicero boldly 'cut down' Vatinius (*concidimus*, *Q. fr*. 2.4.1) and 'mutilate' Antony (*lacerat*, *Phil*. 2.86), and herein lies an additional parallel between Cicero and comedy, this one of specific semantics. For not only does Cicero's *concidimus* find direct precedent in Plautus' *concidit* above, in both Cicero and Plautus it is the general class of 'cutting' and 'shredding' verbs that marks moments of fiercest attack – *differo* in the *flagitatio* scene of *Pseudolus* (*Ps*. 359) and *lacero* in the *Second Philippic* (*Phil*. 2.86).

Of course, that Cicero was intimately acquainted with and even appropriated character sketches from Roman comedy has been persuasively demonstrated by much scholarship.[32] It is not my aim, however, to ascribe to Cicero in such instances a particular role from comedy, nor to suggest that with phrases such as *Clodium praesentem fregi in senatu* (*Att*. 1.16.8) Cicero is purposefully and consciously imitating Plautus, greatly familiar with his comedies though Cicero was. Again, at the root of comedy's references to verbal violence lies simple hyperbole, as Aristophanes' usage demonstrated too – a tendency to exaggerate one's threats and boasts and impart to them a sense of the physical violence that characterizes these plays in general. So too does Cicero exaggerate. Rather, I suggest that Cicero's usage directly parallels the underdog mentality seen in Roman comedy and Plautus' slaves especially – that it both flows from a similar need for and thus represents a similar means of self-empowerment in the face of social disadvantage. As a *novus homo*, even at the height of power and influence Cicero could still feel socially inadequate, for he lacked the inherent prestige an aristocratic lineage bestowed. And so a bold and violent self-fashioning that evoked comic slaves was useful and fitting to him as it could never be for a member of the *nobiles*, whose family name provided social scaffolding on which to stand but also a standard by which to adhere.[33]

---

[32] The parallels between oratory and acting are manifold and are made explicitly even by Cicero himself – cf. *Brut*. 290 especially, but also *Brut*. 200; *Or*. 109; *de Orat*. 1.128-30, 2.192-94, 2.242; for a brief review of such parallels as demonstrated in these passages, cf. Vasaly 1985: 1-3, and more fully Hall 2014: 26-33. A useful summary of scholarship and approaches linking Cicero with the theater can be found in Axer 1989: 299-303, limited in scope to work only up through the 1980s. Among these approaches, parallels of characterization have been drawn especially frequently and often with great illumination to the text at hand; most notable is Geffcken 1973, who examines Cicero's use of comedy and comic characterizations in *Pro Caelio* to build his case, for instance painting Clodia as *meretrix* and *imperatrix*, a female *miles gloriosus* (30-40), and Cicero himself starring as the comic hero and tricky slave (10, 47-48, *et passim* ... e.g. 23, 45); on the *Pro Caelio* see too Leigh 2004: 303-26, esp. 303-8. In like fashion, cf. Vasaly 1985 on the dramatic masks Cicero draws in *Pro Roscio Amerino*; Sussman 1994 and 1998 on Cicero's casting of Antony as a *miles gloriousus* and *meretrix* in the *Second Philippic*; and Damon 1997: 197-251, analyzing Cicero's use of the general parasite type in his speeches.

Conversant with Roman comedy as Cicero was, the violent utterances of Plautus' characters and the boldness therewith attending must surely have lodged in his subconscious at least, and when the need arose to inject his image with a dose of authority, Cicero called upon similar language. In Cicero's usage the slapstick violence of Plautus has turned to political assault, but the syntax and even the semantics remain, and in both is seen a distinct posture whereby a *persona humilior* calls upon boldly violent language to empower himself as he cuts down his opponents. Thus, in such attacks invective truly becomes personal. And as a result, both sides experience a shift in status, for just as these verbs' objects are laid low, so too are their agents concurrently elevated in power, if not in prestige.

---

[33] A good example of the standard set by an elite family name can be seen in Cicero's *prosopopoieia* of Appius Claudius Caecus in *Pro Caelio* (*Cael*. 34), where the latter via Cicero reproaches his living descendant Clodia for her shameful behavior and failure to live up to her noble heritage.

III. Imperial Afterlife

To recap, in prose literature before Cicero's day the semantics of verbal attack remained consistent. To indicate *ad hominem* abuse, Classical Greek and mid-Republican Latin sources alike relied primarily on non-figurative verbs of the sort "to accuse," "to reproach," and "to slander," and when metaphors do enter the discourse, their use is infrequent and their derivation strict to the spheres of competition and combat. Even Cicero's early works display the same tendencies, suggesting that such may have been true of late Republican discourse at the start of his career. In Cicero's consular year, however, a new trend emerges, one marked by a shift in semantics and a newly direct syntax whereby Cicero summons to his aid the violent hyperbole of comedy to break and butcher his targets in face-to-face encounter. And just as the *personae humiliores* of Plautus and Terence elevated themselves through their violent threats and boasts, so too did the bold defiance of Cicero's posture enable the *novus homo* to bolster his own *auctoritas* in the face of ever growing political challenges. With his new verbs and savage posture Cicero fashions himself an orator and statesman supreme in power, and the potency of his presentation is witnessed in the centuries to come. For Imperial prose authors embrace two of these verbs in particular as emblematic of invective attacks – *frango* in specialized, 'Ciceronian' usage, and *lacero* applied more frequently and of verbal abuse more broadly.

Now, by no means are these the only verbs to appear in this period. Indeed, terms standard in the Republic pop up under the Empire as well, for instance *laedo* and *iugulo*, both among the most frequently occurring verbs of Chapter Two.[34] And of Cicero's coined usage *vulnero* and *concido* occur in these centuries too, the latter a special favorite of Quintilian in varied application.[35] But it is *frango* and *lacero* that especially come to symbolize invective, each in their own way.

As mentioned above, the unique status of *frango* lies in its rarified and specialized application, for in prose literature it is used clearly of verbal abuse only twice – once each in Quintilian and Tacitus. And in both cases, I suggest, the author employs the verb specifically to evoke Cicero's own language and ferocity. In Book 7 of *Institutio Oratoria*, Quintilian argues on behalf of rhetoric's utility despite its ills, for it was by eloquence, he tells the reader, that Appius Claudius Caecus once brought down Pyrrhus and that Cicero broke Catiline's *audaciam – num igitur negabitur deformem Pyrrhi pacem Caecus ille Appius dicendi viribus diremisse? aut non divina M. Tulli eloquentia ... Catilinae* ***fregit audaciam*** *...?* (*Inst*. 2.16.7). Here Quintilian refers to Cicero's denunciation of Catiline, and to mark the ferocity of his attacks he opts for *frango*, but *frango* specifically in the variation that Cicero himself began to favor toward the end of his career. When Cicero boasts of 'breaking' Antony in the *Philippics*, he breaks Antony's *audaciam* in particular. Cicero performs this in conjunction with the senate in the *Third Philippic* (*fregissemus audaciam*, *Phil*. 3.2) but on his own in the *Thirteenth Philippic* (*contudi et fregi ... audaciam*, *Phil*. 13.29), the phrasing of which proves a particularly good parallel for Quintilian's usage. Indeed, Cicero had first employed the phrase *frango audaciam* to threaten Vatinius in 56 BCE (*frangerem audaciam*, *Vat*. 2), and by this time *frango* had served as Cicero's weapon for nearly fifteen years. And so with a slight shift in phrasing Cicero breathed new life into the verb, and henceforth in self-reference he preferred this combination.[36]

---

[34] In such instances both *laedo* and *iugulo* frequently refer to verbal damage of some sort, whether administered by judicial oratory or abusive poetry (the latter usage of *laedo* is especially prominent in Augustan and Flavian poetry; cf. e.g. Hor. *S*. 2.1.21, 2.1.67; Ov. *Ib*. 5, *Ib*. 523, *Tr*. 4.1.30, *Tr*. 5.7.31; Mart. 3.97.2, 5.15.2, 10.5.2). In prose of the early Empire, cf. *laedo* at e.g. [Sal.] *Cic*. 7; Quint. *Inst*. 4.1.10, 7.2.28; and Gel. 3.3.15; for *iugulo*, see Plin. *Ep*. 4.9.8, the verb here too particular to judicial action as it was in Chapter Two.

[35] For *vulnero*, cf. *laesum et* ***vulneratum*** *reum ... hac invidia opprimi posse* (Quint. *Inst*. 7.2.30). Note that despite its relative frequency and variety of usage, *concido* in this period is not used of *ad hominem* attack in particular; rather, as a metaphor *concido* bears two primary applications in the early Empire, as seen especially in Quintilian: first, of destroying or crushing 'things' (i.e. inanimate objects) – cf. e.g. Quint. *Inst*. 1. pr. 24, 1.7.33, and 12.1.7; and second, in discussions of rhetoric and philosophy particularly, of violently splitting up sentences and thereby rendering them 'concise' – cf. e.g. Quint. *Inst*. 3.11.21, 5.10.91, 9.4.42, 11.3.53, 11.3.107; and also Sen. *Ep*. 65.16, 89.2.

Thus, in the final years of Cicero's life and works, *frango audaciam* emerges as the fresher and more forceful take on the by now standard *frango*, and it is this phrase that Quintilian chooses in the passage cited above. This in and of itself lends a Ciceronian ring to Quintilian's application; but not only is the phrase *like* Cicero, it is *of* Cicero – his attacks against Catiline specifically, as noted above. In deploying this phrase, then, Quintilian channels Cicero to speak of Cicero, evoking the ferocity that attends Cicero's invective against Vatinius and Antony. And thus too the phrase indicates Quintilian's own conception of the *Catilinarians* as similarly harsh and prone to attack, regardless of modern disagreement over the speeches' stricter status as 'invective'.[37]

---

[36] From 56 BCE on, Cicero uses *frango* to designate his own oratory a total of five times, and on three of these occasions he chooses the phrase *frango audaciam* (all listed above – *frangerem audaciam*, *Vat*. 2; *fregissemus audaciam*, *Phil*. 3.2; and *contudi et fregi ... audaciam*, *Phil*. 13.29); within the other two occur one instance each of *frango* used in first-person active form to govern a personal object (*hunc ... fregerim*; *Fam*. 10.12.4) and in third-person passive form with Cicero himself the ablative of agent (*a me ita fractus est*; *ad Brut*. 2.2.3).

[37] For disagreement as to the invective status of the *Catilinarians*, compare the views of Corbeill 2002 and Powell 2007; the former dubs the speeches among Cicero's "most angry invective" (Corbeill 2002: 198),

In turning to Tacitus' *Dialogus de Oratoribus* similar usage occurs. In section 11, as Maternus undertakes to reply to Aper's first speech, he concedes his own use of eloquence for political purposes, noting that he once 'broke' Nero's *scurra* Vatinius, though here it is Vatinius' *potentia* rather than his *audacia* that Maternus crushes – *imperante Nerone ... Vatini* ***potentiam fregi*** (*Dial*. 11.2).[38] Now, scholars have disagreed over the precise nature of Maternus' attack – potentially oratorical, but too perhaps delivered by one of his dramas, the *Domitius* for instance.[39] But again I suggest that Tacitus' use of *potentiam fregi* evokes Cicero.[40] Of course the phrase itself calls to mind *frango audaciam* and in this regard, therefore, echoes Ciceronian language. Even more so, however, note that it is a Vatinius that Maternus boasts to have broken, and likewise a Vatinius – albeit an earlier one – that in attacking Cicero introduces such usage. Cicero's innovative *frangerem audaciam* in fact sets the *In Vatinium*'s overall tone, for it appears immediately in section two. With *potentiam fregi*, therefore, Tacitus recalls Cicero's own invective against a like-named target and thereby magnifies the rhetorical force of his own statement. Moreover, since Maternus' boast parallels and imitates Cicero's threat, it is all the more likely that *potentiam fregi* signifies oratorical attack in particular. But powerful though Maternus' statement thus stands, in it too lies a wistful reflection on

---

while the latter suggests that the *Catilinarians* should be viewed more as "denunciations" than as invective due to their lack of direct attack (Powell 2007: 2).

[38] Rutledge 2001: 276-7 provides an up-to-date account of what little is known of the life and career of the *scurra* Vatinius.

[39] For a concise summary of past scholarship on this issue, see Van den Berg 2014: 157-8.

[40] Compare that in the *Dialogus* as a whole Tacitus has been seen to adopt a Ciceronian style, in contrast to his other works; Mayer 2001: 27-31 provides a handy yet still critical summary of such parallels along with relevant bibliography.

oratory gone by, and it therefore mirrors what has often been seen as the dialogue's theme at large.[41]

Thus, the two instances in Imperial prose where *frango* denotes invective represent highly specialized and Ciceronian applications, emblematic of Cicero's invective in both language and situation and thus a powerful rhetorical tool at their authors' hands. And again, that they number only two further rarifies such usage.[42] Venturing briefly into verse, Cicero's *frango* reverberates one final time.

In his programmatic *First Satire*, Persius comments on the savagery of Lucilius' satires by famously dubbing the latter to have 'cut up' the city of Rome and to have 'broken' his jaw on his targets – *secuit Lucilius urbem, te Lupe, te Muci, et genuinum* ***fregit*** *in illis* (Persius 1.114-5). Here once again *frango* serves to indicate verbal abuse, though it appears not only *in* satire but also *of* satire. At times scholars have come close to reading in these lines a quote from Lucilius himself, finding the violence of *secuit* and *fregit* indicative of his satires' brutality.[43] Yet for both semantic classes in general – as well as for *frango* in particular – *ad hominem* usage appears first in Cicero. And in fact *seco* as a metaphor in general is quite rare, and used of verbal abuse is it unattested before and after this very passage.[44] It is most likely, therefore, that both *secuit* and *fregit* mark

---

[41] On the consistency with which oratory's decline is in fact treated in the *Dialogus*, see recently Winterbottom 2001: 137-55, reading on the side of the dialogue's coherence, and Van den Berg 2014: 57-90, considering the matter in greater depth and from a more objective standpoint.

[42] There occurs one additional instance of *frango audaciam* at Livy 25.38.11 (*non enim hesterno die ...* ***frangere audaciam*** *vestram ... volui*), but here the phrase denotes action broader in scope and lacking *ad hominem* intent.

[43] Cf. recently Reckford 2009: 26, suggesting that through these lines (*secuit* in particular) Lucilius plays on the 'cutting' sound inherent in his own name.

[44] The number of instances in which *seco* is used in a figurative sense before Persius can be counted nearly on one hand; its earliest use as a metaphor is at Cic. *de Orat*. 2.117 (*OLD*. s.v. 2f) of classifying the different sorts of cases an orator might plead, and Catul. 71.2 (*OLD* s.v. 4c) of the pain caused by arthritis. Other instances that predate Persius are Hor. *S*. 1.10.15 and *Ep*. 1.16.42 (*OLD* s.v. 1c), both of solving a

Persius' own word choice, not that of Lucilius. Persius pairs a rare and therefore fresh metaphor with one whose force was emblematic, and by doing so he both amplifies and anchors the image of satirical violence he draws. Moreover, just as *fregit* directly echoes Cicero, so too *secuit* potentially bears Ciceronian roots – its use here likely represents an outgrowth of Cicero's innovative application of 'cutting' verbs to *ad hominem* speech (*concido*, *lacero*). And so the reach of Cicero's posture extends even to verse satire in both usage and conception. Yet still Persius maintains a level of linguistic autonomy, for beyond the novel coinage of *seco*, he marks Lucilius' ferocity by rendering the latter to break not his targets simply but his own jaw *on* his targets. Thus, *frango* stands newly revitalized here too.

In sum, these three instances of *frango* wield outstanding – and in prose, at least, quite specific – rhetorical force. But though their usage is powerful and furthermore 'typical' of Cicero, it is not usual, for in this period *frango* was employed far more frequently of two main types of 'breaking' – of simple and non *ad hominem* psychological injury, for example broken and debilitated spirits (e.g. Liv. 2.39.11, 38.26.4), quelled ferocity (e.g. V. Max. 9.1. ext. 1), and the mind at large undone (e.g. Sen. *Ep*. 112.1); and especially of the 'breaking' of natural elements, for instance cleaved waves and seas (e.g. Luc. 1.371, 5.440), intermittent sounds (e.g. Verg. *G*. 4.72), and dissipating winds (e.g. Vitr. 1.6.8).[45] Through Cicero's influence *frango* became a

---

matter; Verg. *A*. 10.107 (*OLD* s.v. 6b), of following the line of one's own ambition; and Ov. *Rem*. 443 (*OLD* s.v. 1a), of the mind divided. Persius' use above appears under *OLD* s.v. 4a, "to make an incision in, cut, gash," and is the only figurative instance listed here.

[45] The first category of usage is reflected particularly in the *TLL* groupings *de animo* (*TLL* 6.1.1246.19-64), *de affectibus, vitiis sim.* (*TLL* 6.1.1246.64-1247.19), and *spectat ad animum* (*TLL* 6.1.1249.29-83), the second and third of which originate with Cicero himself and the first with Plautus. For the second category at large, see *TLL* 6.1.1244.20-1246.18 (*sensu latiore et translate*; *de rebus maxime corporeis*); and for such usages specifically, 6.1.12.44.30-1245.2 (*de fluctibus sim.*), 6.1.1245.3-50 (*de voce, sonitu, verbis sim.*), and 6.1.1245.51-63 (*de ventis*). Note that in the second category too Cicero played a fundamental role, for

common metaphor in prose as well as verse to indicate intangible injury of a variety of sorts, from the mental and emotional to the natural and atmospheric.

As a standard term for invective, it is rather *lacero* that early Imperial prose authors most eagerly adopt. In contrast to *frango*, *lacero* frequents the pages of prose when verbal attack forms the subject. Moreover, such references range in both source and subject. In the first and early second centuries CE, Valerius Maximus, Livy, and Suetonius comprise the verb's most enthusiastic proponents, but *lacero* is used more infrequently by Sallust, Tacitus, Pliny, and Apuleius as well.[46] The following four applications and corresponding examples present a sample representative of the range of verbal activities designated by *lacero* in this period.[47]

1. In earlier usage especially, *lacero* continues to refer specifically to oratory, and again often to senatorial oratory in particular. Compare several instances in Livy where a victim is verbally shredded in the senate (*ii non in senatu modo eum* ***lacerarunt***; Liv. 43.8.3; ***laceratus****que probris in senatu tribunus plebis*; Liv. 31.6.5); a like occurrence in the later summary of Book 49, here of Q. Fulvius Nobilior, frequent victim of M. Porcius Cato's attacks (*Q. Fulvius Nobilior ei, saepe ab eo in senatu* ***laceratus****, respondit pro Galba*; Liv. *Perioch*. 49); Valerius Maximus' application of *lacero* to the verbal assault

---

the earliest attested usages *de rebus maxime corporeis* are found at *de Orat*. 1.265 (*TLL* 6.1.1244.22, *de calore, frigore*) and *Fam*. 5.13.3 (*TLL* 6.1.1246.6-7, *de membris infirmandis sim.*).

[46] Livy in particular favors the verb in both proper and figurative usage; cf. that Packard's concordance (1968) lists a total of thirty-nine entries for *lacero* plus an additional five of the noun *laceratio*. Of course as much as prose of the Empire generally drew influence from Cicero, Livy channeled his language and style with particular frequency; cf. e.g. Ogilvie 1965: 19, listing many examples from Livy's text that seem modeled on Cicero's phraseology and imagery and generally suggesting that Livy "can with ease represent ancient history in the language and vocabulary of his day," particularly that of Cicero.

[47] After Cicero, *lacero* is used frequently enough of verbal abuse and invective attack to merit a distinct category for such application in the *TLL* (i.e. *TLL* 7.2.827.52-828.8 – *translate*; *vituperando, detrectando*); the instances I give all derive from this category, and for additional examples I direct the reader here.

on Romulus in the *curia* (*urbis nostrae parentem senatus ... in curia* ***lacerauit***; V. Max. 5.3.1); and again the verb's appearance in a spurious fragment of the *In Pisonem* (*non debes me* ***lacerare****, quia non ego te in exilium misi*; Cic. *Pis*. fr. xx, Nisbet).[48]

2. Yet too the *contio* occurs as a venue for such attacks. Livy again displays such usage – in two instances nearly verbatim (*cum absentem Manlium tribuni plebis ... in contionibus* ***lacerarent***, Liv. 41.6.2; cf. similarly *Lucretium tribuni plebis absentem contionibus adsiduis* ***lacerabant***; Liv. 43.4.6) – as does Sallust in the *Iugurtha*, where Marius employs *lacero* to emphasize to the citizens the vicious nature of the nobility's attacks (*sed in maxumo vostro beneficio quom omnibus locis meque vosque maledictis* ***lacerent****, non placuit reticere*; Sal. *Iug*. 85.26).

3. As was true of *frango* in Persius, in both Valerius Maximus and Suetonius *lacero* denotes abusive poetry rather than oratory. With it the former discusses the banning of Archilochus' poetry in Sparta for its violent attacks on the Lycambids (*itaque maximum poetam ..., quia domum sibi invisam obscenis maledictis* ***laceraverat****, carminum exsilio multarunt*; V. Max. 6.3. ext. 1), and in Suetonius, the grammarian Pompeius Lenaeus shreds Sallust himself in a Lucilian-esque lampoon for writing unflatteringly of his former master Pompey (*Sallustium historicum, quod eum 'oris probi animo inverecundo' scripsisset, acerbissima satura* ***laceraverit***; Suet. *Gram*. 15.2).[49]

4. General talk and rumor forms the fourth and final category. The younger Pliny expresses his anger at the behavior of M. Aquilius Regulus, whom he generally loathed,

---

[48] For discussion of this fragment, see Chapter Three, p. 138 n. 47.

[49] Cf. Kaster 1995: 179-80, detailing the particularly Lucilian characteristics of Lenaeus' *satura* as reflected in the reference.

as Regulus had lacerated Herenius Senecio with no sense of moderation (***lacerat*** *Herennium Senecionem tam intemperanter quidem, ut dixerit ei Mettius Carus*; Plin. *Ep*. 1.5.3).[50] Similarly, Tacitus deems Nero to have been cut up by the general talk on a frequent basis (*sed Nero vocato senatu, oratione inter patres habita, edictum apud populum ... adiunxit. etenim crebro vulgi rumore* ***lacerabatur***; Tac. *Ann*. 15.73.1).

A fifth application type may be added, but this represents not a separate verbal activity but rather a development in usage more generally. In the late first and early second centuries there appear several instances in which *lacero* governs an abstract noun of 'reputation' instead of the personal objects typical in such usage. In both Suetonius and Apuleius *existimatio* is used thus. In the *Divus Iulius*, Suetonius employs the phrase to praise Caesar's rather affable response to his reputation being 'lacerated' by slander and lampoons (*criminosissimo libro et ... carminibus maledicentissimis* ***laceratam*** *existimationem suam civili animo tulit*; Suet. *Iul*. 75.5), and in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, a little bird 'cuts up' Cupid's *existimatio* with his slanders to Venus (*haec illa verbosa et satis curiosa avis in auribus Veneris fili* **lacerans** *existimationem ganniebat*; Apul. *Met*. 5.28.6). Indeed, later on in the *Metamorphoses* the noun *fides* is employed similarly of a doctor's reputation 'cut up' by lies (*medicum, qui praeter iudicii religionem cum fidem suam coram* **lacerari** *videret* ... ; Apul. *Met*. 10.10.3). And so just as *frango*, when its newness began to fade, shifted to *frango audaciam* first in Cicero and then in later prose writers, so too does the pairing of *lacero* with *existimatio* and *fides* likely represent a similar revitalization of the verb's force as a metaphor for harsh and abusive speech.

---

[50] On the life and career of M. Aquilius Regulus, a notorious *delator* and legacy hunter dubbed 'the foulest thing on two feet' (*Regulus, omnium bipedum nequissimus*; Plin. *Ep*. 1.5.14), see Rutledge 2001: 192-8; Pliny's loathing for Regulus is apparent in the various letters in which Regulus figures; besides *Ep*. 1.5, cf. *Ep*. 2.20; 4.2,7; and 6.2.

Thus, as the diverse applications and examples above indicate, in prose under the Empire *lacero* becomes nearly synonymous with invective and verbal abuse of all sorts – written or spoken, in the senate or elsewhere. And as the fifth application in particular signifies, the usage trajectory of *lacero* matches that of *frango* and suggests thereby that this pattern may be true of metaphors on a larger scale.

Now, one could ask why *lacero* in particular recommended itself to this period. By way of an answer I offer a few observations. First, in Cicero's own usage the term was relatively rare; thus, as a metaphor *lacero* proved fresh and powerful both in his own application and in its early adoption after his death. Second, last of Cicero's few applications is *te ... lacerat* of *Phil*. 2.86, which marks the most brutal of Cicero's posture in all its instances for its unparalleled second-person address of Antony. Moreover, its host text – the *Second Philippic* – is itself a crowning moment of Cicero's *ad hominem* abuse. To an Imperial audience, therefore, the verb would symbolize Ciceronian and by extension late Republican oratorical invective at its pinnacle, a sentimentalized token of its vividness and still too utility.[51]

And third, in the early Empire *lacero* experienced active development in both primary and figurative usage and thus retained an intense, graphic force. In primary usage, the verb appears frequently in both prose and verse to indicate a variety of violent acts against living beings primarily, and typically acts associated with physical and especially bloody rending. For instance, Imperial authors apply *lacero* to such acts as the mutilation of a legate by cutting off his ears and nose (Liv. 22.51.9), the mauling of sailors by Scylla's dogs (Verg. *Ecl*. 6.77), and the tearing apart of a human body by teeth

---

[51] Cf. the useful discussion of Kaster 1998 on the process of Cicero's canonization as a conceptual entity in the early Empire, pointing out the role played by simplification and sentimentalization.

(Sen. *Cl*. 1.25.1).[52] And in this period the verb in fact acquired new and specific physical uses as well. In the context of the arena, for example, Martial employs it three times in his *Liber Spectaculorum* to signify mutilation at the hands – or rather paws – of an animal.[53] In addition, under the Empire specifically *lacero* is closely associated with the rending characteristic of female mourning practices, this itself a physical and self-directed manifestation of the blood and emotion that marks invective attacks.[54] Such usage is unattested before the Augustan period, and it illustrates well the verb's continuing development in these years.[55] Under the Empire, therefore, *lacero* remained fluid in its primary sense and carried great visual power for evoking images of blood and mutilation.

Accordingly, in figurative usage *lacero* retained much of this vividness and, amidst frequent primary application, would have resonated strongly for an Imperial audience. As a metaphor it lent its graphic quality not only to abusive and 'bloody' invective but also to emotional and mental affliction, rendering this a psychological equivalent to the corporeal mutilation so frequent in physical applications.[56] Both metaphor types flourish after Cicero and point to his own formative role in the verb's development, for while *lacero* is found occasionally in the fragments of mid-Republican authors, it is at the hands of Cicero and those who followed that the verb seems to have gained full traction.[57] Indeed, a third figurative application – that of 'butchering' songs or speech through poor performance – appears only as of Petronius and continues in Imperial authors thereafter.[58] Thus, the verb's repertoire as a metaphor grew under the Empire as did its primary sense, and its graphic force remained potent. Of course that *lacero* should signify blood and butchery is rather obligatory given its semantics; that one should choose this verb in particular to depict such images, however, is not. Its common appearance as a metaphor for violent oratory as well as a standard term for bloody mutilation of various sorts speaks to the distinct evocative power that *lacero* wielded in the early Empire in both proper and figurative usage.

---

[52] For such examples, see generally *TLL* 7.2.824.45-825.13 (*usu vario; -antur animantia*).

[53] In the *Liber Spectaculorum*, *lacero* is used of such mauling in the following instances – *Daedale, Lucano cum sic* ***laceraris*** *ab urso* (*Sp*. 8.1); *saeva ferum rabido* ***laceravit*** *dente leonem* (*Sp*. 18.3); *ipse sed ingrato iacuit* ***laceratus*** *ab urso* (*Sp*. 21.7); cf. too similar use at Verg. *Ecl*. 6.77 (*nautas canibus* ***lacerasse*** *marinis*). Accordingly, Kathleen Coleman deems *lacero* the technical term for mauling by an animal (Coleman 2006: 99 *ad* Mart. *Sp*. 8/10.5).

[54] On the physical act of rending and beating performed by Roman women in mourning, cf. Corbeill 2004: 75-84, and 83 in particular for the blood and emotion involved in the display.

[55] For *lacero* applied to physical violence during mourning, see *TLL* 7.2.825.50-72 (*de maerentibus*). The term is first applied to such rending in the *Tusculan Disputations*, but it appears there in noun form (*ex hac opinione sunt illa varia et detestabilia genera lugendi: paedores, muliebres* ***lacerationes*** *genarum, pectoris feminum capitis percussiones*; *Tusc*. 3.62); from the Augustan poets on it is the verb that frequently marks this act – cf. its use e.g. at Prop. 2.13.27; Ov. *Met*. 11.726, *Met*. 13.534, *Trist*. 3.3.51; Luc. 7.38; Sen. *Dial*. 6.6.2, *Tro*. 409, *Phaed*. 734; Sil. 4.774; Petr. 111.9; Apul. *Met*. 4.23.3. One additional primary usage arises in the early Empire, that of violently cutting up meat or flesh, specific to Petronius; cf. *TLL* 7.2.825.73-76 (*de scissoribus carnium, maxime altilium*).

Harried on all sides after his consulship, Cicero no longer remained content to 'cast spears' at or simply 'battle' his opponents; with his attacks he sought now to draw blood, and his semantic and syntactic innovations forever left their mark on Latin and even English-speaking conceptions of invective. For in fact "to lacerate" remains a common means of description in modern discourse on invective, whether in classical scholarship or in the realm of current politics.[59] Cicero's words may have cost him his life, but in turn they birthed a new line of metaphors that live on both in the surviving Latin tradition and in our own usage.

---

[56] For *lacero* applied to psychological affliction, see *TLL* 7.2.827.22-51 (*affliguntur animantia*); for use to denote invective, cf. again 7.2.827.52-828.8 (*vituperando, detrectando*).

[57] Note that in the *TLL*'s entry for *lacero*, only twelve total instances are listed that predate Cicero, nearly all of which derive from comedy and again underline the influence of comedy in Cicero's usage; ten of these fall under the *proprie* heading (Pl. *Bac*. 780, *Bac*. 1094, *Cur*. 508, *Mer*. 48; Enn. *scen*. 58; Ter. *Ad*. 315, *Hec*. 65; Pac. *trag*. 158, 329; Cato *orat*. 35), and the other two are categorized as *translate* of a generalized sort (Pl. *As*. 291, *St*. 453).

[58] For this category, see *TLL* 7.2.827.3-21 (*laeduntur inanima; dicta, scripta sim*.).

---

[59] For examples from modern scholarship, cf. Geffcken 1973 and Gruen 1992, both of whom, in discussing Latin texts of which verbal abuse forms the subject, employ the English verb 'lacerate' when *lacero* appears nowhere in the Latin text ("Clodius is holding *contiones miseras* (*Att*. 1.14.5) to denounce the senatorial bill and to **lacerate** his enemies," Geffcken 1973: 59-60; "Cf. also Cic. *Ad Fam*. 12.16.3, who cites Lucilius as standard for *libertas* in **lacerating** verses," Gruen 1992: 273 n. 4). Within current American political discourse, cf. the following quote from an article in the *New York Times* in the final weeks before the 2012 presidential election: "It was a sharp and spirited debate, with both candidates delivering some **lacerating** blows, but Mr. Ryan at times seemed disconcerted by the sheer blowhard intensity Mr. Biden brought to the night" (from the article entitled 'Night of Withering Ripostes, Mostly by Biden', Alessandra Stanley, 10-12-2012; http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/12/us/politics/biden-takes-off-gloves-in-vice-presidential-debate.html?_r=0).

CONCLUSION

This dissertation has analyzed the language used to signify verbal abuse and *ad hominem* attack in select sources from the Greek iambographers through Cicero. It has argued that Cicero's application of 'wounding', 'breaking', and 'cutting' metaphors to such attacks is unparalleled in previous prose sources, Greek or Latin; is specific to his post-consular career; and represents a means of self-fashioning evocative of Plautine slaves' self-elevation through similar metaphors. Chapter One treated Greek and Roman sources before Cicero, and it demonstrated that on both the Greek and Latin sides a notable divide in terminology occurs; prose sources consistently employ non-figurative verbs of 'accusing', 'slandering', and the like to mark harsh or abusive speech, with metaphors rare and specific to combat and athletic competition, while sources in verse frequently call upon imagery outside these realms to portray such attacks. In addition, this chapter identified antecedents to Cicero's post-consular metaphors in the syntax and semantics of comedy, especially Plautus, for in these plays, speech of various sorts 'injures' its target in a direct and pseudo-physical manner reminiscent of actual violence.

Chapter Two assessed the language, phrasing, and usage of Cicero's pre-consular years, surveying the works of this period. It presented the verbs most frequently employed in these works to denote *ad hominem* speech and political action at the broadest level, and from this list it argued three points characteristic of the period – first, that in general these verbs, along with semantically-related nouns found in the same works, again are specific both to and within the spheres of combat and competition; second, that their usage is characterized by 'clustering', that is the nearby presence of additional – and often similar – images; and third, that in application these verbs typically are indirect and impersonal, with first-person forms infrequent and accusative objects absent. The language of Cicero's pre-consular career thereby stands in direct contrast to that of comedy and, most importantly, to his own metaphors from 63 BCE on, and such semantics and application can tentatively be assumed to represent common Republican usage at the start of Cicero's career.

Chapter Three continued at Cicero's consulship (63 BCE) and followed the introduction and development of three new strands of metaphors – verbs of 'wounding' (*vulnero*, *saucio*), 'breaking' (*frango*, *perfringo*), and 'cutting' (*concido*, *lacero*) – in the works of this period. It demonstrated that these verbs, after their initial introduction, defy the characteristics of Cicero's pre-consular language, for in their deployment clustering is absent, first-person forms abound, and explicit accusative objects appear, marking the target of the verb's action and, through syntax, placing him in direct opposition to the verb's subject. Such phrasing creates textual encounters of agent and object in which Cicero necessarily crushes his target, and this chapter argued that Cicero's use of such verbs and phrasing marks a personal posture, crossing generic boundaries and positioning him, at least in his own view, as Rome's predominant statesman and orator.

Chapter Four assessed the introduction, development, and application of these verbs in light of Cicero's political career from 63 BCE on, and as new usages and first-person forms correspond particularly with periods in which Cicero most actively aims to reshape his identity, this chapter argued that in the hands of Cicero, such metaphors and associated first-person posture served specifically as a tool of post-consular self-fashioning, a means by which to bolster his identity and *auctoritas* in the face of increasing political hardships. Moreover, this chapter returned to the Plautine parallels of Chapter One and suggested that Cicero's posture mirrors these instances in psychology and social function too, for both accompany the verbal actions of lower-status individuals – slaves and soldiers in comedy, and Cicero himself as a *novus homo* – and typically serve to elevate these individuals in the face of a social superior. Thus, in deploying his metaphors Cicero appropriates the slapstick hyperbole of comedy for political purposes, and through a bold stance reminiscent of Plautine slaves he elevates himself within Rome's aristocratic landscape. Finally, this chapter showed that two of Cicero's post-consular metaphors, *frango* and *lacero*, assumed emblematic status in the early Empire; *frango* appears more sparsely but in a manner redolent of Ciceronian invective, and prose sources at large so eagerly embrace *lacero* as a standard term for verbal abuse that modern English speakers continues to describe fierce invective as 'lacerating' its targets.

In making such claims, this dissertation suggests that these metaphors played a fundamental – if somewhat subtle – role in Cicero's post-consular works and career. Yet in Book Three of *De Oratore*, Cicero, via Crassus, suggests that the orator should generally exercise restraint in the use of metaphors (*de Orat*. 3. 157-8; cf. *Orat*. 81), and further that he should qualify their force through the addition of such terms as *quasi* and *ut ita dicam* (*de Orat*. 3.165).[1] And indeed, in previous studies Cicero has been found to employ far fewer and less striking images in his speeches than in his poetry or treatises, and likewise to qualify his metaphors – especially new ones – in all but the most elevated contexts.[2] At first glance, therefore, these passages may seem to undermine the arguments of this thesis. Yet theory and practice need not always correspond; in fact, the manner and extent to which Cicero follows his own precepts forms a significant slice of current studies of Cicero.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Fantham 1972: 179-80 on these recommendations in particular, and 176-80 on the discussion of metaphors at *de Orat*. 3.155-68 more generally.

Moreover, the metaphors of this investigation fall outside the scope of the *De Oratore* passages in several regards. First, in recommending the use of qualifiers, Crassus provides as examples only a noun (*pupillum*, *de Orat*. 3.165), whereas this dissertation has treated verbs nearly exclusively. At a basic level, then, part of speech may prove a determining factor, for indeed several of the nouns in Chapter Two receive qualification, but none of the verbs examined throughout this dissertation boast any such examples.[4] Second, these verbs are not mere ornamental images, as Crassus largely treats (cf. *exornandum*, 3.152; *ad ornatum*, 3.155), nor are they specific to Cicero's orations; rather, they prove a cross-generic phenomenon that bespeaks deeply personal involvement on Cicero's part. In short, these are highly functional and individual metaphors, and as such they seem less bound to qualification than those whose purpose is purely decorative. Third and finally, as specified by Crassus, such qualifiers serve particularly to soften an otherwise harsh metaphor (*si vereare ne paulo durior translatio esse videatur, mollienda est praeposito verbo*, *de Orat*. 3.165). Yet harshness may be precisely what Cicero sought with his innovative images, for such would render their use in self-elevation all the more effective. In sum, then, Cicero had no reason to soften these verbs – on the contrary he would have found plenty of incentive to eschew their qualification – and thus this dissertation provides yet another cause to approach the principles of Cicero's *rhetorica* with a critical eye.[5]

---

[2] For Cicero's tempered metaphor use in his orations versus his poetry or treatises, cf. Morawski 1910: 2-5, noting that several of his more 'epideictic' speeches prove the exception. On trends in Cicero's use of qualifiers, cf. the remarks of Corbeill 2004: 143-4, synthesizing Fantham 1972, who notes that the two types of metaphors for which Cicero does *not* apologize are those derived from the natural world – especially the 'ship of state' metaphor – and those applied in grand, elevated contexts. On Cicero's tendency to qualify novel metaphors especially, cf. von Albrecht 2003: 41.

[3] For studies that assess Cicero's rhetorical theory against his practice, cf. e.g. Kirby 1997 on Cicero's deployment of various rhetorical devices and techniques in *Pro Milone*, and Innocenti 1994 on the specific technique of vivid description (*enargeia/descriptio*) as employed in the *Verrines*. In the vein of political thought rather than rhetoric, cf. Zarecki 2014, examining Cicero's presentation of the ideal statesman in *De Republica* and its use as a standard by which to measure political figures of the Republic's end, e.g. Pompey, Crassus, and Antony.

[4] I.e. the nouns *aculeus* (*habet enim quendam* ***aculeum*** *contumelia*, *Ver*. 2.3.95; cf. similarly *Brut*. 173), *telum* (*falsum crimen quasi venenatum aliquod* ***telum*** *iecerint*, *Quinct*. 8; cf. similarly *Rhet. Her*. 4.28), and *vulnus* (*postea quam de re coepit dicere ... addebat ... nova quaedam* ***vulnera***, *Clu*. 58).

In addition, this thesis suggests the utility of focused, diachronic approaches to language. In particular, this dissertation recommends further referent-based studies of metaphor, both in Cicero's works specifically and in Latin literature more broadly, for such studies could assess whether other classes of metaphors display similar change in accord with Cicero's political history, and in addition demonstrable diachronic change within Latin literature overall. And on a broader scale, investigations of this type could refine current understanding of the metaphors and spheres common within Latin prose, namely what specific semantic classes and individual lexical items characterize a particular referent type at a given period of time. Again, observation of Quintilian's and Tacitus' especially Ciceronian use of *fregi* was made possible only by the narrow, focused, and in-depth approach of this project, and additional treatments of similar approach would likely enable other such discoveries.

Finally, through its findings this thesis suggests further efforts to isolate Ciceronian invective from political invective of the late Republic at large, for as Valentina Arena observes, "If the manuscript tradition had had a different fortune so as to preserve only the speeches by, say, Clodius or Catiline we would no doubt have quite a different picture."[6] In the study of invective *topoi* specifically, for instance, Christopher Craig has followed such a course, identifying seventeen specific *loci* derived from previous Greek and Roman precedents that Cicero in fact employs in his speeches, and thus that an audience of Cicero's time could expect to hear.[7] Moreover, in broader view Jonathan Powell has argued that the outstanding invectives of Cicero – for instance *In Vatinium* and *In Pisonem* – are just that, namely 'outstanding' and likely not representative of Republican oratorical practices in either the courts or the senate, and Powell in fact suggests that such pieces of stand-alone invective were preserved in the manuscript tradition precisely due to their 'outstanding' nature.[8]

---

[5] Cf. Fantham's comment that Cicero's rhetorical "principles can only be deduced from his practice" (Fantham 1972: 180).

In a similar fashion, this thesis suggests in particular a reassessment of the extent to which Ciceronian 'invective' represents an elite perspective. As mentioned in the Introduction to this dissertation, the function of Republican political invective has been identified as one of social exclusion – of identifying, shaming, and thereby excluding a deviant member of the elite, and through the didactic lesson provided by such invective, of ensuring stability within the ruling elite.[9] And indeed, as Chapter Three observed, the senate and the senatorial elite are traditionally viewed as the proper context for Roman political invective, both in target and in audience.[10] Anthony Corbeill for instance states that "The most damning invective in the Ciceronian corpus, such as that against Piso and Vatinius, occurs not in speeches held before the people but in those intended to be delivered before a group of senatorial peers."[11] Cicero of course was himself a senator – a *vir consularis*, in fact – and thus participated in this context, yet his was a status derived solely from office rather than from birth as well, for at his essence he was a *novus homo* with no military background who, through his exceptional skill in oratory, used the career-boosting potential of pleading in the courts to climb Rome's political ladder.[12]

---

[6] Arena 2007: 158.

[7] I.e. Craig 2004.

[8] For these suggestions, cf. Powell 2007: 5-16. Similarly, John Ramsey argues that Cicero's published senatorial speeches in general were uncharacteristic of late Republican senatorial oratory, far surpassing typical senate speeches in length and adornment (Ramsey 2007: 123-30).

[9] Cf. Corbeill 1996: 12-13 *et passim* and 2002: 198, 210-16 (esp. 210-11); Koster 1980: 38-39, 354; and Introduction, p. 10 n. 19. Jonathan Powell, though, suggests that the shame imposed by invective did not *exclude* targets but rather marked them "as deviant members of the in-group," as acts of invective tended to be reciprocal and inspire counter-attacks (Powell 2007: 20).

In contrast to many of his peers, Cicero bore no noble name on which to stand, and moreover, from 57 BCE on he battled in addition the odious moniker '*exsul*'.[13] Thus, though his attacks were aimed primarily at fellow senators and were generally intended for an elite audience, Cicero did not deliver them as his peers' true equal. Nor indeed does he seem to have conceived of himself as an equal in such instances, for as this dissertation has argued, in representing the crushing force of his own *ad hominem* attacks, Cicero employed language reminiscent of comedy's slaves, especially Plautus' *servi callidi*. Again, through their violent metaphors, these slaves boldly elevate themselves before and above their social superiors – often their own masters – and in employing like syntax and semantics, Cicero assumes a similarly bold posture of self-elevation. As he threatens his aristocratic opponents and boasts of their defeat, Cicero parallels the daring and insolent slave who exalts himself in the face of a superior, and so just as the substance of Cicero's invective abuse has long been linked to Plautus and the stage, his own conception of such abuse reveals a similar tie.[14] Thus, while Ciceronian invective may still be located within the context of the elite, its perspective seems in at least some regards that of the underdog, a social upstart whose tongue could gain him *auctoritas*, *existimatio*, and political victory, but could never render him a true equal to his aristocratic peers. In light of this, it would be interesting to see if future scholarship may identify other direct parallels between Cicero and non-elite language, whether that of comedy and the theater specifically or that within late Republican oratory and culture more broadly.

---

[10] For discussion of this context, see Chapter Three, pp. 155-6 and p. 156 n.76.

[11] Corbeill 2002: 211.

[12] Cf. e.g. David 2007: 427 on the upward mobility pleading in court offered, especially on the side of the prosecution.

[13] That Cicero was mocked as an *exsul* is documented for instance in his personal correspondence, as he records e.g. at *Q. fr.* 3.2.2 an exchange with Gabinius upon the latter's return to Rome in which Cicero verbally 'wounded' Gabinius, and Gabinius responded by calling Cicero an 'exile' (*ipso decimo die ... irrepsit summa infrequentia. cum vellet exire, a consulibus retentus est. ... cum a me maxime vulneraretur, non tulit et me trementi voce* ***exsulem*** *appelavit*).

Cicero, the consummate philologist, was careful and deliberate in his word choice, seeking always that which was *aptum*.[15] To insert into his prose innovative metaphors that smacked of the theater must too have been intentional, whether or not Cicero consciously channeled specific characters of the stage in doing so. By detailing the language used to denote abusive, *ad hominem* attacks in Greek and Roman literature through Cicero himself, this dissertation has uncovered a subtle yet bold program of self-fashioning and self-elevation that pervades Cicero's post-consular works at large and has shaped the discourse of future generations even up to today. Such words may not have altered the reality of Cicero's position during these years, but they provided a tool with which to carefully craft an idealized image for himself, and thus in his surviving texts

---

[14] On the content of Cicero's invective as reminiscent of Plautus, see Hammer 1906, who documents parallels of insult found between the orator and the playwright.

[15] For *aptum* as a guiding stylistic principle in Cicero's prose, see *Orat*. 74 and von Albrecht 2003 *passim*, esp. 144-5, 161-2, 230, 240-1.

Cicero stands ever authoritative, powerful, and deadly, the *novus homo* that breaks his opponents and elevates himself as the pinnacle of Rome.

WORKS CITED

Achard, G. 1981. *Pratique rhétorique et idéologie politique dans les discours "optimates" de Cicéron*. Leiden: Brill.

Adams, J.N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Arena, V. 2007. "Roman Oratorical Invective." In W.J. Dominik and J. Hall (eds.), *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*, 149-59. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Auhagen, U. 2001. "Lucilius und die Komödie." In G. Manuwald (ed.), *Der Satiriker Lucilius und seine Zeit* (*Zetemata* 110), 9-23. München: Beck.

Austin, R.G. 1933. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Pro M. Caelio Oratio*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Axer, J. 1989. "Tribunal-Stage-Arena: Modeling of the Communication Situation in M. Tullius Cicero's Judicial Speeches." *Rhetorica* 7: 299-311.

Barsby, J. 1999. *Terence: Eunuchus*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bartol, K. 1993. *Greek Elegy and Iambus: Studies in Ancient Literary Sources*. Poznan: A. Mickiewicz University Press.

Batstone, W.W. 1994. "Cicero's Construction of Consular Ethos in the *First Catilinarian*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124: 211-66.

Beard, M. 2002. "Ciceronian Correspondences: Making a Book out of Letters." In T.P. Wiseman (ed.), *Classics in Progress: Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome*, 103-44. Oxford; New York: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press.

Beaujeu, J. 1991. *Cicéron, Correspondance: Tome X*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Berry, D.H. 1989. "Gulielmius and the Erfurtensis of Cicero: New Readings for *Pro Sulla*." *Classical Quarterly* 39: 400-7.

-- 1996. *Cicero: Pro Sulla Oratio*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blass, F. 1887-98. *Die attische Beredsamkeit*. 3 vols. Leipzig: Teubner.

Bossi, F. 1990. *Studi su Archiloco*. Bari: Adriatica Editrice.

Brown, C. 1997. "Iambos." In D.E. Gerber (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*, 13-88. Leiden: Brill.

Brunt, P.A. 1988. *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Burnett, A.P. 1983. *Three Archaic Poets*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Butler, S. 2002. *The Hand of Cicero*. London; New York: Routledge.

Calboli, G. 1993. *Cornifici Rhetorica ad C. Herennium. Introduzione, testo critico, commento*, 2nd ed. Bologna: Pátron.

Cape, R.W. 2002. "Cicero's Consular Speeches." In J. May (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*, 113-58. Leiden: Brill.

Carey, C. 1986. "Archilochus and Lycambes." *Classical Quarterly* 36: 60-7.

-- 1994. "Legal Space in Classical Athens." *Greece & Rome* 41: 172-86.

-- 2000. *Aeschines*. The Oratory of Classical Greece 3. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Charpin, F. 1991. *Lucilius, Satires, Tome III: Livres XXIX, XXX et fragments divers*. Collection des Universités de France, Budé. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Clark, A.C. 1909. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes, Vol. IV: Pro P. Quinctio, Pro Q. Roscio Comoedo, Pro A. Caecina, De Lege Agraria Contra Rullum, Pro C. Rabirio Perduellionis Reo, Pro L. Flacco, In L. Pisonem, Pro C. Rabirio Postumo*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Classen, C.J. 2001. "Lucilius und sein Pudding." In G. Manuwald (ed.), *Der Satiriker Lucilius und seine Zeit* (*Zetemata* 110), 63-71. München: Beck.

Coleman, K.M. 1990. "Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments." *Journal of Roman Studies* 80: 44-73.

-- 2006. *M. Valerii Martialis Liber Spectaculorum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cooper, C. 2007. "Forensic Oratory." In I. Worthington (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, 203-19. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

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

-- 2002. "Ciceronian Invective." In J. May (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*, 197-217. Leiden: Brill.

-- 2004. *Nature Embodied: Gesture in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Corbett, P. 1964. "*Vis comica* in Plautus and Terence." *Eranos* 62: 52-69.

Courtney, E. 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

-- 1999. *Archaic Latin Prose*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Craig, C. 2002. "A Survey on Selected Recent Work on Cicero's Rhetorica and Speeches." In J. May (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*, 503-31. Leiden: Brill.

-- 2004. "Audience Expectations, Invective, and Proof." In J.G.F. Powell and J. Patterson (eds.), *Cicero the Advocate*, 187-213. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crawford, J. 1984. *M. Tullius Cicero, the Lost and Unpublished Orations*. Hypomnemata 80. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

-- 1994. *M. Tullius Cicero, the Fragmentary Speeches: An Edition with Commentary*, 2nd ed. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Damon, C. 1997. *The Mask of the Parasite: a Pathology of Roman Patronage*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

David, J.-M. 2006. "Rhetoric and Public Life." In N. Rosenstein and R. Morstein-Marx (eds.), *A Companion to the Roman Republic*, 421-38. Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell.

De Melo, W. 2011. *Plautus: Amphitryon. The Comedy of Asses. The Pot of Gold. The Two Bacchises. The Captives*. Loeb Classical Library 60. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Degani, E. 1991. *Hipponax: Testimonia et Fragmenta*, 2nd ed. Leipzig: Teubner.

-- 1993. "Aristofane e la Tradizione dell' Invettiva Personale in Grecia". In J.M. Bremer and E.W. Handley (eds.), *Aristophane* (Fondation Hardt 38), 1-36. Geneva: Fondation Hart.

Denyer, N. 2008. *Plato: Protagoras*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dickey, E. 2002. *Latin Forms of Address: from Plautus to Apuleius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dobson, J.F. 1919. *The Greek Orators*. London: Methuen & Co.

Dover, K.J. 1964. "The Poetry of Archilochus." In J. Pouilloux (ed.), *Archiloque* (Fondation Hardt 10), 183-222. Geneva: Fondation Hardt.

-- 1968. *Aristophanes, Clouds*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

-- 1972. *Aristophanic Comedy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

-- 1974. *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford: Blackwell.

-- 1980. *Plato: Symposium*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duckworth, G.E. 1952. *The Nature of Roman Comedy: A Study in Popular Entertainment*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dugan, J. 2005. *Making a New Man: Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dunkle, R.J. 1967. "The Greek Tyrant and Roman Political Invective." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 98: 151-71.

Dyck, A. 1996. *A Commentary on Cicero,* De Officiis. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

-- 2003. *Cicero: De Natura Deorum, Book 1*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Epstein, D. 1987. *Personal Enmity in Roman Politics, 218-43 BC*. London: Croom Helm.

Fantham, E. 1972. *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

-- 2004. *The Roman World of Cicero's* De Oratore. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Focardi, G. 1972. "Linguaggio forense nei prologhi terenziani." *Studi Italiani di Filologica Classica* 44: 55-88.

-- 1978. "Lo stile oratorio nei prologhi terenziani." *Studi Italiani di Filologica Classica* 50: 70-89.

Forman, L.L. 1962. *Index Andocideus, Lycurgeus, Dinarcheus*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Fraenkel, E. 2007. *Plautine Elements in Plautus* (*Plautinisches im Plautus*), transl. T. Drevikovsky and F. Muecke. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Frazel, T.D. 2004. "The Composition and Circulation of Cicero's 'In Verrem'." *Classical Quarterly* 54: 128-42.

-- 2009. *The Rhetoric of Cicero's* In Verrem. Hypomnemata 179. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Galán Vioque, G. 2002. *Martial, Book VII: A Commentary*, trans. J.J. Zoltowski. Mnemosyne Supplement 226. Leiden: Brill.

Geffcken, K. 1973. *Comedy in the Pro Caelio, with an Appendix on the In Clodium et Curionem*. Leiden: Brill.

Gelhaus, H. 1972. *Die Prologe des Terenz. Eine Erklärung nach den Lehren von der inventio und dispositio*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Gelzer, M. 1939. "M. Tullius Cicero als Politiker." *RE* 7.1, *Zweite Reihe [R-Z], Dreizehnter Halbband*: 827-1091.

Gerber, D.E. 1999. *Greek Iambic Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries B.C.*. Loeb Classical Library 259. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glick, M.K. 1941. *Studies in Colloquial Exaggeration in Roman Comedy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Goldberg, S. 1983. "Terence, Cato, and the Rhetorical Prologue." *Classical Philology* 78: 198-211.

-- 1986. *Understanding Terence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Griffith, J. 1970. "The Ending of Juvenal's First Satire and Lucilius, Book XXX." *Hermes* 98: 56-72.

Gruen, E. 1968. *Roman Politics and the Criminal Courts, 149-78 B.C*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

-- 1974. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

-- 1992. *Culture and Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Gunderson, E. 2000. *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Habicht, C. 1990. *Cicero the Politician*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hall, J. 2014. *Cicero's Use of Judicial Theater*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hammer, S. 1906. *Contumeliae quae in Ciceronis invectivis et epistolis occurrunt quatenus Plautinum redoleant sermonem*. Cracow: Sumptibus Academiae Litterarum Cracoviensis.

Hanson, J.A. 1965. "The Glorious Military." In T.A. Dorey and D.R. Dudley (eds.), *Roman Drama*, 51-85. New York: Basic Books.

Harris, E.M. 2008. *Demosthenes, Speeches 20-22*. The Oratory of Classical Greece 12. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Hellegouarc'h, J. 1972. *Le Vocabulaire Latin des Relationes et des Partis politiques sous la République*, 2nd ed. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Henderson, J. 1991. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Old Comedy*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

-- 1998. *Aristophanes: Acharnians, Knights*. Loeb Classical Library 178. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hoffmann, G. 1892. *Schimpfwörter der Griechen und Römer*. Berlin: R. Gaertners Verlagsbuchhandlung Hermann Heyfelder.

Horsfall, N. 2003. *The Culture of the Roman Plebs*. London: Duckworth.

Humbert, J. 1925. *Les Plaidoyers écrits et les plaidoiries réelles de Cicéron*. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France.

Hutchinson, G.O. 1993. "Ciceros Briefe als Literature." *Hermes* 121: 441-51.

Imholtz, A.A. 1972. "Gladiatorial Metaphors in Cicero's *Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino*." *CW* 65: 228-30.

Innocenti, B. 1994. "Towards a Theory of Vivid Description as Practiced in Cicero's *Verrine* Oration." *Rhetorica* 12: 355-81.

Jebb, R. 1876. *The Attic Orators*. 2 vols. London: Macmillan.

Kaimio, M. 1990. “Comic Violence in Aristophanes.” *Arctos* 24: 47-72.

Karakasis, E. 2005. *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaster, R. 1995. *Suetonius: De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

-- 1998. “Becoming ‘CICERO’.” In P. Knox and C. Foss (eds.), *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen* (*Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* 92), 248-63. Stuttgart: Teubner.

-- 2006. *Cicero: Speech on Behalf of Publius Sestius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kennedy, G. 1963. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. London: Routledge.

-- 1972. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 B.C. – A.D. 300*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

-- 1985. “Oratory.” In P.E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox (eds.), *Cambridge History of Classical Literature, vol. I: Greek Literature*, 498-526. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kirby, J.T. 1997. "Ciceronian Rhetoric: Theory and Practice." In W.J. Dominik and J. Hall (eds.), *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*, 13-31. London: Routledge.

Komornicka, A.M. 1964. *Métaphores, personnifications et comparaisons dans l’ oeuvre d’ Aristophane*. Archiwum Filologiczne 10. Wroclaw: Zaklad Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Konstan, D. 1993. “Rhetoric and the Crisis of Legitimacy in Cicero’s Catilinarian Orations.” In T. Poulakos (ed.), *Rethinking the History of Rhetoric:*

Multidisciplinary Essays on the Rhetorical Tradition, 11-30. Boulder: Westview Press.

Koster, S. 1980. *Die Invective in der griechischen und römischen Literature*. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 99. Meisenheim am Glan: Hain.

Krenkel, W. 1970. *Lucilius: Satiren*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.

Krostenko, B. 2001. *Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Landgraf, G. 1878. *De Ciceronis Elocutione in Orationibus Pro P. Quinctio et Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino Conspicua*. diss. Würzburg. Würzburg: A. Stuberi.

Laurand, L. 1936-40. *Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron*, 4th ed. 3 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Leigh, M. 2004. "The *Pro Caelio* and Comedy." *Classical Philology* 99: 300-35.

Lilja, S. 1965. *Terms of Abuse in Roman Comedy*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Lintott, A. 1968. *Violence in Republican Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Louis, P. 1945. *Les Métaphores de Platon*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

MacDowell, D.M. 1990. *Demosthenes: Against Meidias (Oration 21)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

-- 2000. *Demosthens: On the False Embassy (Oration 19)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mack, D. 1967. *Senatsreden und Volksreden bei Cicero*. [orig. published 1937, Würzburg]. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Malcovati, E. 1967. *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta Liberae Rei Publicae*, 3rd ed. *Vol. 1: Textus*. Turin: Paravia.

-- 1965. *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia; fasc. 4, Brutus*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Mankin, D. 2011. *Cicero: De Oratore, Book III*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Manuwald, G. 2004. "Performance and Rhetoric in Cicero's *Philippics*." *Antichthon* 38: 58-76.

-- 2007. *Cicero, Philippics 3-9*. 2 vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Marx, F. 1904-5. *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae*. 2 vols. Lipsiae: In aedibus Teubneri.

May, J.M. 1988. *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

-- 1995. "Cicero and the Beasts." *Syllecta Classica* 7: 143-53.

Mayer, R. 2001. *Tacitus, Dialogus de Oratoribus*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, K. 2000. *Slaves, Masters and the Art of Authority in Plautine Comedy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

McDermott, W.C. 1972. "Cicero's Publication of his Consular Orations." *Philologus* 16: 277-84.

McDonnell, M. 2006. *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mitchell, J. 1966. "The Torquati." *Historia* 15: 23-31.

Morawski, G. 1910. "De Metaphoris Tullianis Observationes." *Eos* 16: 1-5.

Morstein-Marx, R. 2004. *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muecke, F. 2005. "Rome's First 'Satirists': Themes and Genre in Ennius and Lucilius." In K. Freudenburg (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*, 33-47. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Müller, A. 1913. "Die Schimpfwörter in der griechischen Komödie." *Philologus* 72: 321-37.

Nagy, G. 1976. "Iambos: Typologies of Invective and Praise." *Arethusa* 9: 191-205.

-- 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Nisbet, R.G.M. 1961. *M. Tulli Ciceronis In L. Calpurnium Pisonem Oratio*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Ogilvie, R.M. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Opelt, I. 1965. *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter und verwandte sprachliche Erscheinungen: Eine Typologie*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Otto, A. 1890. *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Packard, D.W. 1968. *A Concordance to Livy*. 4 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Page, D.L. 1981. *Further Greek Epigrams: Epigrams Before AD 50 from the Greek Anthology and Other Sources, not Included in Hellenistic Epigrams or the Garland of Philip*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parker, H. 1989. "Crucially Funny or Tranio on the Couch: the *Servus callidus* and Jokes about Torture." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 119: 233-46.

Petersmann, H. 1999. "The Language of Early Roman Satire: its Functions and Characterizations." In J.N. Adams and R.G. Mayer (eds.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry* (*Proceedings of the British Academy* 93), 289-310. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pocock, L.G. 1926. *A Commentary on Cicero* In Vatinium. *With an Historical Introduction and Appendices*. London: University of London Press.

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*, 1-23. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.

-- 2010. "Court Procedure and Rhetorical Strategy in Cicero". In D.H. Berry and A. Erskine (eds.), *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*, 21-36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-- 2013. "Cicero's Style." In C. Steel (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, 41-72. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Powell, J.G.F. and Patterson, J. 2004. "Introduction." In J.G.F. Powell and J. Patterson (eds.), *Cicero the Advocate*, 1-57. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Preuss, S. 1963. *Index Demosthenicus*. [orig. published 1892, Teubner]. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

-- 1965. *Index Aeschineus*. [orig. published 1926, Teubner]. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Puelma Piwonka, M. 1978. *Lucilius und Kallimachos: zur Geschichte einer Gattung der hellenistich-römischen Poesie*. [orig. published 1949, V. Klostermann]. New York: Garland Publishing.

Purcell, N. 1999. "Does Caesar Mime?" In B. Bergman and C. Kondoleon (eds.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*, 181-94. National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C.: Yale University Press.

Ramsey, J.T. 2003. *Cicero: Philippics I-II*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-- 2007. "Roman Senatorial Oratory." In W.J. Dominik and J. Hall (eds.), *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*, 122-35. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Raschke, W.J. 1979. "The Chronology of the Early Books of Lucilius." *Journal of Roman Studies* 69:78-89.

Reckford, K.J. 2009. *Recognizing Persius*. Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Richlin, A. 2014. "Talking to Slaves in the Plautine Audience." *Classical Antiquity* 33: 174-226.

Riggsby, A. 1997. "Did the Romans Believe in Their Verdicts?" *Rhetorica* 15: 235-51.

-- 2004. "The Rhetoric of Character in the Roman Courts." In J.G.F. Powell and J. Patterson (eds.), *Cicero the Advocate*, 165-85. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rosen, R. 1988a. *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition*. APA American Classical Studies 19. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

-- 1988b. "Hipponax and his Enemies in Ovid's *Ibis*." *CQ* 36.2: 291-6.

-- 2007. *Making Mockery: The Poetics of Ancient Satire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rotstein, A. 2010. *The Idea of Iambos*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ruffell, I.A. 2003. "Beyond Satire: Horace, Popular Invective and the Segregation of Literature." *Journal of Roman Studies* 93: 35-65.

Rutherford, R.B. 1995. *The Art of Plato: Ten Essays in Platonic Interpretation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rutledge, S.H. 2001. *Imperial Inquisitions: Prosecutors and Informants from Tiberius to Domitian*. London: Routledge.

Sandbach, F.H. 1985. "Plato and the Socratic Work of Xenophon." In P.E. Easterling and B.M.W Knox (eds.), *Cambridge History of Classical Literature, vol. I: Greek Literature*, 478-97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press:.

Santoro L'Hoir, F. 1997. *The Rhetoric of Gender Terms: 'Man', 'Woman', and the Portrayal of Character in Latin Prose*. Mnemosyne Supplement 120. Leiden; New York: Brill.

Schmid, J. 1895-99. *De conviciis a X oratoribus Atticis usurpatis. Pars I-II.* Ambergae: Typis Curavit J. Böes.

Segal, E. 1968. *Roman Laughter: The Comedy of Plautus*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shackleton Bailey, D.R. 1965. *Cicero: Letters to Atticus, Vol. 1 (Books I-II)*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-- 1980. *Cicero: Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem et M. Brutum*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 22. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-- 2009a. *Cicero: Philippics 1-6*, rvsd. by J.T. Ramsey and G. Manuwald. Loeb Classical Library 189. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

-- 2009b. *Cicero: Philippics 7-14*, rvsd. by J.T. Ramsey and G. Manuwald. Loeb Classical Library 507. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Skutsch, O. 1901. "Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus ('Cornelius', #221)." *RE* 4: 1384-6.

Spencer, W.E. 2010-2011. "Conspiracy Rhetoric in Cicero's *Verrines*." *Illinois Classical Studies* 35-36: 121-141.

Starkie, W.J.M. 1966. *The Clouds of Aristophanes*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Steel, C. 2005. *Reading Cicero: Genre and Performance in Late Republican Rome*. London: Duckworth.

-- 2007. "Name and Shame? Invective Against Clodius and Others in the Post-Exile Speeches." In J. Booth (ed.), *Cicero on the Attack: Invective and Subversion in the Orations and Beyond*, 105-28. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.

Stockert, W. 1983. *T. Maccius Plautus, Aulularia*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Stockton, D. 1971. *Cicero: A Political Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stroh, W. 1975. *Taxis und Taktik. Die advokatische Dispositionskunts in Ciceros Gerichtsreden*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Süss, W. 1910. *Ethos: Studien zur älteren griechischen Rhetorik.* Leipzig; Berlin: Teubner.

Sussman, L.A. 1994. "Antony as a *Miles Gloriosus* in Cicero's *Second Philippic*." *Scholia* 3: 53-83.

-- 1998. "Antony the *Meretrix Audax*: Cicero's Novel Invective in *Philippic* 2.44-46." *Eranos* 96: 114-28.

Taillardat, J. 1965. *Les Images d' Aristophane: Études de langue et de style*, 2nd ed. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Tarditi, G. 1968. *Archilochus. Fragmenta edidit, veterum testimonia collegit Iohannes Tarditi*. Rome: In aedibus Athenaei.

Tatum, W.J. 1999. *The Patrician Tribune: Publius Clodius Pulcher*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

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*, 47-70. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.

Usener, H. 1901. "Italische Volksjustiz." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 56: 1-28.

Van den Berg, C.S. 2014. *The World of Tacitus'* Dialogus de Oratoribus*: Aesthetics and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vasaly, A. 1985. "The Masks of Rhetoric: Cicero's *Pro Roscio Amerino*." *Rhetorica* 3: 1-20.

-- 1993. *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

-- 2002. "Cicero's Early Speeches." In J. May (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*, 71-111. Leiden: Brill.

-- 2009. "Cicero, Domestic Politics, and the First Action of the Verrines." *Classical Antiquity* 28: 101-37.

-- 2013. "The Political Impact of Cicero's Speeches." In C. Steel (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, 141-59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Von Albrecht, M. 1997. *A History of Roman Literature: From Livius Andronicus to Boethius*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.

-- 2003. *Cicero's Style: A Synopsis*. Leiden: Brill.

Von Blumenthal, A. 1922. *Die Schätzung des Archilochos im Altertum*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Walters, B. 2011. *Metaphor, Violence, and the Death of the Roman Republic*. Diss. University of California, Los Angeles.

Warmington, E.H. 1938. *Remains of Old Latin, Volume III: Lucilius, The Twelve Tables*. Loeb Classical Library 329. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

West, M.L. 1971-2. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

-- 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.

White, P. 2010. *Cicero in Letters: Epistolary Relations of the Late Republic*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Winterbottom, M. 2001. "Returning to Tacitus' *Dialogus*." In C. Wooten (ed.), *The Orator in Action and Theory in Greece and Rome*, 137-55. Mnemosyne Supplement 224. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Wiseman, T.P. 1985. *Catullus and His World: A Reappraisal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wooten, C. 1983. *Cicero's Philippics and Their Demosthenic Model*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Wright, F.W. 1931. *Cicero and the Theater*. Smith College Classical Studies 11. Northampton, MA: Smith College.

Wright, J. 1974. *Dancing in Chains: The Stylistic Unity of the Comoedia Palliata*. Rome: American Academy.

-- 2005. *Demosthenes, Speeches 18 and 19*. The Oratory of Classical Greece 9. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Zarecki, J. 2014. *Cicero's Ideal Statesman in Theory and Practice*. London; New York: Bloomsbury Academic.