

AMICITIA AND THE PROFESSION OF POETRY IN EARLY IMPERIAL ROME*

By PETER WHITE

This paper deals with the relationship between Latin poets and their wealthy friends at Rome, and it has a mildly polemical aim. I will begin by noticing some embarrassments which arise when one approaches the subject in the light of conceptions like 'patronage' and 'patron'. Then I will show that poets and their great friends conducted themselves according to a characteristically Roman code of manners, and will argue that this familiar code of *amicitia* fully explains the treatment of poets in Roman society. In part two I will describe the advantages—social visibility, literary backing, and material support—which poets sought by associating themselves with the life of the upper classes, and I will try to connect these objectives with the equestrian status which so many Roman poets seem to have held.

Three limitations should be admitted at the outset. First, my assertions are meant to cover the period from about the middle of the first century B.C., when poetry was recognized as a respectable pursuit for a grown man, to the middle of the second century after Christ, when the body of poetry with which I am most familiar ends. Second, in principle this paper is concerned only with poets, and only with Latin poets at that. To have included literary men of other sorts, like historians, philosophers and *grammatici*, and also to have included writers in Greek, would have risked confusing distinctions of social status which it is important to observe. Non-poets are mentioned only where their situations seem parallel, and where I have had to eke out scanty resources. Finally, I have ignored all that can be construed as imperial patronage: the literary relationships of the emperors seem no less distinct from those of other *principes viri* than their political and social relationships.

I

In order to begin with something concrete, let us consider a passage from the *Satires* (I. 10. 81–90) in which Horace appeals to the standards of his literary allies:

Plotius et Varius, Maecenas Vergiliusque,
Valgius et probet haec Octavius optimus atque
Fuscus et haec utinam Viscorum laudet uterque
ambitione relegata. te dicere possum,
Pollio, te, Messalla, tuo cum fratre, simulque
vos, Bibule et Servi, simul his te, candide Furni,
conpluris alios, doctos ego quos et amicos
prudens praetereo, quibus haec, sint qualiacumque,
adridere velim, doliturus, si placeant spe
deterius nostra.

That Maecenas was the patron of Horace probably nobody would venture to question. But what of Pollio, whose approbation Horace claims to enjoy here, and to whom he presents the opening poem of the second book of *Odes*? It is a commonplace that Pollio was an early patron of Vergil, yet he is noticed no more often¹ nor more conspicuously in Vergil's works than in the Horatian corpus. If Pollio qualifies as patron of the one, the same role cannot easily be discounted for the other. But in that case, are we to count as a patron also Messalla, whom Horace cites in the same breath with Maecenas and Pollio, and who is elsewhere

* I am most grateful to the members of the Department of Classics, University of Toronto, who invited and generously received the lecture for which part one of this paper was written in the spring of 1975. I am grateful also to Professor A. D. Momigliano, in whose seminar at the University of Chicago I read a portion of part two in the following year; to Diana C. White for patient criticism of

successive rewritings; and to the editorial committee of the *Journal* for good advice at the end.

¹ Pollio is mentioned at *Eclogues* 3. 84, and he also receives the *Fourth Eclogue*. I accept the argument of G. W. Bowersock, *HSCP* 75 (1971), 73–80, that the dedicatee of the *Eighth Eclogue* is not Pollio but Octavian.

mentioned twice as often as Pollio? Then if we include Messalla, have we any standard by which to rule out Plotius and Varius, to whose estimate the satirist appeals first? Yet if the term 'patron' can compass both Maecenas and Varius, it has lost much of its utility in labelling one determinate role in the literary milieu of Horace. Because the concept is so awkward to apply in this passage, one might be led to conclude that Horace is not talking about patronage at all, and to object that I have introduced an irrelevant issue. But Horace *is* talking about approval and support, and this sort of artistic vindication is one of the functions most commonly exercised by (or at least imputed to) those Roman personalities whom we are in the habit of calling patrons. If the men named in *Satires* I. 10 are not patrons, how do we know that they are not?

So far as I am aware, there has been no attempt to establish what value the terms 'patron' and 'patronage' have in discussions of Roman literary life. The words are easily accepted, and their backing is rarely called in question.² Their connotations, however, are determined very much by the society which the user of the words best knows. And unlike, for example, 'knight', 'freedman', or 'serf', the word 'patron' points to a role which one can identify and appreciate in the modern world. But the social institutions in terms of which we understand patronage are far different from those of first-century Rome; in this respect, a student of Rome is at a much greater disadvantage today than, say, a scholar living in eighteenth-century England would have been.³

Let me illustrate by examining what seems to be an ordinary acceptance of the word today. A patron is thought to be a wealthy and cultured individual who subsidizes a not wealthy artist or writer. 'A wealthy or influential supporter of an artist or writer' is the definition offered by *Webster's Third International Dictionary*; the word is often heard as a synonym of 'philanthropist'. Much is taken for granted in this conception. On the part of the patron, an interest in the writer's work and the purpose of enabling him to pursue it; a patron may be prompted by the desire to share vicariously in his protégé's success. On the other side, it deserves attention first of all that the protégé is usually assumed to be an artist or a writer; we do not easily speak of patrons (though we do of patronage) outside an artistic context. Another assumption is that the artist or writer pursues a recognized career: that what he does has the status of a full-time occupation, whether or not it yields him a sufficient livelihood. As for the nature of the support, we think of it first of all as something material, which relieves the artist's economic needs, and for that reason too we tend to assume that patronage is a continuing function ('support') rather than a momentary intervention.

But these aspects of patronage are sometimes barely glimpsed in the Roman world of letters. Writing then was less distinctly recognized as an occupation than it has become in modern times. And if we try to reconstruct the motives on the other side of the relationship, it is very hard to impute to a man like Gaius Memmius either a philanthropic disposition or literary sensibilities. As for the importance of continuing material support, there is no evidence that Asinius Pollio spent his largesse on any literary project but his library. There is no evidence that Pliny contributed more to Martial's maintenance than the *viaticum* on which Martial voyaged back to Spain.

The immediate difficulty with our terms 'patron' and 'patronage', then, is that they imply circumstances which may be either anachronistic or not fundamental in the relationship between the poets and the magnates of Rome. And the use of these ill-fitting ideas has contributed to what I think is a more serious misunderstanding. Once patronage is conceived as a more or less deliberate policy of encouraging literature and art, it is readily seen as an instrument of broader schemes. Thus from the patronage extended by the Scipios one may infer a cultural programme, or in the patronage of Augustus and Maecenas detect the propaganda of the new state.

The subject of patronage and propaganda deserves more discussion, but not in this

² Gordon Williams has expressed misgivings, however, in *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (1968), 45. I must admit to careless use of the words myself, in *JRS* 64 (1974), 40-61 and *HSCP* 79 (1975), 265-300.

³ Here let me remark that the literary relationships which I will describe in this paper have many striking resemblances to those treated by A. Beljame, *Men of Letters and the English Public in the Eighteenth Century, 1660-1744*, tr. E. O. Lorimer (1948).

paper. Here it will be more useful to show that there is a thoroughly Roman context for the activities to which we give the name of patronage, and that this context is the omnipresent institution of *amicitia*. If we consider the practices, the vocabulary and the attitudes met in literature from Horace to Juvenal, we will discover scant reason to think that poets enjoyed a status which set them apart from the astrologers, parasites, fortune-hunters, social climbers and other friends who attached themselves to the *domus* of a great man.⁴ The part they are assigned as satellites within this petty dominion helps to explain certain peculiarities in the way poets act and the way they are treated. And the role of the *dominus* as host, critic, prompter and provider, is reflected in the numerous references to his home and his activities which the poems contain.

(1) To begin with practices, poets can be observed to perform the same sort of activities in dealing with their benefactors as other dependants.⁵ The most detailed information comes from Martial, who endlessly complains of having to waste his time on duties and attentions. He is expected at the *salutatio* (1. 70, 9. 100, 10. 82) and must often join the great man's escort to the forum (3. 46, 9. 100, 11. 24). He renders attention for various household ceremonies, at recitations, and during appearances of the *dominus* in court (3. 46). At night he returns to collect the *sportula* or to join his host for dinner (as an entertainer, Martial could count on invitations: 'sum . . . conviva frequens', 9. 97. 9-10). His vexation with these demands grows more pronounced with every new book, and the best illustrations can be drawn from the last book published before his retirement to Spain. In 10. 70 Martial catalogues the distractions into which his day is broken:

Quod mihi vix unus toto liber exeat anno
 desidia tibi sum, docte Potite, reus.
 iustius at quanto mirere quod exeat unus,
 labantur toti cum mihi saepe dies.
 non resalutantis video nocturnus amicos,
 gratulor et multis; nemo, Potite, mihi.
 nunc ad luciferam signat mea gemma Dianam,
 nunc me prima sibi, nunc sibi quinta rapit.
 nunc consul praetorve tenet reducesque choreae,
 auditur toto saepe poeta die.
 sed nec causidico possis inpune negare,
 nec si te rhetor grammaticusve rogent:
 balnea post decumam lasso centumque petuntur
 quadrantes. fiet quando, Potite, liber?

Another poem (58) of the same book concludes with this plaintive appeal to a wealthy friend:

Sed non solus amat qui nocte dieque frequentat
 limina nec vatem talia damna decent.
 per veneranda mihi Musarum sacra, per omnes
 iuro deos: et non officiosus amo.

⁴ Compare the more vivid but similar catalogue of dependants given by J. Marquardt, *Privatleben*², 205-6.

⁵ I say 'dependants' here rather than 'clients' in the hope that the former will be accepted as a looser term, yet even 'dependants' may promote a false impression. We tend to think and write as though Roman society were neatly divided into a client population and an upper class of patrons. But the reality was more confused. In theory and to some extent even in practice, courtesies and *officia* were performed as between one friend and another, and they were mutual. The 'client' offered gifts to the 'patron', but the 'patron' also made presents to the 'client'; dinners were sometimes exchanged; and 'client' and 'patron' recited poetry and applauded it by turns. The activities mentioned in these pages, therefore, should not be seen as a burden which fell

exclusively on the lesser partner in a friendship. In the second place, although *clientes* certainly existed in the entourage of a great man, the word was not applied to most of those whom we are in the habit of calling 'clients'. *Clientes* are the almost faceless numbers in the outer reaches of a man's acquaintance; persons known on more intimate terms are *amici* or *sodales*. Moreover, *clientes* and *sodales* do not constitute separate groups in the sense that one consists of dependants, the other of equals. In the setting of a great man's house, all, or almost all, the visitants will be in some degree beholden to the great man's favour. What determines whether one is another man's dependant or his better (there is hardly any middle ground) is not class simply, but the precise weight of his *dignitas* (age, family background, wealth, honour) in comparison with one's own.

From the evidence of the *Silvae* we know that Statius went through a similar round of activities, and sometimes even into the same houses as Martial. And Martial's grumblings are closely paralleled in the satires of Juvenal, written some twenty or thirty years later. It is my impression that these texts are usually accepted as being true enough to their times, but that they are not considered representative of the treatment which poets encountered in an earlier and more golden era. No doubt Vergil and Horace were more fortunate in their friendship with Maecenas. But that relationship was so seldom duplicated that perhaps it should be considered the exception rather than the norm. We should not assume that, a century before Martial, the roles and rules of literary and social life were so differently arranged that the rewards of poets were generally more abundant. What really creates the plight of Martial and Juvenal is that their relationship with prospective benefactors is not defined principally by their work as poets, or by the rich man's literary interests. They are not merely acquainted with the great man, but are in some sense attached to his *domus*. And attachment to the *domus*, with its attendant vexations, can be documented in literary relationships long before the end of the first century after Christ.

To the period of Claudius' or Nero's reign is usually assigned⁶ the *Laus Pisonis*, a poem which celebrates the public accomplishments and private virtues of Calpurnius Piso. Towards the end of it, the author says enough about himself for us to discern that he wrote in order to secure entry into Piso's immediate society. His purpose is directly stated at lines 218-19, 'dignare tuos aperire Penates, / hoc solum petimus', and in the following lines his phraseology makes plain that he envisions spending his life in Piso's company:

iuvat, optime, tecum
degere cumque tuis virtutibus omne per aevum
carminibus certare meis.

Looking back still further, to the early Augustan period, we find the same expectation voiced by a contemporary of Horace, the nameless author of the *Panegyricus Messallae*.⁷ The honest poetaster who composed these verses offered them as a gift ('nec munera parva / respueris', ll. 7-8) and as an introduction of himself.⁸ As yet an outsider, he is asking to be taken into Messalla's entourage. What he too envisions is a permanent adhesion to Messalla and his *domus*. After volunteering to follow Messalla over wintry seas, and even, if need be, to plunge himself into the fires of Aetna, he avows (197-200):

sum quodcumque, tuum est. nostri si parvula cura
sit tibi, quanta libet, si sit modo, non mihi regna
Lydia, non magni potior sit fama Gylippi,
posse Meleteas nec mallet vincere chartas.

Ovid is not typically named among poets who courted the favour of the great, yet there are a few passages from the epistles *Ex Ponto* which disclose that he frequented the house of Paullus Fabius Maximus. The most explicit statement is I. 2. 129-30:

ille ego sum, qui te colui, quem festa solebat
inter convivas mensa videre tuos:
ille ego, qui duxi vestros Hymenaeon ad ignes,
et cecini fausto carmina digna toro:
cuius te solitum memini laudare libellos,
exceptis domino qui nocuere suo:
cui tua nonnumquam miranti scripta legebas:
ille ego de vestra cui data nupta domo est.
hanc probat et primo dilectam semper ab aevo
est inter comites Marcia censa suas.

⁶ See Schanz-Hosius, II⁴ (1935), 489-91. The dating rests entirely on the assumption that the Calpurnius Piso celebrated in the poem is the conspirator of the year 65.

⁷ See Schanz-Hosius, II⁴, 188-9. The date of the poem is fixed approximately by a reference in line 12 to Messalla's consulship, which he held in 31 B.C.,

and by the absence of any reference to his later military feats, including particularly his triumph in 27.

⁸ Lines 35-6 ('convenientque tuas cupidi componere laudes/undique quique canent vincto pede quique soluto') indicate that the author expects other writers to be trying the same approach.

A poet who waits upon a prominent noble, who is called to dine with him on holidays, who produces verse for the great domestic observances, who is given a place and an audience for recitation, and who in turn applauds his host's essays in poetry—if one were to judge only by the activities mentioned, one would surely have guessed Statius and the Flavian period, rather than Ovid and the Augustan.

But whenever we can glimpse what actually passed between poets and their wealthy friends, the relationship seems much the same. My last example will be Horace, and because so many of our beliefs about the fortunes of poets at Rome are based on his experience, he must be treated more at length.

When he describes his relationship with Maecenas to the man who has waylaid him in *Satire* 1. 9, he speaks not of a private, individual friendship, but of a community of friends whose time is spent together (ll. 48–52):

non isto vivimus illic,
quo tu rere, modo; domus hac nec purior ulla est
nec magis his aliena malis; nil mi officit, inquam,
ditior hic aut est quia doctior; est locus uni
cuique suus.

Since Maecenas was neither a senator nor a pleader in the courts, he had no occasion to call for certain of the *officia* of which Martial and Juvenal complain, such as swelling an escort to the forum, or providing a claque while he delivered an oration. But he did expect his friends to render attendance at other times. In *Satires* 2. 6. 28–39, Horace is discovered bustling through the city streets as he hurries to pay his morning visit to Maecenas; *Epistles* 1. 17. 1–7 also imply that he has suffered the burden of the *salutatio*. The two friends sit and watch the circus games together, and in the afternoon they take their recreation together in the Campus Martius (*Satires* 2. 6. 48–9). In *Satires* 2. 7. 32–7 a last-minute summons to dinner is described as though it were a common occurrence. Horace characterizes himself in *Satires* 2. 6. 41–6 as the sort of friend Maecenas liked to have along for company on a trip, and on one famous trip, he is duly found in Maecenas' retinue, measuring the days to Brundisium along with Vergil, Plotius and Varius. The slave Davus, who in *Satires* 2. 7 is allowed to get off several accurate hits at his master, charges in lines 81–2 that Horace is no better than a puppet on Maecenas' strings: 'tu, mihi qui imperitas, aliis servis miser atque/duceris ut nervis alienis mobile lignum.' And late in the friendship, Horace is seeking a graceful way to extricate himself from the old camaraderie (*Epist.* 1. 7. 25–8):

quodsi me noles usquam discedere, reddes
forte latus, nigros angusta fronte capillos,
reddes dulce loqui, reddes ridere decorum et
inter vina fugam Cinaræ maerere protervae.

Horace may have succeeded better than other Roman poets in safeguarding his liberty. But there can be no doubt that he, like Martial, found himself enwound by many strands in the life and daily routine of his benefactor. A poet had to present himself at the *dives domus* just as other *familiares* did. And when he came, he took part in the same activities as they, and received the same kinds of largesse. There is little or nothing which singles out poets from their companions who are not poets.

(2) In Latin the same sort of language is used in speaking of friendships with literary figures as for other forms of *amicitia*. Nothing in the terminology suggests that poets by virtue of their art occupy a special place in the regard of the rich. It is well to recall at the outset that no Latin writer of antiquity ever introduced the words *patronus* and *patrocinium* into this context, and that conversely the modern noun 'patronage' descends not from the classical but the medieval lexicon.⁹

⁹ The suffix reveals the word as a French coinage: *-age* is the reflex of *-aticus*, a suffix which served in Latin to form adjectives, from which in turn a small

number of substantive forms developed, like *viaticum*. But in early French, on the analogy of *viaticum*/ *voyage*, the suffix *-age* had an enormous development

In fact, the modern colouring which likens a patron to a benefactor and supporter owes more to medieval developments than to the spirit of Roman institutions. During the Middle Ages the word *patronus* retained most of the senses in which it had been applied during classical times. But it also gained currency in applications that are characteristic of a post-classical world, and of these, two in particular may have heightened the suggestion of beneficence. First, *patronus* was used of saints who took to heart the interests and needs of particular parties.¹⁰ But more important, the word was widely used in connection with the founding and endowment of churches, and with the right of appointment to them. In the twelfth century, a controversy over lay investiture and lay ownership of churches was resolved in favour of ecclesiastical supremacy. The rights of founders were newly defined as comparatively modest rights of *patronatus* rather than of ownership. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, *patronus* and related words appear more and more frequently in this ecclesiastical context. And according to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (citing a text of 1278), it is in this context that the word 'patron' first appears in the English language, as meaning 'one who holds the right of presentation to an ecclesiastical benefice, the holder of the advowson.' Later, when 'patronage' makes its first appearance in English (in a charter of 1412), the context is the same. Similarly in French: the earliest instance which the Littré dictionary cites under *patron* belongs to the thirteenth century and refers to patrons of churches. As for *patronage*, four of the five attestations cited in Tobler-Lommatzsch's *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch* (all belonging to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries) have to do with feudal privileges over church affairs.¹¹

It seems reasonable to suppose that, as these words entered the vernacular, they carried colourations absorbed in the feudal milieu of the late Middle Ages. To be sure, it was not only in the dealings of lords with churches that the medieval conventions of 'patronal' behaviour were formed. Nevertheless, our modern notion that patronage implies the dispensing of material benefits may have been particularly determined by the centuries-long role of ecclesiastical patrons, in whose award lay a fund of employments and revenues. And if the connotations of the word are not to be traced to the social relationships of this period, they are likely to be modern in origin rather than more ancient, predating the existence of the word itself. A glance at the historical dictionaries will show that 'patronage' in the sense of secular bounty belongs to the language of the sixteenth century and after.

In classical Latin, *patronus* is not used in speaking of literary relationships. For that matter, at least during the Empire, it is not even used in a general way to describe the role in society of the lordly man who receives the respectful attentions of lesser men and who dispenses favours and rewards to them. A *patronus* is the man who has manumitted a slave, the formally designated sponsor of a town or corporation, or a lawyer who has undertaken a defence. The word does not denote the man who maintains a circle of friends and dependants.¹² There is also another lacuna in the nomenclature worth mentioning here. Although *clientes* is one of the words that can be applied to a rich man's satellites, the word *clientela* seems never to describe the relationship between him and them, or to designate the

in the forming of substantives. See W. Meyer-Lübke, *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen* II (1894), 521-3. The word *patronagium*, cited once from a late (1448) text in the Du Cange lexicon, was evidently re-imported into Latin from French; it is unattested during the early Middle Ages. For this information I am indebted to the kind offices of Dr. Theresia Payr, who assures me that the word has not turned up in the materials for the *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch*, and of Mme. Anne-Marie Bautier, who has similarly verified its absence from the *Novum Glossarium*.

¹⁰ The conception of a 'patron' saint is not entirely without analogy in Roman paganism: compare Plautus, *Rudens* 261-2, 'bonam atque opsequentem deam atque hau gravatam/patronam exsequuntur benignamque multum', and Catullus' invocation to his Muse (I. 9), 'o patrona virgo'.

¹¹ I am grateful to Professor Carl Hammer of Carnegie-Mellon University for timely direction over this unfamiliar ground, and am indebted for instruction to H. E. A. Feine, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte: Die katholische Kirche*⁵ (1972), 261-2, 397-8; *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* VIII (1910), 389-92, s.v. 'patronage'; J. A. Godfrey, *The Right of Patronage according to the Code of Canon Law* (1924), 11-18 and 38-47; and S. Wood, *English Monasteries and their Patrons in the XIIIth Century* (1955).

¹² Marquardt had perceived this important restriction on usage: 'Am Ende der Republik hat der eigentliche Stand der Clienten insoweit aufgehört, als er nur noch durch die Freigelassenen repräsentiert und der Name *patronus*, der sich ursprünglich auf die Clientel bezog, ausschliesslich von dem Freilasser gebraucht wird', *Privatleben*, 204. The only instance I know of in which the words *patronus* and *cliens* occur together outside the narrowly restricted contexts I have named is found in Horace, *Epist.* I. 7. There Volteius Mena is termed the *cliens* of Philippus (I. 25), and is made to address Philippus with the words *o patrone* (I. 92). On the uniqueness of the terminology in this situation, see W. Neuhauser, *Patronus und Orator: Eine Geschichte der Begriffe von ihren Anfängen bis in die augusteische Zeit*, *Commentationes Aenipontanae* 14 (1958), 112-15. It is not unimportant that Mena is in fact a freedman (cf. I. 54), though not Philippus' freedman: he may be slipping into the deferential mode of address he practised towards his former master. Finally, I know of two cases in which *cliens* and *patronus* are juxtaposed in situations not clear enough for one to be able to establish a context, *ILS* 6577 and Pliny, *NH* 34. 17—though my guess is that both are concerned with the patronage of towns.

dependants collectively. The word does survive in writing of the Empire, but its value, and frequency, had declined sharply with the passing of Republican politics. And in the specific context of social relationships, it is not found at all in writers like Seneca, Petronius, Martial and Pliny, whose usage I would take to be normative.¹³ (The satirists Horace, Persius, and Juvenal also avoid it; but it would have been metrically cumbersome in any case.)

What words can be summoned to express the distinction between the dependants and the great man I shall discuss in a moment. But it is necessary to insist first that ordinarily the two parties are not distinguished at all.¹⁴ Whether a man is superior, equal, or inferior in standing to another, both are called *amici*, and the relationship itself is *amicitia*. This egalitarian compass of the words can be most simply illustrated with three or four examples from Pliny's *Letters* in which the status of the respective friends is known.¹⁵ Corellius Rufus, a consular senator nearly a generation older than Pliny, is termed an *amicus* by Pliny (*Epist.* 1. 12. 11), while from the other side Pliny terms himself the *amicus* of Rufus (1. 12. 7). Ummidius Quadratus is a young senator and protégé who is about half Pliny's age: Pliny writes of him 'familiarissime diligo' (7. 24. 2). On Romatius Firmus, Pliny bestowed 300,000 sesterces so that Firmus might qualify for equestrian rank. In the letter announcing this gift, Pliny refers to *nostra amicitia* (1. 19. 3), and also calls himself the *amicus* of Firmus (1. 19. 4). Suetonius, for whom Pliny obtained the *ius trium liberorum* among other *beneficia*, Pliny claims to *diligere* (10. 94); he counts himself among Suetonius' *amici* (*ibid.*), while Suetonius in his turn is said to be among Pliny's *amici* (3. 8. 3).¹⁶

Amicus and *amicitia*, together with *amor* and *amare*, are favoured over all other words for describing an attachment between persons. In Martial's poems and Pliny's letters, they occur at least three times as often as any other complex of terms.¹⁷ Moreover most of the concurrent terms which do appear act merely as synonyms, being substituted to vary the expression, but not the substance, of the idea embodied in *amicitia*. Kindred terms with significant currency at the end of the first century (Hellegouarc'h gives copious and on the whole comparable data for the late Republic) are *sodalis* (a favourite word in the *Epigrams*), *diligere/dilectus*, *contubernium/contubernalis* (the latter much used by Pliny), *caritas/carus*,¹⁸ *familiaritas/familiaris* (yet in this period the adverb is more common, in phrases like *familiariter diligere*),¹⁹ and finally the affectionate possessives *meus* and *noster*.²⁰ The affinity

¹³ For the use of *clientela* and *cliens* during the Republic, see J. Hellegouarc'h, *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la République* (1968), 54-6. Even during the Republic, use of the word *clientela* appears to be avoided in social (as opposed to political) contexts.

¹⁴ Although Hellegouarc'h (*op. cit.*, n. 13) recognizes that Latin usage frequently glides over distinctions of status, this recognition does not deter him from founding his discussion of *amicitia* upon a distinction between the two parties (p. 41). Nevertheless, since his treatment deals mainly with the period of the late Republic, it makes a useful companion study to this paper, which concentrates on the following period. Certain differences in our respective purposes should be noted, however. Hellegouarc'h takes great pains to distinguish between terms used for friends who are equals and terms used for friends who are not. Whereas I do not think that this distinction is very well reflected in the vocabulary itself. Secondly, Hellegouarc'h tries to elicit nuances which differentiate the various words which make up the vocabulary of *amicitia*, seeking, for example, what distinguishes *amare* from *diligere*, or *necessitudo* from *familiaritas*, and he tries to present a more or less complete catalogue of the different words employed. From my point of view, the terminology is made up of several clusters of indifferent synonyms, and I am concerned to describe only what is common and ordinary language, not to provide a comprehensive lexicon.

¹⁵ Information about these persons is most handily obtained from the 'General List of Contemporary

Persons', 738-62 of A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary* (1966).

¹⁶ The bilateral value of the notion expressed as *amicitia* is also evident in remarks like 'amatur a me plurimum nec tamen vincitur' (Pliny, *Epist.* 2. 13. 8) and 'hunc hominem adpetentissimum tui . . . sic amam tamquam gratiam referas. neque enim obligandus sed remunerandus est in amoris officio, qui prior coepit' (*Epist.* 7. 31. 7).

¹⁷ cf. Hellegouarc'h, *op. cit.* (n. 13), 63, 'le mot *amicitia* lui-même est celui qui désigne de la façon la plus générale les rapports favorables établis entre deux hommes ou deux groupes politiques'; and 142, '*amare* est évidemment [le verbe] qui exprime l'*amicitia* sous sa forme la plus générale'.

¹⁸ cf. Hellegouarc'h, *op. cit.*, 147-9 and 207.

¹⁹ cf. Hellegouarc'h, *op. cit.*, 68-71.

²⁰ *Comes* and *convictor/convictus* are often found in the company of these other words, but they are not precisely synonyms. *Comes* usually denotes, not a relationship, but an activity or function, referring to someone who happens actually to be accompanying the rich man on his way. Cf. Hellegouarc'h, *op. cit.*, 59-60: 'il désigne la "cour" d'un personnage de haut rang, particulièrement lorsqu'ils lui font une escorte d'honneur au cours de ses déplacements dans la ville.' *Convictor* and *convictus*, although they can refer to the *actus convivendi*, tend in ordinary parlance to evoke the narrower context of the *convivium*, and to describe dinner parties and persons who happen to be present at them.

of these words with one another can be seen in the way they cluster together. In one of Pliny's letters of recommendation (2. 13. 5-10) are found successively *arte familiariterque diligere, meus contubernalis, amicus, sodalis, amari a me, carus, amare, amicitia, intima familiaritas*; another letter (10. 97) offers *familiariter diligere, caritas, amicitia, amicissime*. For a last example, compare the words which Horace puts in the mouths of Teiresias and Ulysses as they discuss captation of a rich man (*Sat.* 2. 5): *comes* (l. 17), *amicus* (33 and 43), *carum caput* (96), and *sodalis* (101).

Nevertheless, whatever words they used, the two parties to a Roman friendship were acutely conscious of every nuance that put one person in the shadow of the other. *Amici* rarely could be and rarely considered themselves as peers. When it became necessary to press the distinction, there existed ways of indicating with whom the advantage or the disadvantage lay. One might speak of *amici minores* (Pliny, *Epist.* 2. 6. 2), or, less condescendingly, of *amici pauperes* (Pliny, *Epist.* 9. 30), or of *tenuiores amici* (Cicero, *Mur.* 70), or of *humiles amici* (Seneca, *Epist.* 47. 1), or of a *mediocris* (Cicero, *Fin.* 2. 85) or *modicus amicus* (Juvenal 5. 108). *Cliens* was used of the person who sought his fortune by attendance on another.²¹ But its blunt, realistic tone made it unsuited for polite discourse; Pliny eschews it. A less bald-sounding equivalent was *cultor*.²² But *cultor* is much less prominent than the corresponding verb *colere*, which regularly serves to mark the nature of *amicitia* where the distinction of persons is to be observed.²³ *Curare* is an occasional synonym.²⁴ An epigram of Martial which nicely poises the contrasting interpretations of friendship sets the word *colere* against *amare* (2. 55):

Vis te, Sexte, coli: volebam amare.
parendum est tibi: quod iubes, colere;
sed si te colo, Sexte, non amabo.

From the language that discloses unequal relationships, we have so far disengaged a few phrases which identify the dependent, or lesser friend, and the verb which typically describes his activity. But there exist more words which refer to the rich friend than words for any other aspect of the institution. Many are phrases built around the word *amicus*. We hear of the *dives amicus* (Martial 5. 18. 9; Horace, *Epist.* 1. 18. 24), the *locuples amicus* (Pliny, *Epist.* 3. 11. 2), the *potens amicus* (Martial 7. 45. 1; Quintilian 5. 12. 16; Seneca, *De brevitate vitae* 7. 7; Horace, *Epist.* 1. 18. 44 and 86; *Odes* 2. 18. 12), and the *magnum amicus* (Martial 3. 41. 3; Pliny, *Epist.* 3. 11. 2; Juvenal 1. 33, 3. 57, 6. 313). These adjectives, together with *beatus*, are also used alone, most often in the plural, to cover the whole class of magnates and millionaires around whom interested parties cluster. Finally, two nouns occur in this context. *Dominus* had gained fashion as a respectful appellation for all occasions (a useful salutation for anyone whose name you had forgotten, according to Seneca and Martial).²⁵ *Rex* expressed livelier feeling and had a longer history of popular use. From the time of Plautus on, it was familiarly applied to the lordly figure who maintained a host of parasites and clients.²⁶

²¹ For example, Petronius 30. 11; *Laus Pisonis* 119, 134; Martial 10. 10. 11, 10. 74. 2; Juvenal 5. 64, 9. 72.

²² *Cultor* is the equivalent of *cliens* at Ovid, *Ars Am.* 1. 722; Seneca, *De brevitate vitae* 2. 4; *Laus Pisonis* 109, 133; Martial 9. 84. 4; Juvenal 9. 49. Ernout-Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*⁴, discuss only the possibility of a derivation of *cliens* from *cluere*. But an etymology current in late antiquity connected it with the verb *colere*: cf. Servius on *Aen.* 6. 609, 'si enim clientes quasi colentes sunt, patroni quasi patres . . .', and Isidore, *Orig.* 10. 53, 'clientes prius colentes dicebantur a colendis patronis.' That writers of the classical period already assumed the same etymology is suggested by Seneca's collocation of words at *Epist.* 47. 18, 'colant tamquam clientes', and by Horace's construction of the noun with an adverb at *Epist.* 1. 7. 75, 'mane cliens'.

²³ A few examples out of many: Cicero, *Amic.* 69; Seneca, *Epist.* 47. 18; *Laus Pisonis* 113; Martial

6. 50. 1, 12. 68. 2; Statius, *Silvae* 1. 4. 36; Pliny, *Epist.* 2. 9. 6, 7. 31. 5; Tacitus, *Dial.* 9. 5; Juvenal 7. 37.

²⁴ Cicero, *Att.* 5. 4. 2, *Fam.* 9. 5. 2; Petronius 5. 4; Martial 6. 50. 3, 10. 9. 3; Pliny, *Epist.* 1. 5. 15; Juvenal 7. 91.

²⁵ Seneca, *Epist.* 3. 1; Martial 5. 57. For the use of the word generally, see M. Bang's appendix in L. Friedlaender-G. Wissowa, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, IV⁹⁻¹⁰ (1911), 82-8.

²⁶ The origin of the term is discussed by E. Fraenkel, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto*, tr. F. Munari (1960), 182-3. To the examples from Plautus, Terence, Horace and Juvenal cited by Fraenkel, one might add Columella 1 *praef.* 9; Seneca, *De firmitate sapientis* 15. 1; Statius, *Silvae* 3. 2. 92; Martial 2. 18. 5 and 8, 2. 68, 3. 7. 5, 4. 19. 13; *Anth. Lat.* 407. 1 and 408. 2 (? Seneca), 252 (? Florus).

The conclusions which I think should be drawn from this survey of usage can be stated as follows. When writers of the Empire spoke about the establishment which gathered around a wealthy man, they had recourse to words which are informal, and which often have the flavour of slang. With the possible exception of *cliens*, there are no precise terms and no proper titles in this vocabulary. Words like *amicus*, *diligere*, *sodalis*, and *amicitia* which did not convey distinctions of status were clearly favoured, and were used much more often than words that did differentiate.²⁷ Even when distinctions of rank were pressed, Latin writers often spoke of the respective parties as *amici*, and simply added a qualifying adjective. I know of no generic name for the relationship, standing on the same plane as *amicitia*, which draws attention to the aspect of dependence or dominance. In Roman society the attachment of one person to another was termed and regarded as *amicitia*, whether or not the 'friends' were equals.

If in this account I have said nothing specifically about the formulas which poets and patrons employ in their discourse with one another, that is because nothing different can be said. The casual, simple vocabulary of *amicitia* barely reflected fundamental distinctions of worth and standing. It lay far beyond its expressive power to register whether or not a dependant happened to be an artist. Poets were *amici* and *sodales*, like anybody else.²⁸

(3) Under the rubric of 'attitudes' I should like to take up a problem for which it is difficult to find specific points of reference: in what sense did the Roman gentlemen who befriended poets conceive that they were playing a role in the encouragement of letters?

Not surprisingly, the most vigorous opinion on this question was stated by a poet. In the *Seventh Satire*, lines 30-47, Juvenal charged that these rich *literati* refused—and deliberately refused—to acknowledge any responsibility for the material welfare of their impecunious protégés:

30 didicit iam dives avarus
tantum admirari, tantum laudare disertos
ut pueri Iunonis avem.
.....
36 accipe nunc artes. ne quid tibi conferat iste,
quem colis et Musarum et Apollinis aede relicta,
ipse facit versus atque uni cedit Homero
propter mille annos, et si dulcedine famae
40 succensus recites, maculonsas commodat aedes.
haec longe ferrata domus servire iubetur
in qua sollicitas imitatur ianua portas.
scit dare libertos extrema in parte sedentis
ordinis et magnas comitum disponere voces;
nemo dabit regum quanti subsellia constant
et quae conducto pendent anabathra tigillo
quaeque reportandis posita est orchestra cathedris.

We know that this is not merely a rabid outpouring of frustration because in the *Dialogus* (13) one of the *divites et beati*, Domitius Afer, offered a cooler assessment that supports Juvenal's:

[versuum] tamen hic exitus est, ut cum toto anno, per omnes dies, magna noctium parte unum librum excudit et elucubrat, rogare ultro et ambire cogatur, ut sint qui dignentur audire, et ne id quidem gratis; nam et domum mutuatur et auditorium exstruit et subsellia conducit et libellos

²⁷ It is remarkable to see that these words are used no matter how debased the relationship. Cf. Martial 9. 2: 'Pauper *amicitiae* cum sis, Lupe, non es amicae / et queritur de te mentula sola nihil. / illa siligeneis pinguescit adultera cunnis, / *convivam* pascit nigra farina tuum. / incensura nives dominae Setina liquantur, / nos bibimus Corsi pulla venena cadu; / empta tibi nox est fundis non tota paternis, / non sua desertus rura *sodalis* arat; / splendet Erythraeis perlucida moecha lapillis, / ducitur addictus, te futuente, *cliens*; / octo Syris suffulta datur lectica puellae, / nudum sandapilae pondus *amicus* erit . . .'

²⁸ Nevertheless, it might be worth citing texts where this language is used of two parties clearly identified as poet and rich friend: for Terence and Scipio Africanus, Porcius Licinus frag. 3 (p. 45 Morel); for Saleius Bassus and Curvatus Maternus, Tacitus, *Dial.* 5. 2; for Martial and Pliny, Pliny, *Epist.* 3. 21. Credit for insisting that during the early Empire the Romans ordinarily spoke of *amici* and *amicitia* where we speak of 'patrons,' 'clients,' and 'patronage' should go to W. Allen, 'On the Friendship of Lucretius with Memmius', *CP* 33 (1938), 167-81, and to W. Allen and P. H. DeLacey, 'The Patrons of Philodemus', *CP* 34 (1939), 59-65.

dispergit. et ut beatissimus recitationum eius eventus prosequatur, omnis illa laus intra unum aut alterum diem, velut in herba vel flore praecerpata, ad nullam certam et solidam pervenit frugem, nec aut amicitiam inde refert aut clientelam aut mansurum in animo cuiusquam beneficium, sed clamorem vagum et voces inanis et gaudium volucre.

Both the partisan and the detached observer agree that poets could expect no profits. Both agree that the helping hand which proffered hospitality, accommodation and applause drew back when the problem of expenses arose.

In most cases, we do not know how those Romans who are famed for their connections with poets would have presented their own interpretation of their role; Scipio, Memmius, Maecenas and Calpurnius Piso left no testimony. But we do hear the interpretation of one great gentleman in some of Pliny's letters, which have the added value of rounding out the testimony of Tacitus and Juvenal on roughly the same era. Two letters are most important. The first is 8. 12, which contains a characterization of Titinius Capito, 'the Maecenas of Trajan's Rome', as Ronald Syme has called him:²⁹

[Titinius Capito] est optimus et inter praecipua saeculi ornamenta numerandus. Colit studia, studiosos amat fovet provehit, multorum qui aliqua componunt portus sinus gremium, omnium exemplum ipsarum denique litterarum iam senescentium reductor ac reformator. Domum suam recitantibus praebet, auditoria non apud se tantum benignitate mira frequentat; mihi certe, si modo in urbe, defuit numquam . . .

The associations which a modern reader naturally brings to the reading of this passage are well expressed in the graceful translation by Mrs. Radice: 'Titinius Capito is a splendid personality who should be numbered among the shining lights of our generation; a patron of literature and admirer of literary men, whom he supports and helps in their careers . . .'³⁰ But notice first that the single manifestation instanced of Capito's support is that 'domum suam recitantibus praebet, auditoria . . . frequentat': exactly the role performed by Juvenal's rich friend. As for helping literary men in their careers, the words 'studiosos amat fovet provehit' need not mean more than that Capito talked literature with *littérateurs*. Passages from other letters do much to fix the context of these services to literature. At *Epist.* 3. 15. 1 the words used are 'mira benignitate poetarum ingenia fovisse', but the issue is simply a friend's desire to have Pliny read and criticize a draft of verses. At 7. 20. 3 Pliny writes 'erit . . . insigne duos homines . . . alterum alterius studia fovisse'; what he means is that he and Tacitus have been exchanging comments on each other's work. At 6. 6. 3 he describes a friend as 'non studiorum tantum verum etiam studiosorum amatissimus', a qualification which he immediately equates with the particular that 'every day he used to come to hear Quintilian, Nicetes, and Sacerdos.'³¹ Finally, let us consider the assertion that Capito is 'multorum qui aliqua componunt portus sinus gremium.'³² Does this not resolve itself into the familiar conception of the great *domus* open to literary friends? And bring us back to the figure of the rich man surrounded by his *amici*? If Capito was more than this, he had transcended the limits of the most familiar role in Roman literary life.

The second letter is more famous: it is *Epist.* 3. 21, which Pliny wrote on learning of Martial's death in Spain. But if his remarks are read as the reaction of a literary philanthropist who has consorted with celebrities, they seem to have a very peculiar tone:

Audio Valerium Martialem decessisse et moleste fero. Erat homo ingeniosus acutus acer, et qui plurimum in scribendo et salis haberet et fellis, nec candoris minus. Prosecutus eram viatico secedentem; dederam hoc amicitiae, dederam etiam versiculis quos de me composuit. Fuit moris antiqui, eos qui vel singulorum laudes vel urbium scripserant, aut honoribus aut pecunia ornare; nostris temporibus ut alia speciosa et egregia, ita hoc in primis exolevit. Nam postquam

²⁹ Tacitus I (1958), 93.

³⁰ *The Letters of the Younger Pliny*, tr. B. Radice (1963), 219.

³¹ cf. also *Epist.* 5. 17. 1, 'scio quanto opere bonis artibus faveas' and 6, 'faveo enim saeculo ne sit sterile et effatum', in a letter describing a recitation given by a young noble; and 1. 14. 5, 'neque enim est fere quisquam qui studia, ut non simul et nos amet,' again in the context of faithful attendance at readings of poetry.

³² Compare these metaphors with the language used by Statius, *Silvae* 3 *praef.*, 5-11 (line numbers in this and subsequent references to the prose prefaces of the *Silvae* correspond to A. Klotz's Teubner text, second edition, 1911): 'tibi certe, Pollio dulcissime . . . non habeo diu probandam libellorum istorum temeritatem, cum scias multos ex illis in sinu tuo subito natos . . . quotiens in illius facundiae tuae penetrali seductus altius litteras intro et in omnis a te studiorum sinus ducor.'

desimus facere laudanda, laudari quoque ineptum putamus. . . . Meritone eum qui haec de me scripsit et tunc dimisi amicissime et nunc ut amicissimum defunctum esse doleo? Dedit enim mihi quantum maximum potuit, daturus amplius si potuisset. Tametsi quid homini potest dari maius, quam gloria et laus et aeternitas? At non erunt aeterna quae scripsit: non erunt fortasse, ille tamen scripsit tamquam essent futura.

The first peculiarity is that Pliny tells so little about the most popular writer of the Flavian age—much less, for example, than he says about Silius Italicus (*Epist.* 3. 7) or Domitius Tullus (*Epist.* 8. 18) in other necrologies. In fact, one would scarcely realize from this letter that Martial was a celebrity at all. This obliviousness of Martial's position in society cannot be due to immediacy or accident; Pliny was not writing down his first confused emotions. On the contrary, he wraps his *clausulae* in epigrams, and strives throughout for sententious altitude. The perspective is deliberate.

There is another gap between our expectation and the actuality in what Pliny says about the *viaticum*. Although elsewhere he often expatiates about literature, and about the nurture and recognition of talent, there is not a word of that here. Moreover, the donation of travel money, coming as it did on the eve of Martial's permanent retirement to Spain, cannot have been intended to make his literary career in Rome more comfortable. There is no hint of prior subsidies. I have already tried to show that financial or material support is not what Pliny has in mind when he speaks about promoting literature. Conversely here, in talking about his donation to Martial, he does not claim a role in the superintendence of contemporary literary life.

These peculiarities of perspective disappear as soon as we discard modern preconceptions about literary patronage, and interpret the letter about Martial in terms of *amicitia*. We do not perceive Martial as a prominent public figure because he is being described as another individual gathered into the web of personal services and obligations. The public figure presented to us in fact is not Martial but Pliny. The letter is so framed as to disclose the courteous attention shown to a promising senator by a writer of the day, and the magnanimous friendship which ensued.

Furthermore, it is Pliny's consciousness of exercising a public role which, more than anything else, colours his attitude to Martial. He responds not to the merits of Martial's art, or to the stringency of his fortunes, but to the claim established by the unique *beneficium* that can be rendered by a poet. 'Gloria et laus et aeternitas' is the promise repeatedly vouchsafed in verses composed by dependants to honour their great friends. That Pliny could so easily subscribe to this conventional appeal may seem to us naive. But it is consistent with the outlook of his class. Compare the last and most earnest argument by which a cultured gentleman with a background much like Pliny's had urged generous treatment of a poet 150 years earlier (Cicero, *Pro Archia* 28-9):

Iam me vobis, iudices, indicabo et de meo quodam *amore gloriae* nimis acri fortasse, verum tamen honesto vobis confitebor. . . . insidet quaedam in optimo quoque virtus, quae noctes ac dies animum *gloriae stimulis* concitat atque admonet non cum vitae tempore esse dimittendam *commemorationem nominis nostri*, sed cum omni posteritate adaequandam.

No doubt both Pliny and Cicero conceived that they were dealing magnanimously with their poet friends. But magnanimity was incumbent upon a gentleman in dealing with *all* his friends. It could only have been in the elaborate code of *amicitia* that a gentleman would find the tacit understandings and the standards of behaviour which would govern his relationship with a poet. There did not exist a Roman code of literary patronage.

II

Despite the mortifications that lay in store, poets continued to troop to the *limina* of Roman magnates. In this part of my paper, I should like to consider why. It would be reckless to deny that poets and their rich *amici* were ever attracted by the mutual affection and esteem which Cicero preaches in the *De amicitia*. But on the whole, the material available to us does not expose the private attitudes of anyone involved, and therefore I will leave this area of motivation out of the account.

Poets attached themselves to the houses of the great in the first place because there was nowhere else for them to go. Under the Empire, the social, cultural, and even the political activity of the capital was still animated by the *principes civitatis*, and it was carried on as much within their mansions as upon the forum. Around the *principes* clustered all who wanted to take part. By the Augustan period, the efforts of *grammatici* and rhetors had begun to produce an intelligentsia, or at least a moderately well-educated class, who lacked the means or the credentials or the desire to pursue senatorial politics. Apart from judicial oratory and the equestrian service, very few professions had evolved in which an educated man of modest means might secure his independence and at the same time avoid the stigma of working for hire. It is most unlikely that, having no occupation to pursue, such a man could then stand aloof from the interlocking hierarchies of which society was formed. Even philosophers of the most individualistic stamp were seen to take up residence in rich men's houses.

Although in these currents almost everyone was bound to drift into some great man's entourage, poets had a special reason for desiring an attachment. It was through their connections that they found readers. Poets depended on well-to-do *amici* to sponsor their recitations, to praise and circulate their books, and to acquaint them with other useful friends. Against bad publicity arising out of slights, misconstructions, or pure jealousy, the *amicus* could be implored to interpose the bulwark of his prestige.

I must emphasize here how diligently Roman writers had to court their readers. It was several generations after Ennius before a commercial book trade was organized at Rome; and even after there were writers and booksellers in profusion, the booksellers did not undertake what would now be called the business of promotion and circulation. In the pyramid of Roman society, wealthy men with a large following were uniquely placed to publicize the work of their poet friends. Publicity may in fact have been the most solid of their services to literary men. In any case, it was an essential function, and the ancient writer's concern to exploit the friendships of his friends in finding readers is often apparent. The cliques which from the time of Terence on are so noticeable in Roman literary history have usually been associated with disputes over artistic values. But we should not forget that these cliques were often connected with prominent citizens, and that they vigorously pursued the practical end of making some writers fashionable and others obsolete. The same point may be made about Lucilius' often-echoed pronouncement, 'Persium non curo legere, Laelium Decimum volo'. Although Lucilius may be implying a statement about his poetics, he has couched it in words which at the simplest level express his quest for readers.

Many passages could be cited which bear on this argument, but the most copious illustrations come from writers of occasional verse like Martial, whose casual themes more readily betray his preoccupations. *Epigrams* 12. 2 is Martial's *envoi* for the last book of poems, sent from Spain to Arruntius Stella, who had just entered on his consulship in Rome. Martial first advises his book to make its way to one of the great libraries in the capital, then (ll. 9 ff.) suggests a different destination:

vel si malueris, prima gradiere Subura;
 atria sunt illic consulis alta mei:
 laurigeros habitat facundus Stella penatis

 ille [te] dabit populo patribusque equitique legendum.

Martial obviously assumes that Stella's new eminence will work to his advantage in swaying literary opinion at Rome. An example at the municipal level can be compared. Another book of poems was sent to a local magnate in the Umbrian town of Sarsina. At the end of the accompanying *envoi* (7. 97, again addressed to the *liber*), Martial writes:

o quantum tibi nominis paratur!
 o quae gloria! quam frequens amator!
 te convivia, te forum sonabit,
 aedes, compita, porticus, tabernae.
 uni mitteris, omnibus legeris.

Stattius looks for the same sort of boost from Atedius Melior, to whom he sends a book of poems with this request: 'haec qualiacumque sunt, Melior carissime, si tibi non displicuerint, a te publicum accipiant' (*Silvae* 2 *praef.*, 34-6).

From other texts we partly learn by what services the influential friend was expected to help publicize a book. In 4. 82 Martial asks his friend Rufus to pass on two of his books to a third party with whom Martial is not personally acquainted. In 5. 80, he suggests that his friend Severus might want to show a new book of epigrams to an eminent man of letters who is Severus' friend.³³ Certain letters of Pliny afford a glimpse of efforts made from the opposite side. In *Epist.* 1. 16 Pliny puffs the varied *oeuvre* of Pompeius Saturninus to Erucius Clarus. In 4. 27. 5, he volunteers to send to another friend a new book of poetry written by his protégé Sentius Augurinus.³⁴ But effective intervention did not entail even as much exertion as this. As visitants gathered for errands or celebrations in the great houses of Rome, the activity most earnestly carried on was talk. In this salon-like setting, a new poet's reputation could be made or destroyed by the most casual words, and naturally a poet sought to prompt words in his favour. One of Martial's most common overtures is to entreat an important man's protection against those who would disparage or maliciously interpret his poems.³⁵ No doubt *maligni* aplenty moved in Martial's world. But this appeal may very well have served the simpler purpose of wresting compliments from uneffusive friends.

For two reasons, then, a poet might find himself installed in the retinue of one of the *principes civitatis*. First, the currents of social life sooner or later lodged almost every unattached person against the rock of some great house. And in the second place, writers depended on the good offices of prominent citizens to prepare a favourable reception of their work among people of fashion. But what material advantages did poets stand to gain from these attachments? The answer to this question can be found, I think, by rearranging some familiar details of Roman social life, and it is with that task that the remainder of my paper is concerned.

Modern writers who think in terms of 'patronage' often assume that material benefits must have been the most important need, and the most important objective, of poets like Martial. This assumption is not entirely incorrect, but it is necessary to begin by pointing out some peculiarities of literary life in Rome which may serve to qualify it.

In the first place, the notion of a privately 'commissioned' work was alien to the Roman understanding of good manners. It is true that many Latin poems purport to have been written at the prompting of the poet's *amicus*, or are described by the poet as 'promised' to the *amicus*. And in the case of a great many other poems concerned with the birthdays and the deaths, the celebrations and the achievements of important people, it is likely that the poets had been more or less subtly invited to get to work. But so far as I know, we never hear of arrangements which committed the *amicus* to pay for the poem—nor would such a crass and explicit exchange have been expected between two men who claimed to be friends. A commission in the modern sense would have been out of the question. Moreover, it is difficult to think of cases in which a poem was written, and the recipient then freely offered a reward; but very easy, on the other hand, to quote complaints from Martial that his hope of recompense from the friends he flattered went for nothing. And not only is there little sign of payment or reward made immediately after the presentation of literary work. We rarely hear of large money gifts made by *privati*³⁶ to poets at other times.

The most revealing information I know about what poets did receive is found (again) in the corpus of Martial. In the 1200 epigrams of his twelve numbered books, he often alludes to circumstances of his own life, and sometimes mentions what sorts of things he obtained, or sought, from his rich friends. The gifts mentioned included a loan of 100,000 sesterces (6. 20; cf. 3. 41, 6. 5, 4. 76, 5. 82), a place in the country (12. 31), a slave boy or girl (8. 73), some Saturnalia trinkets and some silver tableware (7. 53), a toga (9. 49; cf. 2. 85), a cloak (6. 82), roofing tiles (7. 36), mules (11. 79), a *covinnus* (12. 24), a *phiala*

³³ cf. also 7. 68, 7. 80, and 10. 93.

³⁴ cf. 7. 12, 8. 12. 1, and Martial 7. 52.

³⁵ See 4. 86. 6-7, 7. 26. 9-10, 7. 72, 10. 33; cf. Statius, *Silvae* 4 *praef.* 43-5.

³⁶ Let me emphasize again that I am not talking about relationships between poets and the emperors, who did on several occasions bestow large sums on poets.

(8. 50; cf. 8. 33), a boar (7. 27), and a basket of food (9. 72).³⁷ Of course these examples cannot be treated as an inventory: some of the poems probably reflect fictitious rather than actual situations, and apart from that, it would be absurd to imagine that Martial recorded in the *Epigrams* all the transactions that took place between him and his *amici*. Nevertheless, the items listed should be representative of what someone in Martial's position could expect from various friends. If they are representative, two conclusions have to be drawn. First, no poet could reasonably have expected to maintain himself from year to year on income of this sort. Outright gifts of money are unusual, and comparatively few of the things that are bestowed have any substantial value. More important, such gift-giving is casual and sporadic: it would have been impossible to calculate how much one could count on and when.

My second point is that these gifts were precisely the sort of presents which Roman friends typically exchanged under the polite code of *amicitia*. Martial received them not in virtue of his merit or of his services as a literary man, but simply because he could claim a place within the circle of the bestower's *amici*. Most of the gifts are so paltry that we may think (as Martial and Juvenal often encourage us to think) that they were shabby handouts kept by for hangers-on. But this would be to misinterpret the social context in which the gifts were made. The Roman calendar was dotted with occasions when gifts to friends were appropriate: not only birthdays, but several holidays, like the Saturnalia, the Caristia, the Rosalia, and the first of March (which was the women's day).³⁸ Gifts were often made even when there was no particular occasion for it, as at dinner parties, for example. In fact, it was because Roman custom already sanctioned the liberal use of presents as tokens of friendship that the strategy of *captatio* found such ready employment under the Empire.

But for the most part, the gifts were not expected to be very large. The proper standards are discussed in an exchange of letters between Fronto and his friend the historian Appian. After sending two slaves to Fronto, Appian wrote a letter urging that costly gifts were not necessarily inappropriate.³⁹ Fronto would not accept the slaves, and explained his refusal as follows:

To ask for gifts is shameless, far more to accept them. And it is all one whether we take from a willing or a reluctant giver; for it is not right to ask, but it is not right to take either. Nor should a man accept such gifts as shall leave the sender poorer and render the receiver richer. And great gifts involve both these results. . . . For whom can we say that costly gifts benefit? The poor? But they cannot send them. The rich? But they do not need them. Moreover, great gifts cannot be given continuously; or, if a man send great gifts and often, he must come to the end of his resources. But small gifts admit of being given continuously and with no compunction, since a man need but make a small acknowledgment to one who has sent a small gift.⁴⁰

That gifts even between two wealthy *amici* might be modest is shown by some of Pliny's letters. In *Epist.* 1. 7. 6 Pliny thanks the consular Octavius Rufus for some dates; in 7. 21. 4 he thanks his senatorial colleague Cornutus Tertullus for sending a hen; and in 5. 2 he thanks Calpurnius Flaccus for some thrushes.

I have dwelt upon the etiquette of gift-giving, and emphasized its modest aspect, because I think that the gifts of which Martial speaks are often misinterpreted. They are not to be regarded as income or payment accruing from the poems he produced for society

³⁷ cf. also the gifts itemized in 7. 92 and 12. 36.

³⁸ Some of the evidence for these holidays is gathered in J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome* (1969), 121-6.

³⁹ Appian's letter may be found on pp. 227-8 of van den Hout's edition of Fronto, or in the Loeb edition by C. R. Haines (1962) I, 264-9.

⁴⁰ This passage of Fronto's letter is found on pp. 230-2 of van den Hout, or in vol. 1, pp. 275-7 of the Loeb; translation is by Haines. At an earlier period, Cicero is less explicit than Fronto about gift-giving, but his viewpoint is similar. Note first that the subject barely appears among the issues requiring the casuist's attention in the *De amicitia* (see sections 70 and 79-80): surely not because the

exchange of gifts was unheard of or unimportant in Cicero's time, but because the scale on which it was practised was too small to create problems. In the *De officiis*, Cicero divides *beneficia* into material gifts and services, and argues that the latter are far more befitting a gentleman (2. 52 f.). Note especially section 64, where he raises the same consideration as Fronto: 'habenda autem ratio est rei familiaris, quam quidem dilabi sinere flagitiosum est, sed ita, ut inliberalitas avaritiaeque absit suspicio. posse enim liberalitate uti non spoliantem se patrimonio nimirum est pecuniae fructus maximus.' Finally, compare the hierarchy of *beneficia* set up by Seneca at *De beneficiis* 1. 11, where the kinds of gifts ordinarily exchanged among friends occupy the lowest place.

friends. Their significance is rather that they establish his status as an *amicus* of the donors. In addition to these modest tokens, however, there were other benefits of much greater value which often fell into the lap of well-established friends. These benefits I will consider in a moment. But first let me return to a problem raised earlier and left unresolved: what was the primary income on which the poets who were connected with great men maintained themselves?

It should be obvious that most Roman poets of whose lives we know any details could not have been poor men. Those at least who write in the more informal and personal genres frequently allude to slaves, dwellings, and small properties which they appear to own. Furthermore, the cult of the *doctus poeta* presumed on the part of the poet an education, which required money, and continuing study, which he must have had leisure in order to pursue. Even the participation by poets in the many social activities of their hosts and friends points to a measure of financial independence: since their time was evidently free for them to dispose of, they cannot have been tied to other employments.

But the most certain guarantee of their comparative self-sufficiency is furnished by their social standing. In 1966, Claude Nicolet pointed out that many literary figures of the Republican period seem to have been Roman knights, and he instanced among the poets Lucilius, Catullus, Laberius, Lucretius, Cornelius Gallus and Horace.⁴¹ Two years later, Lily Ross Taylor, though hesitant about the status of certain of Nicolet's *equites* (Catullus and Lucretius), carried the survey down to the end of the Augustan period, adding Tibullus, Ovid, Propertius, and (possibly) Vergil.⁴² If the survey is extended through the Early Empire, one can add several more names. To take only poets whose work is extant, Persius was an *eques*,⁴³ as was Martial.⁴⁴ Statius reveals that his father was a knight.⁴⁵ As for Juvenal, if the satirist of Aquinum is to be identified with the Juvenalis honoured at Aquinum as captain of a cohort,⁴⁶ then Juvenal too must have been an *eques*. Most of those poets who cannot be identified as *equites* were senators: Lucan,⁴⁷ Silius Italicus,⁴⁸ and Valerius Flaccus.⁴⁹

It is well known that in order to qualify for the title of *eques Romanus* a man had to show a capital worth of at least 400,000 sesterces, and that this requirement fitted into a schedule of property qualifications. A census of about 100,000 sesterces was needed in order for one to be eligible to sit in the local council or senate of a Roman town; 200,000 in order to qualify for the panels from which jurors were selected for the law courts at Rome; and 1,000,000 (or 1,200,000) in order to enjoy the distinction of membership in the Senate of Rome.⁵⁰ No source explains either why graduated property qualifications were thought desirable, or by what calculations the particular amounts we hear of were fixed. But one possibility is that capital worth was meant to guarantee income, and that a man was required to have an income large enough for him to keep up the standard of magnificence appropriate to his station.

The equestrian census of 400,000 sesterces would in fact have yielded enough income so that a man could live at Rome without depending on further employment.⁵¹ From property held in land, a landowner could expect a 6 per cent annual return in rents; if a man had capital to loan at interest, he could expect an even larger return.⁵² A 6 per cent

⁴¹ *L'ordre équestre à l'époque républicaine* 1 (1966), 441-56.

⁴² 'Republican and Augustan Writers Enrolled in the Equestrian Centuries', *TAPA* 99 (1968), 469-86.

⁴³ 'Natus in Etruria Volaterris, eques Romanus, sanguine et affinitate primi ordinis viris coniunctus', according to the ancient *vita* (ll. 4-5, p. 37 of W. V. Clausen's edition of Persius, 1956).

⁴⁴ See *Epigrams* 5. 13. 1-2: 'sum, fateor, semperque fui, Callistrate, pauper/sed non obscurus nec male notus eques'; cf. 3. 95. 9-10, which attests Martial's tribunate.

⁴⁵ *Silvae* 5. 3. 116-20, alluding to the golden *bullae* of the knights.

⁴⁶ *CIL* x. 5382 = *ILS* 2926. The text of this inscription has recently been discussed by S. Monti in *RAAN* 40 (1965), 79-110; *pace* J. Reynolds in

JRS 61 (1971), 146, Monti does not seem to be arguing against the identification of the cohort captain and the satirist.

⁴⁷ See the *vita* in Reifferscheid's edition of the fragments of Suetonius, p. 76.

⁴⁸ See Pliny, *Epist.* 3. 7.

⁴⁹ *Argonautica* 1. 5-7 identify the poet as *quindecim-vir sacris faciundis*.

⁵⁰ These figures are taken from R. Duncan-Jones, *The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies* (1974), 4, n. 2, who gives the evidence for them.

⁵¹ J. Carcopino, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, tr. E. O. Lorimer (1940), 66, had suggested that this was the significance of the equestrian census, and he documented his suggestion with the first two of the passages I quote here.

⁵² See Duncan-Jones, *op. cit.* (n. 50), 4 and 21.

return on 400,000 sesterces comes to 24,000 sesterces. A figure of this order turns up in several sources as the amount needed in order to live at Rome in minimum comfort for one year. In *Satires* 14, Juvenal declares that the necessities of life can be procured at modest cost: one can make do with the same amount of money as a Socrates or an Epicurus. Then he makes a concession to the standard of living which obtains in Rome (322-4):

acribus exemplis videor te cludere? misce
ergo aliquid nostris de moribus, effice summam
bis septem ordinibus quam lex dignatur Othonis.

Approximately the same amount is specified by a character who makes no pretence of ascetic leanings. Naevolus, the all-purpose companion of Juvenal's *Ninth Satire*, in despair of ever reaching financial security through his present employments, exclaims 'quando ego figam aliquid, quo sit mihi tuta senectus/a tegete et baculo' (ll. 139-40). Then he describes the cozy minimum he has in mind: four slaves, some silver plate, and 'viginti milia faenus / pigneribus positis' (140-1). Naevolus expects to make do on an income of 20,000 sesterces a year; in one of Martial's epigrams (3, 10), an allowance of 2,000 a month (or 24,000 a year) is named as a sum on which a *filiusfamilias* might reasonably be expected to maintain himself:

Constituit, Philomuse, pater tibi milia bina
menstrua perque omnis praestitit illa dies,
luxuriam premeret cum crastina semper egestas
et vitiis essent danda diurna tuis.

Finally, we know of a post in the Roman army which was evidently a sinecure, and which was reserved for men of equestrian rank, the *semestris tribunatus*. We know of it partly because this post was sought and often filled by literary men. The salary, which presumably would have covered at least what it cost to live, was 25,000 sesterces.⁵³

These four pieces of evidence suggest that the census rating of a Roman knight was directly related to the cost of living in the style of a knight. In that case, it can be no coincidence that so many Roman poets are identifiable as knights. If they were knights, they had no need to earn a livelihood, but could live in modest comfort on the income from capital. I should emphasize that the figure which is represented in our sources as a liveable income could be secured if a man held merely the lowest possible amount for the equestrian census. Yet some of the equestrian poets—Persius, for example—will have owned a great deal more.⁵⁴ But in any case, the relationship between the craft of poetry and the equestrian census was so familiar that Horace had only to invert it in order to find a useful irony (*AP* 382-4):

qui nescit versus tamen audet fingere. quidni?
liber et ingenuus, praesertim census equestrem
summam nummorum vitioque remotus ab omni.

Poets, then, at least poets who were knights, did not depend on the munificence of their friends for their primary income. They owned enough to live off rents and interest. Nevertheless, an equestrian poet might considerably enhance his fortunes by attaching himself to a wealthy friend, or to several friends. Friendship challenged a Roman gentleman to display his liberality, and the people who surrounded him were the immediate beneficiaries.

The main benefits which the friends of a rich man might anticipate can be grouped in seven categories. Except for the first, I have not tried to range them in any particular order of importance or frequency.

⁵³ On the *semestris tribunatus*, see the section s.v. 'legio' in de Ruggiero, *Diz. Epigr.* (by Passerini) IV, cols. 578-9.

⁵⁴ Perhaps another point should be made. I have listed only those poets who appear actually to have held the rank of *eques Romanus*. Yet one might also

possess the equestrian census, or more than that, without meeting the other qualifications of an *eques*. It does not follow, therefore, that poets not known as *equites*, or even known not to be *equites* (like Phaedrus), were poor men.

(1) Inheritances and bequests were by far the most important and most common form in which gifts with a large cash value were made. In the exchange of letters between Appian and Fronto already mentioned, both parties acknowledge that gifts made by will had a propriety which large gifts made under other circumstances were thought not have.⁵⁵ By making bequests, a gentleman bore witness to the friends he had made and to their excellence; a Roman will typically provided for bequests to many different individuals. The consequence was that someone on good terms with a number of wealthy friends could expect to be enriched periodically as they died.

Not a great deal of evidence about specific bequests received by specific persons survives. But the importance of legacies to Martial and Suetonius can be deduced from their (successful) efforts to obtain the *ius trium liberorum*.⁵⁶ For a non-Senator, the only advantage in counting as the father of three children was that he was thereby entitled to take up legacies which he would otherwise have had to forfeit.⁵⁷ Unless Martial and Suetonius counted on regularly being named in their friends' wills, they had no reason to seek the *ius liberorum*.

There is no way to calculate what amount would be representative of the income a man might derive from inheritances and bequests; in lieu of statistics, we must be content with examples. 'Substantial sums were frequently reaching Pliny from inheritances and legacies: those (three) whose amount he mentions have a total value of HS 1,450,000, while three further bequests are referred to without mention of their amount.'⁵⁸ These six inheritances fall within a period of about fifteen years. One of Martial's poems assumes that the fictitious character to whom it is directed can have received 2,000,000 from four inheritances within a period of seven months.⁵⁹

(2) Cash gifts were also made during the benefactor's lifetime, but, as I have argued earlier, there is good reason to think that they were sparingly dispensed. Those we hear about are most often tied to special occasions which were not likely to occur more than once in the beneficiary's lifetime. So, for example, Pliny contributes toward the dowry for a friend's daughter,⁶⁰ and gives Martial travel money on the occasion of the poet's retirement to Spain.⁶¹ The kind of grant most frequently mentioned in our sources is the capital supplement offered to bring a man's census up to the 400,000 sesterces which would enable him to qualify as an *equus Romanus*.⁶²

However, there are also references to gifts of money which may not have been so precisely limited; for example, a grant of 200,000 in Martial 4. 61. 1, of 6,000 in 4. 76 and 6. 30, and of 5,000 in 10. 11.⁶³

(3) Loans at low or no interest could also be obtained from one's *amici*.⁶⁴ It is one of Martial's standing jokes that for the unscrupulous borrower, a loan was as good as a gift.

(4) Gifts were sometimes made in the form of land or a house. In the tale told by Horace at *Epistles* 1. 7, Philippus arranges for Volteius Mena to purchase a country place by donating half the cost and loaning the rest. According to the scholia on Persius 2. 1, the senator and historian Servilius Nonianus arranged for a mutual friend of his and Persius' to secure a piece of property.⁶⁵ Pliny gave a farm to his *nutrix* (*Epist.* 6. 3), and sold another property below cost to a friend (7. 11. 5-6). Gifts of real estate were also made in the form of bequests.⁶⁶

⁵⁵ cf. Appian to Fronto, 'friends too do not shrink from taking under wills. And why, pray, should a man take under a will, but take nothing from the living, when the latter gift is an even greater proof of affection?' (van den Hout, 227; Loeb 1, 267). See also Fronto's retort to this sophistry (van den Hout, 230; Loeb 1, 273).

⁵⁶ Martial 2. 91-2 and, for Suetonius, Pliny, *Epist.* 10. 94.

⁵⁷ See M. Kaser, *Das römische Privatrecht*² 1 (1971), 320-1.

⁵⁸ Duncan-Jones, op. cit. (n. 50), 21, cf. 25-7.

⁵⁹ *Epigrams* 1. 99. Cf. 2. 61. 11-12, which alludes to a legacy of 300,000 and two of 100,000.

⁶⁰ *Epist.* 2. 4. 2 and 6. 32. 2; cf. the dowry given by Aurelius Cotta to the daughter of his freedman Zosimus, *ILS* 1949.

⁶¹ *Epist.* 3. 21; cf. 6. 25. 3.

⁶² *ILS* 1949; Seneca, *De benef.* 3. 9. 2; *Laus Pisonis* 109-11; Martial 4. 67, 5. 19. 10, 5. 25, 12. 6. 9-11, 14. 122; Pliny, *Epist.* 1. 19.

⁶³ cf. also the vague allusions to *largiri* and *pecunia* in Seneca, *De benef.* 2. 14. 4, 3. 8. 2, 3. 19. 1; Martial 4. 40, 5. 19. 9, 5. 42, 8. 19. 9, 12. 6. 9, 12. 13; Pliny *Epist.* 9. 30.

⁶⁴ Martial 2. 30, 3. 41, 4. 15, 6. 5, 6. 20, 8. 37, 9. 102, 10. 15, 10. 19. 2, 11. 76; Pliny, *Epist.* 3. 11.

⁶⁵ cf. Otho's friendly purchase of land for a *speculator* in Galba's Praetorian Guard, Tacitus, *Hist.* 1. 24. 2.

⁶⁶ cf. the provisions of Trimalchio's will, Petronius 71. 2, and the arrangements discussed in the *Digest*, 33. 7. 27 *pr.*, 35. 1. 17, 39. 5. 9. 1.

This kind of beneficence cannot have been unusual, because the dream of getting some land from a rich friend is presented as one of the stock traits of the indigent fortune-seeker who appears so often in our literary sources: examples can be cited from Calpurnius Siculus, Martial, Juvenal and Lucian.⁶⁷ To judge by the instances I have found, gifts of property seem to have been used as the ultimate reward for a man's most faithful *familiares*, both freedmen and close friends. It is in this context of domestic attachments that I would place the Sabine farm which Horace had from Maecenas, or the property which Martial obtained in Spain from his countrywoman Marcella (*Epigrams* 12. 31).

(5) In the spacious town houses and villas of the rich, favoured friends could find comfortable lodging. The habit of residing in another man's house probably lies behind several of the terms used in speaking of friendly relations, such as *familiaris*, *convictus* and *contubernalis*. Examples of extended hospitality can be cited from the Republic as well as from the Empire: the dramatist Pacuvius in the house of Laelius,⁶⁸ the philosopher Antiochus with Atticus,⁶⁹ the philosopher Staseas with M. Pupius Piso,⁷⁰ the *grammaticus* Caecilius Epirota with Gallus,⁷¹ the historian Timagenes with Pollio,⁷² the *rhetor* Albius Silo with Plancus,⁷³ Sulpicius Cornelianus with Fronto.⁷⁴ Arrangements for providing *gratuitae habitationes* also attract discussion in the *Digest*.⁷⁵

(6) Citizens of wealth and influence frequently arranged for their poorer friends to hold sinecures and other desirable appointments, or they themselves provided such positions. One thinks first of temporary appointments in the army, or on the staff of officials who were going out to serve in the provinces; Catullus is the most famous example, but many others could be cited from the correspondence of Cicero, Pliny and Fronto. There are fewer examples of civilian and domestic sinecures, probably because these posts could be obtained through a less formal process of application. But there is some evidence that such opportunities existed. Pliny, seeking to find a good schoolmaster who can be hired to teach in his North Italian *patria*, asks Tacitus 'ut ex copia studiosorum, quae ad te ex admiratione ingenii tui convenit, circumspicias praeceptores quos sollicitare possimus'.⁷⁶ And one of the complaints of Juvenal (or his *alter ego* Umbricius) is that citizens of wealth and influence do not invite their humbler friends to sit 'in consilio . . . aedilibus' (*Sat.* 3. 162): a grievance which suggests that more favoured friends were offered such appointments.

(7) In the passage just mentioned, Juvenal also complains that persons of his sort are disregarded when the rich man selects a husband for his daughter: 'quis gener hic placuit censu minor atque puellae / sarcinulis impar?' (*Sat.* 3. 160-1). What is remarkable here is the sense of injury Juvenal feels at being passed over. He evidently does not think, and does not expect his readers to think, that a marriage between the rich man's daughter and someone like himself is *a priori* impossible.⁷⁷ One can point to a couple of arranged marriages which are not perfectly parallel, but which may help to illustrate the sort of opportunity Juvenal had in mind. In a passage already quoted from *Ex Ponto* 1. 2 (see p. 77), Ovid recounts the ties by which he was attached to the household of Paullus Fabius Maximus, and mentions that his wife had been chosen for him from the entourage of Paullus' wife Marcia. Pliny documents a similar arrangement in *Epist.* 1. 14. Invited to suggest a suitable husband for the niece of a friend, he warmly commends a close friend ('me . . . familiarissime diligit', 1. 14. 3) and compatriot from northern Italy. The magnates who disposed of so many other affairs in the lives of lesser men were consulted about

⁶⁷ Calpurnius Siculus, *Eclogues* 4. 152-5; Martial 1. 55, 8. 18, 9. 11, 18; Juvenal 9. 59-60; Lucian, *De mercede conductis* 20. 22 (line numbers as in Macleod's OCT).

⁶⁸ (Laelius speaking) 'hospes et amicus meus M. Pacuvius', Cic., *Amic.* 24.

⁶⁹ (Atticus speaking) 'Antiochus, familiaris meus . . . quocum vixi', Cic., *Leg.* 1. 54.

⁷⁰ 'Est apud M. Pisonem adolescentem . . . Peripateticus Staseas', Cic., *De or.* 1. 104.

⁷¹ 'ad Cornelium Gallum se contulit vixitque una familiarissime', Suet., *Gram.* 16. 1.

⁷² After having been forbidden access to the palace of Augustus, Timagenes 'in contubernio

Pollionis Asinii consenuit', Seneca, *De ira* 3. 23. 5-8; the whole passage is relevant for showing the closeness of Timagenes' association with Pollio.

⁷³ 'receptus in Planci oratoris contubernium', Suet., *Gram.* 30. 2.

⁷⁴ (Fronto speaking) 'habitavimus una, studuimus una' (van den Hout, 165).

⁷⁵ 9. 3. 5. 1, 39. 5. 7. 9.

⁷⁶ *Epist.* 4. 13. 10; cf. *Epist.* 3. 3. Lucian's *De mercede conductis* throughout speaks of domestic appointments for philosophers, *grammatici*, rhetors, and even musicians (see 4. 15-18 and 25-6, 25. 33, 36. 28-9).

⁷⁷ cf. Martial 6. 8.

marriages as well. It is reasonable to think that dutiful and pleasing companions were sometimes guided to an advantageous match.

In *beneficia* like these lay the real rewards for which a poet might think it worth his while to cultivate the friendship of prominent men. And two observations about the nature of these rewards may serve to end this part of my argument, and to connect it with part one. In the first place, it is impossible to distinguish the sort of benefits bestowed on poets from the treatment of other *amici* in the great man's entourage; in this respect, practice exactly corresponds to the situation I have described in part one. My second point only elaborates on the first: it would be incorrect even to divide the great man's *amici* into peers and dependants, and to suppose that the benefits I have enumerated are the special perquisites which fall to dependants. Here again, the modern term 'patronage' biasses our interpretation of *amicitia*, turning it into a functional relationship by which more powerful members of society support the weaker. What is true of the vocabulary of *amicitia* is true also of gifts and benefits: although lesser *amici* may be discriminated against in countless ways, the benefits they receive, if they receive any, are like the benefits which rich and prominent citizens bestowed on *amici* of their own class. Bequests, loans, gifts, sinecures, arranged marriages—almost every variety of *beneficium* I have discussed one could find illustrated among the favours which Cicero and his peers did for one another. Social distinctions were not ignored. But just as persons of both low and high degree were called by the same name of *amici*, so all shared in the benefits by which a Roman gentleman proclaimed his friendship.

To answer now in summary the question raised at the beginning of part two, poets attached themselves to wealthy households for reasons which had little to do with their poetic interests, and much to do with the composition of Roman society. Friendship with prominent citizens did help to satisfy one important professional need: it gave access to a ready-made audience, and guaranteed a certain amount of publicity for the poet's work. But otherwise, poets fared no differently from other persons in their relationship with the leaders of society. They were drawn almost inevitably into some attachment by the forces which aligned all men in a hierarchy of orders and individuals. And once established in the *amicitia* of a rich man, poets received material benefits which were the perquisites of friends rather than the due of poetry.

University of Chicago