1 Ancient theories

We begin with Cicero (d. 43 BCE). To be sure, long before his time many theories of the emotions had been elaborated, particularly within the Stoic and Epicurean philosophies of the Hellenistic era.[1] Cicero drew on these traditions when he wrote on emotions for the Latinate audience of the Roman West. Medieval people inherited his writings. But they read them through Christian lenses. Christianity, which became the official religion of the Roman Empire in the 380s, radically transformed ancient ideas about the emotions. To get a clear idea of some of the most important of those changes, we will focus in the second part of this chapter on Saint Augustine's reconsideration of the Ciceronian canon. Augustine (d. 430), perhaps the most influential of the Western Church Fathers, read Cicero on the emotions and reoriented the discussion. Armed with the theories and the vocabularies of Augustine and Cicero, we will be ready to look at some early medieval emotional communities in Chapter 2. In addition, the writings of Cicero and Augustine discussed here exerted an enormous influence on later emotional communities, especially those of the twelfth century and beyond, as we shall see in Chapter 4 and those thereafter.

Cicero's somber, "Stoic" emotions

While Cicero expressed many emotions in his writings, we are here interested in his theoretical works on the topic, particularly the *Tusculan Disputations* and *Laelius on Friendship*. Both were written near the end of Cicero's life, the first in 45 and the second in 44 BCE. This was a period of crisis for Cicero. Caesar was ready to end the Republic, and Cicero no longer had a role in the state, as he longed to have. Further, his beloved

[1] Good introductions to these theories include Martha C. Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics* (Princeton, 1994); Juha Sihvola and Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *The Emotions in Hellenistic Philosophy* (Dordrecht, 1998); Simo Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy* (Oxford, 2004), 47–80; Richard Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind: From Stoic Agitation to Christian Temptation* (Oxford, 2000).

daughter had recently died.[2] Retiring to his estate at Tusculum, just southeast of Rome, he intended the writing of his *Disputations* to be a kind of therapy. In the course of his wide-ranging discussion, he offered what amounted to a summary of Stoic theory (which had been elaborated in the course of the third and second centuries) and a list in Latin of the *perturbationes animi* that were equivalent to the Stoic *pathé*, or "emotions." The Stoics intended to achieve *apatheia*, freedom from the effects of the *pathé*. Cicero wanted to demonstrate his "strength of mind" in the face of emotional turmoil. Was the discussion, then, Cicero's own? Yes and no. He did not accept every Stoic idea; he shaped their theories to conform to his own.

But his own ideas at the time were not the sum total of his thinking on the topic. Indeed, the *Tusculan Disputations*, with its jaundiced view of nearly every emotion, was but one side of his theory (and his disposition). As if writing to correct himself, Cicero shortly thereafter produced the *Laelius*, which claimed that a man without feeling was hardly a man at all.

Cicero's sorrows

In the *Tusculan Disputations*, Cicero wrote about the *perturbationes*, the Latin word that he chose for the emotions. The Greek word he was translating, *pathé*, was more precisely equivalent to the Latin word *passiones*, "passions," but "perturbations" was closer to Cicero's own dark feelings at the time he was writing. The *Tusculan Disputations*, written as a dialogue with "Brutus," began with Cicero vigorously lampooning the terrors of death and offering many reasons why "the dead were not in a bad way."[3] He turned in the second book to disparage pain, arguing that it was "clearly nothing (*nihil ... plane*)" when compared to disgrace (*turpitudo*).[4] In books 3 and 4, he belittled the emotions, organizing his discussion around the four genera of emotions – *voluptas* and *aegritudo* (pleasure and pain), *libido* (or *cupiditas*), and *metus* (desire and fear) – that had been elaborated by the Stoics. Let us now turn to these categories (noting in passing that in his fifth and final book, Cicero left off criticizing and became instead an advocate of virtue). Cicero's scheme is shown in Table 1.1.

Pleasure and pain were reactions to present stimuli; desire and fear to things anticipated. This was perfectly in accordance with Stoic views.

[2] For Cicero's circumstances at the time, see Margaret R. Graver, *Cicero on the Emotions: Tusculan Disputations 3 and 4* (Chicago, 2002), xi–xv.
[3] *M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanae Disputationes* 1.46.111b, ed. Michaelangelus Giusta (Turin, 1984) [henceforth: *TD*], 86: "nullo in malo mortuos esse."
[4] Cicero, *TD* 2.13.31, p. 116.

Table 1.1 *Cicero's genera of* perturbationes animi[a]

Present	Future
voluptas/*elatio animi*/*laetitia*, pleasure	*libido*/*cupiditas*, desire
aegritudo, pain/distress	*metus*, fear

[a] The slash (/) indicates synonyms or near-synonyms here, but in other tables may indicate antonyms; the context makes its meaning clear. Here and elsewhere, English translations must be considered only rough equivalents.

Table 1.2 *Cicero's* constantiae[a]

Present *constantiae*	(Corresponding *perturbationes*)
gaudium, joy	(*voluptas*), pleasure
(there is no *constantia* for present evil)	(*aegritudo*), pain/distress
Future *constantiae*	(Corresponding *perturbationes*)
voluntas, will	(*cupiditas*), desire
cautio, caution	(*metus*), fear

[a] Corresponding *perturbationes* are provided only for reference.

However, the emphases in Cicero's discussion were very much his own. First, Cicero hardly mentioned the Stoic "pre-passions," the bodily contractions, expansions, tears, pallor, blushes, and stings that told the wise man that an emotion was about to happen and that he must not assent to it.[5] Second, the Stoics considered certain emotions good: they were called the *eupatheiai* (*eu* meaning good) and there were many of them: varieties of *gaudium* (joy) like enjoyment, cheerfulness, and good spirits; kinds of *voluntas* (will) like good intent, benevolence, and affection.[6] Cicero mentioned these good emotions, which he termed *constantiae*, or consistencies, but unlike the Stoics, he did not bother to list their many kinds. Thus, reading Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*, you would imagine that there were only three *constantiae* as shown in Table 1.2.

[5] On Stoic pre-passions, see Knuuttila, *Emotions*, 63–68. Cicero mentions them briefly in *TD* 3.34.83, p. 204. See Graver, *Cicero on the Emotions*, 124–26.

[6] Graver, *Cicero on the Emotions*, 138, lists some of the Stoic species of *eupatheiai*: for example, Diogenes Laertius and Pseudo-Andronicus named "enjoyment (*terpsis*), cheerfulness (*euphrosuné*), and good spirits (*euthumia*)" as species of joy; "good intent (*eunoia*), goodwill (*eumeneia*), welcoming (*aspasmos*) and affection (*agapésis*)" were forms of will.

Table 1.3 *Cicero's* aegritudines

adflictatio, affliction
adflictari, to be miserable or afflicted
aemulatio, rivalry
aemulari, to rival
aerumna, weariness
aerumna adfici, to be weary
angor, anxiety
angi, to be vexed
desperare, to despair
dolor, sorrow, pain
dolere, to sorrow
invidentia, envying
invidere, to envy
invidia, envy, spite
lamentatio, lamenting, mourning
lamentari, to lament
luctus, grief
lugere, to grieve
maeror, sorrow
maerere, to sorrow
misericordia, pity
misereri, to pity
molestia, irritation, annoyance
(in) molestia esse, to be annoyed
obtrectatio, jealousy
obtrectare, to be jealous
sollicitudo, worry
sollicitari, to worry

Rather than consider the consistencies in detail, Cicero dwelled on the perturbations, and, of these, he emphasized distresses (*aegritudines*).[7] We may even say that Cicero treated *aegritudo*, pain/distress, as the type, or model, of emotions, and the worst of them all. Their many forms are listed in Table 1.3.

[7] The Stoics, too, emphasized distress (*lupé*) but they gave equal attention to desire (*epithumia*) and were keen to specify the many species under that rubric, including numerous kinds of rage, for example anger (*orgé*), heatedness (*thumos*), bile (*cholos*), hatred (*ménis*), rancor (*kotos*), and exasperation (*pikria*); see Margaret R. Graver, *Stoicism and Emotion* (Chicago, 2007), 56, Fig. 4. Nussbaum, *Therapy of Desire*, 287 n. 65 notes: "The reader of these lists [of Stoic passions] will be struck by the prevalence of terms designating angry and hostile feelings ... If one were to inquire into the motivations behind the Stoic condemnation of the passions on the basis of these lists alone, one would have to conclude that worries about malice and anger are central. The rest of the evidence confirms this."

Table 1.4 *Cicero's* perturbationes *(apart from the* aegritudines*)*

libido/*cupiditas*, desire
desiderium, desire, longing, yearning
discordia, discord
excandescentia, heatedness
indigentia, need
inimicitia, enmity
ira, anger
irasci, to be angry
odium, hatred
metus, fear, dread
conturbatio, agitation
exanimatio, petrifaction
formido, dread
pavor, panic
pigritia, indolence, sloth
pudor, shame, shyness
terror, terror
timor, fright
voluptas/*elatio animi*/*laetitia (nimia)*/*amor*, pleasure, gladness, love
delectatio, delight
jactatio, ostentation, vainglory
malevolentia, malice, spite, Schadenfreude

Cicero used many nasty adjectives to describe pain/distress: it was *taetra* (loathsome), *misera* (sad), and *detestabilis* (hateful).[8] He assimilated it to grief (*luctus*, *maeror*, *dolor*), *luctus* being the greatest (*maxima*) distress of all.[9] He took pleasure in elaborating on the folly of grieving.[10] For Cicero, the *aegritudines* covered a very large semantic field.

He dealt with the rest of the emotions far more perfunctorily, as Table 1.4 demonstrates.

In the *Tusculan Disputations* love (*amor*) was equated with *voluptas*, which Cicero called shameful (*turpis*). He said that love was "of such great triviality (*tantae levitatis*) that I find nothing to compare with it."[11] Not only did he ridicule homosexual love, but his treatment of *Medea*

[8] Cicero, *TD* 3.11.25, p. 164.
[9] Forms of *doleo*, *luctus*, and *maeror* are used to illustrate *aegritudo* in Cicero, *TD* 3.25.60, pp. 188–89; see also *ibid*., 3.28.68, p. 194.
[10] *Ibid*., 3.27.64–31.75, pp. 191–99. Graver, *Cicero on the Emotions*, 142, suggests some reasons for Cicero's focus: "The emphasis on distress, which is even more marked here than in Greek versions of the list, perhaps reflects the importance of grief and suffering in the literary tradition as well as Cicero's own interest in the subject."
[11] Cicero, *TD* 4.32.68, p. 254.

shows that he belittled heterosexual love as well.[12] He said nothing whatever of affection.[13]

Cicero's loves

Cicero belittled love when he wanted to explain the Stoic point of view. But the Stoics represented only one of the many traditions of Greek philosophy familiar to Cicero. One of those traditions was nourished by Aristotle's view of friendship as articulated in his *Nicomachean Ethics*. There, while recognizing (and talking a good bit about) friendships based on practical utility or pleasure, Aristotle considered friendships "between the good" as the most perfect. "It is those who wish the good of their friends for their friends' sake who are friends in the fullest sense, since they love each other for themselves."[14] Indeed, "a friend is another self."[15] Thus, still in forced retirement at Tusculum, Cicero wrote a much sunnier piece, *Laelius on Friendship*. (As befitted a good lawyer and politician – which Cicero was – he was glad to argue the case for and against emotions on both sides.) In his new work, written in the form of a dialogue set in the past and led by Laelius, the good friend of the just-deceased Scipio (d.129 BCE), Cicero argued on behalf of love (*amor*) and friendship (*amicitia*). Indeed, he had Laelius urge his interlocutors to "put friendship before all things human, for nothing is so fitting to nature."[16]

One important purpose of the dialogue was to distinguish friendship from political alliance, even though the same word might be used for both.[17] Political relationships were based on weakness and need. By contrast, friendships (Cicero argued) sprang entirely from love, and this made them benevolent. "For *amor* (love), from which the word *amicitia* (friendship) derives, is most necessary for establishing a bond of

[12] See *ibid.*, 4.32.69–33.71, pp. 255–56.
[13] See Graver, *Cicero on the Emotions*, 174–76.
[14] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 8.3.6 (1156b10), trans. Harris Rackham (Cambridge, MA, 1932), 461.
[15] *Ibid.*, 9.4.5 (1166a30), p. 535.
[16] Cicero, *Laelius de Amicitia* 5.17, trans. William A. Falconer (Cambridge, MA, 1964) [henceforth *DA*], 108–211 at 126. On the philosophical schools on which Cicero drew for this piece, see Benjamin Fiore, "The Theory and Practice of Friendship in Cicero," in *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald (Atlanta, 1997), 59–76, esp. 59–66.
[17] See the discussion in David Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World* (Cambridge, 1997), 123–29 and 136–37; Constant J. Mews, "Cicero on Friendship," in *Friendship: A History*, ed. Barbara Caine (London, 2009), 65–72, esp. 69–71; Sandra Citroni Marchetti, "'I Could Not Love Caesar More': Roman Friendship and the Beginning of the Principate," *The Classical Journal* 99 (2004): 281–99 at 286–88. Fiore, "Theory and Practice," 66–76, discusses political friendships and stresses the differences between Cicero's ideal and the reality.

benevolence (*benevolentiam coniungendam*)."[18] Benevolence is a pale word in English. By contrast, for Cicero it had enormous force: "If you were to rid nature of the bond of benevolence, neither home nor city could exist."[19] Benevolence was the antidote to hatreds (*odiis)* and discords (*discidiis*).[20]

Thus it is no surprise that Cicero's definition of friendship itself rested on benevolence, agreement, and love: "Friendship is nothing other than agreement (*consensio*) in all things divine and human along with benevolence (*benevolentia*) and love (*caritas*)."[21] Cicero's use of the word *caritas* rather than *amor* here was not particularly significant. He used the two words as synonyms alongside verb forms of *dilectio* (also love). Thus, following his definition of friendship, he added that it arose from "an inclination . . . of the *animi* (soul/mind) along with a certain feeling of loving (*sensu amandi*),"[22] and, using the word *caritas*, he likened the love between children and parents to the "similar feeling of love (*similis sensus . . . amoris*)" that takes shape when we meet someone in whom we see the light of virtue. "For there is nothing more lovable (*amabilius*) than virtue, nothing that leads more to loving (*diligendum*)."[23]

But now Cicero had to take on the Stoics, who, by striving to avoid anxiety (here Cicero used the word *angor*, one of the *aegritudines* in Table 1.3), ended up feeling nothing at all. That made their ideal "wise man" less than human: "For when emotion is taken away (*motu animi sublato*), what difference is there – I don't say between an animal and a man – but between a man and a tree or a stone?"[24] Moreover, if we flee, like the Stoic, from cares and anxieties, "we must also flee from virtue (*virtus fugienda est*)," which always must "spurn and hate anything contrary to it, as goodness (*bonitas*) [opposes] malice (*malitia*); temperance (*temperantia*) [rejects] lustful desire (*libido*); and bravery (*fortitudo*) [hates] faintheartedness (*ignavia*) . . . Therefore it is proper for the well constituted mind/soul (*animi*) both to rejoice (*laetari*) at good things and to sorrow (*dolere*) at their opposite."[25]

[18] Cicero, *DA* 8.26, p. 138. The etymology is correct: *amo* (I love)-icus➔ *amicus* (friend)➔ *amicitia* (friendship).
[19] *Ibid.*, 7.23, pp. 132–33. On the meanings of *benevolentia* in the *DA*, see Fiore, "Theory and Practice," 62.
[20] Konstan, *Friendship*, 130–35, points out that the hatreds and discords of which Cicero was thinking were those of his day. Citroni Marchetti, "I Could Not Love," 288, argues that the nature of friendship changed with the arrival of Caesar, when equality among "the élite of senators was substituted by a relationship of [Caesar's] benevolence that functioned for everybody from the top downwards."
[21] Cicero, *DA* 6.20, p. 130.
[22] *Ibid.*, 8.27, p. 138: "applicatione . . . animi cum quodam sensu amandi." [23] *Ibid.*
[24] *Ibid.*, 13.48, p. 158. [25] *Ibid.*, 13.47, p. 158.

Table 1.5 *Cicero's "good" emotions*

amicitia, friendship
amor, love
amare, to love
redamare, to love in return[a]
benevolentia, benevolence, good will
caritas, love
concordia, concord
diligere, to love
fides, loyalty[b]
solacio, solace, comfort[c]

[a] Cicero, *DA* 13.49, p. 160. Cicero coined the term "*redamare*."
[b] *Ibid*., 18.65, p. 174, where *fides* is termed the "*firmamentum* ... *stabilitatis constantiaeque* (the prop of stability and consistency)."
[c] As a remedy for grief: see *ibid*., 2.10, p. 118.

In this passage, then, Cicero named some "good emotions." Indeed, he spoke of the man of virtue as a person of *constantia* (consistency) – the very word that he used in the *Tusculan Disputations* for the Stoic good emotions (*eupatheiai*).[26] As he put it, good men are those who "so conduct themselves, so live, that of them is proved good faith (*fides*), integrity (*integritas*), justice (*aequitas*), generosity (*liberalitas*), nor is there in them any cupidity (*cupiditas*), libido (*libido*), audacity (*audacia*), and they are of great consistency (*magna constantia*)." We need, then, to add the good emotions discussed in *Laelius* to those that Cicero listed in his *Tusculan Disputations*. These are presented in Table 1.5.

In avoiding bad emotions and cultivating the good, Cicero's virtuous man engaged in what much later would be understood as the battle of the virtues against the vices. But where did that battle take place? What was the *animus* that was the seat of these emotions, which, as Cicero put it, "rejoiced at good things and sorrowed at their opposite"?[27] Cicero explored this question in the *Tusculan Disputations* in the course of discussing the nature of death.[28] Some, he reported, thought that the *animus* was the heart itself (*cor ipsum*).[29] But Empedocles said that the *animus* was the blood suffusing the heart (*cordi suffusum sanguinem*), while other philosophers thought that it pertained to a part of the brain (*pars ... cerebri*). Plato, too, put it firmly in the body, holding that the *animus* was divided into three parts, with one part (reason [*ratio*]) in the head (*caput*) and the other two parts (the irascible [*ira*] and the concupiscible

[26] *Ibid*., 5.19, p. 128. [27] Above, n. 25. [28] Cicero, *TD* 1.8.16-1.11.25, pp. 12–20.
[29] *Ibid*., 1.9.18, p. 14.

[*cupiditas*]) in the breast (*pectus*) and under the diaphragm (*praecordium*) respectively.[30] Meanwhile Aristotle, as reported by Cicero, claimed that "to love, to hate, to desire, to fear, to be anxious, and to rejoice" were among the activities of the mind (*mens*), which itself derived from a special "fifth nature (*quintam . . . naturam*)" beyond the four elements of earth, fire, air, and water.[31] As for the Romans: they tended to identify the *animus* with the *anima* – the vital spirit.[32] Cicero's discussion tells us that the classical world had many different notions about the nature and the location of the *animus* and thus of the emotions. To some extent, this discussion persists today.[33]

In the *Tusculan Disputations*, Cicero called emotions into question; in the *Laelius* he celebrated them. In the end, he presented a huge thesaurus of emotion words and attitudes about them that nourished both the theories and the feelings of subsequent generations.

Augustine's willful emotions

Just after Cicero wrote, a revolution in values began to undermine the assumptions of the ancient world. Four hundred or so years later, the Roman Empire was Christian and the emotions of the ancient world had to be reevaluated in the light of the new religion. Augustine (354–430), bishop of Hippo (395–430), did that quite consciously. He knew Cicero's *Laelius* and the allure of its notion of friendship, but by the time he wrote his *Confessions* (397/401), he had rejected it.[34] He knew Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*, but in various writings he disputed and modified it. Let us look at how he managed both of these things.

Augustine's reevaluation of friendship was straightforward. In his *Confessions*, he admitted that he had once sought "to love and to be loved"; he had felt that he and a boyhood friend had been "one soul in two bodies."[35] But now he wanted to redefine "true friendship." It was not a relationship forged between two men but rather the work of God, who, infusing their hearts with love, "glued" them together.[36]

[30] *Ibid.*, 1.10.20, p. 16. [31] *Ibid.*, 1.10.22, p. 17. [32] *Ibid.*, 1.9.19, pp. 14-15.
[33] See Scheer, "Topographies of Emotion," 32–61.
[34] For the dates of the works of Augustine discussed here, see Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (Berkeley, 1969), Chronological Tables.
[35] Augustine, *Confessions* 3.1.1, in Saint Augustine, *Confessions*, ed. and trans. Pierre de Labriolle, 2 vols. (Paris, 1969, 1977) [henceforth *Conf.*], 1:45: "Amare et amari"; *ibid.*, 4.6.11, 1:74: "unam fuisse animam in duobus corporibus."
[36] Augustine, *Conf.* 4.4.7, 1:71: "tu [God] agglutinas inter haerentes tibi caritate diffusa in cordibus nostris (you glue together those adhering to you by the love diffused in our hearts)." On Augustine's debt to Cicero, see James McEvoy, "Friendship and Mutual Deception in Book IV of the *Confessions* of Augustine," in *Eklogai: Studies in Honour of*

Furthermore, two people could not be friends unless they shared the "right faith" – the right form of Christian doctrine. Here Augustine entered into a more general discussion about Christian friendship that was taking place during his lifetime and beyond.[37] (See Plate 1.1.)

Friendship was not the only affective issue that Augustine discussed theoretically. Although he did not write a treatise devoted to the emotions, he talked about them in works spanning much of his lifetime.[38] Already in the first book of *On Free Will* (388) he presented his view of human nature in the form of a dialogue. While the major crisis of Augustine's era would not happen until later (in 410 with the Sack of Rome), Augustine himself was in nearly continual personal crisis for the first thirty or so years of his life. Before writing *On Free Will* the year after his baptism (387), he had taken up and then repudiated Manichaeism; had similarly embraced and then rejected a common-law wife (originally in order to marry an heiress); had held prestigious posts in Rome and Milan; had been impressed by Ambrose, bishop of Milan; and only at age 32 had converted to Christianity.[39] His main design in *On Free Will*, as in so many of his writings, was to privilege permanence over transience. Free will for Augustine meant seeking the good – the permanent, eternal good: God. With the help of God, people could – and should – fix their wills on the good; their wills in turn would carry their emotions along.[40] Without this turn to the eternal, emotions would attach themselves to everything people were unwilling to lose and yet, ironically, would most certainly lose. These attachments perverted the right order of things. Again in the *City of God*, written many years later (413–20), perpetuity and ephemerality were Augustine's great themes. The City of God was eternal;

Thomas Finan and Gerard Watson, ed. Kiernan McGroarty (Maynooth, 2001), 3–19; John F. Monagle, "Friendship in St. Augustine's Biography: Classical Notion of Friendship," *Augustinian Studies* 2 (1971): 81–92; and Tarcisius Jan van Bavel, "The Influence of Cicero's Ideal of Friendship on Augustine," in *Augustiniana Traiectina*, ed. Jan den Boeft and Johannes van Oort (Paris, 1987), 59–72.

[37] See Stefan Rebenich, "Augustine on Friendship and Orthodoxy," in *A Companion to Augustine*, ed. Mark Vessey (Chichester, 2012), 365–74; Carolinne White, *Christian Friendship in the Fourth Century* (Cambridge, 1992). For Augustine's notion of friendship as the basis of his theory of family, society, and the state, see Donald X. Burt, *Friendship and Society: An Introduction to Augustine's Practical Philosophy* (Grand Rapids, 1999).

[38] See Emmanuel Bermon, "La théorie des passions chez saint Augustin," in *Les Passions antiques et médiévales. Théories et critiques des passions*, 1, ed. Bernard Besnier, Pierre-François Moreau, and Laurence Renault (Paris, 2003), 173–97, for an overview of Augustine's theory.

[39] Brown, *Augustine*, remains the classic biography.

[40] Augustine does not say much about the need for God's grace in *On Free Will*, but in his *Retractions*, he makes the point very clear. See Goulven Madec, "Unde malum? Le livre I du *De libero arbitrio*," and Ragnar Holte, "St. Augustine on Free Will (*De libero arbitrio*, III)," in *"De Libero Arbitrio" di Agostino d'Ippona*, commento di Goulven Madec et al. (Palermo, 1990), 16–17, 83–84.