

Ambiguities in Amicitia:
The Issues in Assessing the Relationship between Horace and Maecenas

By
Braden Engstrom

A thesis presented for the B.A. degree
with Honors in
The Department of Classical Studies
University of Michigan
Spring 2016

Aspirat primo Fortuna labori

-Virgil (*Aeneid* II.385)

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I want to express my extreme gratitude to my advisor Basil Dufallo. Although I never had the pleasure of having him as a teacher, his insight and advice was crucial in completing the thesis process. He provided me countless suggestions, read numerous terrible drafts, and kept pushing me to do my best work. I thank him for all of his support throughout this endeavor, without which I would be nowhere.

I would also like to thank Ruth Caston and Donald Sells for introducing me to Horace's poetry. Their guidance and perspective drew me to write about Horace. Next, I would like to thank Netta Berlin not for only leading the thesis class but for serving as a teacher and mentor for me from my first day at the University of Michigan. She has helped to shape me into the scholar I am today. Also, I am grateful for David Potter for serving as my second reader.

I also want to acknowledge Matthew Alling for introducing me to Latin. I can honestly say that without him as my middle school and high school teacher, I would never have fallen in love with Latin. He has changed who I am as a student and for that I will be forever grateful.

I want to thank all of my family, friends, and coworkers who offered their input. Whether it be reading my drafts or just listening to me brainstorm, their advice has gotten me through this final stretch. Finally, I want to thank my parents, Mary and Tom, for everything they have done for me. I am eternally grateful for their continued support.

Abstract

This thesis examines the inherent issues in using Horace's poetry to assess his relationship to Maecenas. By analyzing Horace's poetry and the scholarship about it, I hope to clarify the ways in which scholars treat the relationship between Horace and Maecenas. The language Horace uses to describe Maecenas shows that the label "friends" is not inherently applicable. The faces Horace dons when discussing Maecenas shows how he is using his patron as a character in a highly complex image-management program. In addition, Horace's treatment of *amicitia* and slavery in the *Epistles* reinforces the economic significance of the patron-poet relationship. While scholars may want to label the pair as "friends," there is a distinct lack of firm evidence of affectionate behavior. In conjunction with the emphasis on the hierarchy in the patron client relationship, this demonstrates that the label "friends" is not the best way to describe Horace and Maecenas. The best way to discuss the pair is as patron and poet and their relationship as literary *amicitia*. This research shows the pitfalls inherent in reading ancient literature as historical truth.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
The Language of <i>Amicitia</i> in Horace's Poetry	3
Terminology of Friendship	4
Terminology of Patronage	7
The Language of <i>Amicitia</i> and Maecenas	9
Saving Face: Maecenas' Role in Horace's Face-Management	22
<i>The Satires</i>	24
<i>The Odes</i>	30
<i>The Epistles</i>	35
Other <i>Amicitiae</i> in Horace's Poetry	43
The <i>Amicitiae</i> of <i>Epistles</i> 1.17 and 1.18	45
Horace the Slave	50
Conclusion	57
Bibliography	59

Introduction

Horace begins his poetic corpus with the infamous *Qui fit, Maecenas...?*¹ From this point on, it is nearly impossible to study the poems of Horace without the mention of his patron Maecenas. The patron-client relationship that existed between the two has become the archetype of literary patronage. Maecenas has become synonymous with the word “patron,” in large part due to his numerous appearances in Horace’s corpus.² Few, if any, scholars would argue that Maecenas was not the patron of Horace.

There is, however, much variation as to the nature of the relationship between the men. While the relationship is certainly one of patronage, many opt to refer to the pair as “friends.” There is a tendency to use Horace’s poetry as justification for this claim. The issue in doing so is that poetry is inherently fabricated. At its most basic level, poetry is in general “imaginative or creative literature.”³ Therefore, we cannot assume that Horace’s poems are truly biographical.

In addition to this quality of poetry, Horace’s poems contain three confounding factors that further restrict our ability to assess the relationship between Horace and Maecenas. The stylized language, nuanced faces, and themes Horace employs serve to further add ambiguity to the *amicitia*. It is my purpose to assess how each of these factors pose problems in attempting to analyze the relationship between Horace and Maecenas.

In the first chapter, I will show how the language of friendship is misinterpreted by modern scholars. While Horace may refer to Maecenas as an *amicus*, he does not strictly imply

¹ Hor. *Serm.*1.1.1, “How is it, Maecenas...?” All translations, unless otherwise specified, are my own. In this paper, I use the Wickham and Garrod Oxford Classical Text.

² Reckford 1959, p.195.

³ *Oxford English Dictionary*, 3rd ed.

that Maecenas is his “friend.” Instead, the language of friendship is used by Horace as a substitute for the technical terminology of patronage.

In the second chapter, I demonstrate how the persona Horace dons does not constitute evidence for his beliefs. Specifically, I will show how the poems that mention Maecenas are used as tools to protect and advance Horace’s public image. For this reason, these poems are not firm evidence of Horace’s attitudes towards his patron.

In the final chapter, I analyze the poems in which patronage is a key theme. In these poems, Horace does not focus on the amount of affection between a patron and client, but rather on the constraints a client faces. I then apply this theme to slavery as Horace often times compares his position as a poet to that of a slave.

Overall, I aim to show that though there is a desire to label Horace and Maecenas as “friends,” there is not enough evidence within Horace’s poetry to do so. Instead, I suggest that we refer to the pair as patron and poet and that their relationship was an *amicitia*.

The Language of *Amicitia* in Horace's Poetry

The primary issue in analyzing the relationship between Horace and Maecenas is the ambiguities that arise in the words Horace uses to describe Maecenas. These words have led some scholars to label the pair as “friends.”⁴ DuQuesnay boldly claims that their friendship is, “historical fact.”⁵ To Reckford, “the evidence for mutual affection of Horace and Maecenas is so extensive and well known that we need not discuss it at any great length.”⁶ These scholars often cite Horace's entrance into Maecenas' inner circle, *in amicorum numero* (Hor. *Ser.* I.6), or even Horace's overtly positive endearments of Maecenas as proof of friendship.⁷

While on the surface this argument appears sound, further analysis of the terminology used by Horace to describe Maecenas complicates this notion of friendship. In the case of literary patronage, there is a nuanced language to describe the arrangements made between patron and poet. Specifically, poets eschewed use of the terminology of *patrocinium* for patronage, *patronus* for the benefactor, and especially *cliens* for their own position.⁸ Romans resented the public image of dependence on a benefactor, and therefore did not refer to their own patronage in these technical terms. Instead, the Romans favored the term *amicitia* or “friendship” to describe a patronage relationship.⁹ References to *amicitia* or even an *amicus* in poetry are signs indicating a patronage relationship. This intentionally blurs the true nature of interactions, leaving ambiguity as to the extent of the closeness of the relationship.¹⁰ Therefore references to a

⁴ DuQuesnay (1984), Reckford (1959), and Lowrie (2007).

⁵ DuQuesnay 1984, p.49.

⁶ Reckford 1959, p.201.

⁷ Reckford 1959, p.200-201, 207.

⁸ Bowditch 2010, p.55.

⁹ Bowditch 2001, p.19.

¹⁰ Saller 1982, p.11.

benefactor as an *amicus* must be taken with skepticism. This is no different in analyzing the relationship between Horace and Maecenas.

We must then consider whether “friendship” is the right label for the relationship. Are scholars merely conflating the stylized use of *amicitia* with its literal use to indicate friendship? Is there evidence pointing towards friendship in the modern sense of the word? Clearly the ambiguities in the terminology of patronage create an issue for scholars. By analyzing the nuances of the language that describes friends and patrons, I strive in this chapter to highlight how this problem extends to the relationship between Horace and Maecenas. Ultimately, my purpose is to show that labeling these men as “friends” suffices, provided that there is an understanding that the terms *amicus* and *amicitia* are not the same as modern “friendship.”

Terminology of Friendship

As defined by the *Oxford English Dictionary*, a friend is “a person with whom one has developed a close and informal relationship of mutual trust and intimacy.”¹¹ In order to determine whether this label of “friends” is appropriate for Horace and Maecenas, we must first compare this English definition to Roman beliefs on what it meant to be “friends.” Certainly, the words *amicus* and *amicitia* provide the basic translations “friend” and “friendship.” As defined by the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, *amicus* is comprised of *amo-* and the adjectival suffix *-icus*.¹² While this may imply a relationship based on affection, there are also definitions present that suggest an *amicus* does not require affection. This etymology indicates that while term “friend”

¹¹ *Oxford English Dictionary* 3rd ed. The *OED* merely defines friendship as “the state of being friends” which is not of significant value to this discussion.

¹² *Oxford Latin Dictionary* 2nd ed.

is a useful tool to convey an author's superficial meaning, we often fail to consider the nuances of the language and the manner in which Romans viewed and discussed friendship.

While many Roman authors comment on friendship, Cicero considers the intricacies of *amicitia* most directly in his treatise *De Amicitia*.¹³ Through the persona of Laelius, Cicero attempts to define *amicitia*: “For friendship is nothing other than harmony of all divine and human affairs along with benevolence and affection.”¹⁴ Though he conveys an extremely idealistic image of friendship, the notion of “harmony... along with benevolence and affection” still embodies some of the core attributes of Roman friendship.¹⁵ The most powerful assertion of friendship in *De Amicitia* demonstrates the closeness associated with friends: “For he who looks upon a true friend looks upon a sort of copy of himself.”¹⁶ Cicero does not simply mean that two friends appear the same, but rather that they manifest the ideal of the *alter ego* or *alter idem*. In what C. Williams calls the “grandest of all idealizations,” a pair of friends are viewed as a single soul divided between two bodies.¹⁷ We use this same concept today in phrases such as “part of my soul,” “soulmate,” or “my other half,” often referring to a spouse rather than a friend. Though it certainly is effective to portray friendship in an idealistic way, these descriptions do not comprise the totality of actions and attitudes that embody the common practices of Roman friendship.

¹³ Saller 1982, p.12 argues for and relies upon Seneca for his discussions of friendship. Since Seneca comes several generations after Cicero, I choose to rely upon Cicero's writings as do others, especially C. Williams 2012. Saller does observe however that “Seneca's views differ little from Cicero's”, thus making the choice inconsequential.

¹⁴ Cicero. *De Amic.* 20, *Est enim amicitia nihil aliud nisi omnium divinarum humanarumque rerum cum benevolentia et carite consensio*. Here I choose to translate *amicitia* as “friendship” as Cicero appears focused on this aspect of the term rather than imply patronage.

¹⁵ C. Williams 2012, p. 4.

¹⁶ Cic. *De Amic.* 23, *Verum enim amicum qui intuetur, tamquam exemplar aliquod intuetor sui*.

¹⁷ C. Williams, p. 15.

Whereas philosophical friendship is centered on the ideals of common interests and selfless service, the actual practice often revolved around the exchange of gifts and services.¹⁸ In his *Reading Roman Friendship*, Craig Williams argues that the three main factors that point to an *amicitia* are trustworthiness (*fides*), a continued reciprocal exchange of favors and debt (*beneficia, gratia, officia*), and goodwill or affection (*voluntas, amor, bene velle*).¹⁹ As Williams later summarizes, “relationships described with the language of *amicitia* came with the presumption of a minimal degree of goodwill and implied the possibility of benefit for one or both parties.”²⁰ The focus on “a minimal degree of goodwill” creates a contrast to the philosophical *alter ego*. Also, Williams emphasizes that *amicitia* remains ambiguous in reference to the status of its participants. While many *amici* were social or financial equals, this need not always be the case.²¹ Even in the money economy of Rome, there were numerous services which could not be bought by money; instead, ““friends supplied [these necessary] services.”²² Here, we can begin to see the inherent “paradox” of Roman friendship as the basis in mutual affection clashes with the exchange of *officia*.²³

In terms of friendship, the interplay between affection and reciprocity characterizes the inherent spectrum of relationships that could be labeled *amicitia*. Cicero ultimately qualifies his claims on *amicitia*, saying, “I say this so that those who think I am speaking about every kind of friendship may not start criticizing me.”²⁴ This statement shows that, in fact, varying levels and

¹⁸ Saller 1982, p.13-14.

¹⁹ Williams 2012, p.22-23.

²⁰ Williams, p.23.

²¹ Williams, p.22.

²² Hands 1968, p.32.

²³ Saller 1982, p.12.

²⁴ Cicero. *Inv.* 2.167, *Ne forte qui nos de omni amicitia dicere existimant reprehendere incipient.*

manifestations of *amicitia* were evident to a Roman. One such iteration of *amicitia* describes a patron-client relationship.

Terminology of Patronage

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, “patronage” is “the action of a patron in using money or influence to advance the interests of a person, cause, or art.”²⁵ Contemporary usage of this term does not grasp the complex behavior of Roman patronage. The main features of Roman patronage, as proposed by Saller, are the reciprocal exchange of goods and services, some personal attributes to distinguish it from commercial transactions, as well as the sense that “the two parties are of unequal status and offer different kinds of goods and services.”²⁶ With this in mind, I shall focus this section on the language Roman authors used to describe the nature of relationships, showing how the language used to describe *amicitia* ultimately comes to be applied to patronage.

As previously mentioned, Romans did not use the terminology of *patronus*, *cliens*, or *patrocinium* to describe patronage relationships. Typically, *patronus* was restricted to lawyers, patrons of communities and former rulers of freedmen; the term was scarcely used in the context of political or literary patronage.²⁷ The infrequency of these terms comes from the social inferiority and degradation implied by these words. In his *De Officiis*, Cicero writes, “[Romans think it] like death to be called clients or to benefit from patronage.”²⁸ Romans neither wanted to disrespect their *clientes* by referring to themselves as *patroni*, nor did a client ever desire to be

²⁵ *Oxford English Dictionary* 3rd edition.

²⁶ Saller 1982, p.1.

²⁷ Saller, p.11.

²⁸ Cicero. *De Off.* 2.69, *Patrocinio vero se usos aut clientes appellari mortis instar putant.*

called a *cliens*, a word often reserved for the members of the lower classes.²⁹ Due to the inherent inequality required in patronage, they instead opted for language that did not specifically imply such disparity – the language of *amicitia*.

By embracing the terminology of friendship to describe patron-client interactions, Romans ultimately demonstrate that a patronage relationship is a variant of *amicitia*. Rather than *patronus* or *cliens*, Romans favored *amicus*, often with a qualifier such as *magnus* or *bonus*; the terms *officia*, *beneficia*, and *gratia*, were used to describe the exchange of services.³⁰ An *amicitia* could begin with one party offering some *beneficium* to a patron, attempting to garner some favor and begin a relationship. Eventually, as an *officium* is returned, each falls into a form of debt to the other. There was a strong ethic of reciprocity in relationships as Romans found the *ingratus amicus* among the lowest forms of social life.³¹ While there was a desire *officium reddere*, there often was no absolution of debt, as only “total self-liquidation” would allow both parties free to break off the relationship.³² Though the desire to end the relationship changes case to case, the ethic of reciprocity demonstrates the power of debt in maintaining the relationship. Within a patronage relationship, the exchange of gifts was such that one provided the recipient with something he could not get on his own. While members of an equal social rank may be beholden to others through this sort of gift exchange, without the inequality of social rank or ability to give, the relationship is merely a friendship. To rectify this imbalance, writers often used phrases such as *magnus amicus* or *potens amicus* to emphasize that the patron was superior.³³ Nevertheless, in both types of *amicitia*, there is an exchange of *officia* and the

²⁹ Saller 1982, p.11.

³⁰ Saller 1982, p.10.

³¹ Saller, p.11.

³² Sahlins 1965, p. 178.

³³ Bowditch 2010, p.55.

recipients would most likely be referred to as *amici* of some kind. Certainly, this significant overlap in terminology hinders our ability to analyze the relationship of Horace and Maecenas.

The Language of Amicitia and Maecenas

The features of a powerful *amicitia* with Maecenas appear throughout Horace's corpus. To begin this section, I will first place the relationship within that of patronage, analyzing the dynamic of reciprocity between the men. Without first demonstrating that Maecenas is Horace's patron, any attempt to analyze the usage of the terminology of *amicitia* in Horace's poetry is moot. Following that, I will track instances of the use of the Roman terminology or ideals of *amicitia* within Horace's poetry, showing that these demonstrate the ambiguities inherent in the terminology. Finally, I will conclude by arguing that the label of friendship can only be applied to Horace and Maecenas in a limited way.

Horace's poetry, particularly his first few major works, demonstrates a relationship that meets all three of the requirements defined by Saller: a personal element of some duration, asymmetry and, most importantly, reciprocal exchange. The most evident element is the duration of their cordial relationship. Within his collection, Horace certainly discusses his own autobiographical recollection of the beginnings of the relationship. In *Satire* 1.6, Horace portrays himself as an up and coming man when Maecenas eventually and reluctantly invites him *in amicorum numero*.³⁴ At the same time he praises Maecenas for seeing him for his core values and not for his ignoble birth.³⁵ This acknowledgement of Maecenas' benevolence resonates throughout Horace's corpus. As Horace continued publishing his works, Maecenas remained not

³⁴ Hor. *Serm.* 1.6.61-2.

³⁵ Fraenkel 1957, p.101.

only his dedicatee, but a prominent subject. In his *Odes*, Horace beseeches Maecenas to come to his famed Sabine villa and enjoy his company.³⁶ In his second book of *Sermones*, Horace details a dinner party with Maecenas.³⁷ Horace even directs many of his *Epistles* towards Maecenas, providing further evidence of the duration of their relationship.³⁸ From these examples, it is apparent that Maecenas supported Horace through his publication of the *Epodes*, *Odes* 1-3, *Sermones* 1-2, and *Epistles*.³⁹ Many scholars suggest that eventually Horace grew independent from Maecenas as his need for a patron diminishes.⁴⁰ Whether or not such a split happened, the span of the relationship certainly satisfies Saller's stipulation of a personal element of duration.

In respect to asymmetry, Horace not only depicts Maecenas as superior, but also diminishes his own status. On the surface, Horace and Maecenas both belong to the equestrian order. While Maecenas was born into the class, Horace earned his class status as a result of becoming a tribune in Brutus' army.⁴¹ Therefore, Maecenas' bloodline and position within the current regime give him superiority over Horace and his freedman roots.⁴² Horace calls attention to Maecenas' regal lineage in *Satire* 1.6, saying, "Maecenas, whichever of the Lydians has settled in the Etruscan territory, no one is more generous than you."⁴³ Here, Horace links Maecenas to Rome's forefathers and the ancient Etruscan lineage. Horace places extra emphasis on heritage in order to contrast Maecenas' ancestry with his own. Throughout the same poem, Horace repeats the phrase *libertino patre natum* ("born to a freedman father") to reinforce his

³⁶ Horace extends such an invitation in *Odes* 1.20, 3.8, and 3.29.

³⁷ Hor. *Serm.* 2.8.

³⁸ Horace addresses *Epistles* 1.1, 1.7, and 1.19 to Maecenas.

³⁹ Oliensis 1998, p.2.

⁴⁰ Zetzel (1982, p.96) argues that Horace outgrew the need for Maecenas. G. Williams (1968, p.87-88) argues that Augustus replaces Maecenas as the patron of poetry as he writes "Augustus no longer left it to Maecenas to take an interest in poets." Finally, Reckford (1959, p.198-199) discuss Maecenas' withdrawal from the public spotlight.

⁴¹ Lyne 1995, p.3.

⁴² G. Williams 1968, p.453. Williams adds that there is a layer of "self-deprecating irony" in Horace's tone.

⁴³ Hor. *Serm.* 1.6.1-2, *Maecenas, Lydorum quiduid Etruscos incoluit finis, nemo generosior est te.*

lower position.⁴⁴ Horace also plays with this idea by portraying himself as unrefined, especially in his earliest works. In other poems, Horace refers to Maecenas as *clare Maecenas eques*⁴⁵ or even *atavis edite regibus* as a means of honoring his social standing.⁴⁶ Thus, Horace's continued reinforcement of Maecenas' ancestry serves to further underscore the asymmetry.

Horace adds to this inequality through physical descriptions of himself and Maecenas. While he does not ever explicitly explicate Maecenas' appearance, Horace uses partial descriptions of Maecenas to create the illusion of inequality. After falling ill while traveling with Maecenas on the diplomatic mission to Brundisium, Horace remarks that at one location, "Maecenas goes off for sport, Vergil and I for sleep, for playing the ball game is unfriendly to those with bleary eyes and sick stomachs."⁴⁷ Here, Horace implies that Maecenas is healthy enough to partake in strenuous activity while he and Vergil, the poets, are too frail. This juxtaposition highlights Horace's attempt to diminish his physical appearance in his poetry and, by extension, elevate Maecenas' stature.

Finally, I will examine which *officia* were exchanged between the pair. Certainly, an exhaustive list is impossible to create due to obvious gaps in the historical record. However, Horace's poetry offers a window into what sorts of objects or actions the pair exchanged. It is evident that Horace obtained much material wealth from Maecenas. Horace hints at Maecenas' generosity in various places, particularly in *Satire* 1.6, as he says, *nemo generosior est te*.⁴⁸ As far as the actual gifts Maecenas provides that make him *generosior*, Horace does not specify,

⁴⁴ Hor. *Serm.* 1.6.6, 45, 46.

⁴⁵ Hor. *Odes* 1.20.5.

⁴⁶ Hor. *Odes* 1.1.1.

⁴⁷ Hor. *Serm.* 1.5.48-49, *lusum it Maecenas, dormitum ego Vergiliusque: namque pila lippis inimicum et ludere crudis.*

⁴⁸ Hor. *Serm.* 1.6.1-2.

instead employing the phrase *auctius atque ... melius* to emphasize that Maecenas has given much.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, there is one gift that Horace vocally discusses – his Sabine Villa.

The Sabine Villa, thought to be given to Horace in 32-31 B.C.E. as a land grant, coincided with Augustus' land redistribution program of the 40s and 30s.⁵⁰ This benefaction greatly changed Horace's economic circumstances, as well as his poetic material. Certainly somewhat fictionalized and reinvented throughout Horace's works, the Sabine Villa becomes Horace's escape from the bustle of Rome as well as an Epicurean retreat from which Horace can assume the role of the *sacerdos*.⁵¹ Though the farm eventually plays a large part in Horace's poetic persona and the reception of his poems, it is first and foremost a *munus* from Maecenas.

In addition to such concrete gifts, Maecenas provided Horace with the intangible resources and connections necessary to become successful. In the Augustan age, a poet "required either independent means or a patron; there was no third way."⁵² For Horace, "independent means" was no longer an option when he returned from Philippi defeated: "humble and with my wings clipped, lacking my paternal home and estate, bold poverty drove me to write verses."⁵³ Through his other accounts of fighting for Brutus, we can glean that Horace was a tribune, a position given only to those of equestrian rank.⁵⁴ Though he must have therefore had some private resources, it is evident through language such as *decisis...pennis* and *paupertas...audax* that he no longer had sufficient means to write poetry. In addition, Horace gets access to Maecenas's inner circle and by extension Augustus. Even outside of the realm of literature,

⁴⁹ Hor. *Serm.* 2.6.3-4.

⁵⁰ Fraenkel 1957, p.15.

⁵¹ Bowditch 2001, p.4.

⁵² Reckford 1959, p.200.

⁵³ Hor. *Epistles* 2.2.50-52, *Decisis humilem pennis inopemque paterni et laris et fundi, paupertas impulit audax ut versus facerem.*

⁵⁴ Lyne 1995, p.3.

Romans found a career in associating themselves with the rich.⁵⁵ When Horace enters *in amicorum numero* with Maecenas, he is not merely becoming a client whom Maecenas summons to social engagements, he enters into a literary circle filled with other great writers with whom he could collaborate and debate. In addition, Horace gets access to the emperor through Maecenas, which was beneficial, as Augustus legitimized Horace's work. In addition to this, Augustus was "a poetically exciting idea;"⁵⁶ Augustus' transformative role "revived the dream of world domination," providing "material which no poet had mined before."⁵⁷ The allure of Augustus as a literary topic was a driving force for poets to attempt to gain his favor through association with Maecenas.

On the other side of the relationship, Horace provides three main services for Maecenas: propaganda, symbolic capital, and discretion. Initially, Horace's poetry serves as a vehicle to convince opponents of Augustus to endorse the emperor. In this aspect, the *Sermones* become a work of propaganda at the urging of Maecenas. This point is evident in I.M DuQuesnay's, "Horace and Maecenas: The Propaganda Value of *Sermones* I," as it is argued that Horace makes Maecenas, Augustus, and their "friends" into models of tolerance, pacifism, and camaraderie.⁵⁸ Rather than overtly praise Augustus or slander his rival Sextus Pompeius, Horace instead focuses his poems on "the very moral issues which are at the heart of contemporary analysis of Rome's problems" – *avaritia*, *luxuria*, *aequitas*, *libertas*, and *ambitio*.⁵⁹ For example, *Sermones* 1.3 discusses the theme of *aequitas* ("fairness") as Horace himself says that, "a sweet friend, as it is fair, must weigh my good deeds with my vices."⁶⁰ The use of the word *aequum* leads the reader

⁵⁵ P. White 1982, p.56.

⁵⁶ P. White 1993, p. 207.

⁵⁷ P. White 1993, p.208.

⁵⁸ DuQuesnay 1984, p.101.

⁵⁹ DuQuesnay 1984,p.100.

⁶⁰ Hor. *Serm.* 1.3.69-70, *Amicus dulcis, ut aequum est, cum mea compenset vitiis bona.*

to the idea of *aequitas* that the poem represents. It is important to remember that for Horace, Augustus showed the ultimate act of *clementia*, a variant of *aequitas*, in forgiving Horace for his efforts in war. This reference to the Battle of Philippi demonstrates could be seen as a source of disgrace for Horace. Instead, Horace uses references to Philippi as a way to remind his audience not of his efforts against Augustus, but rather the emperor's clemency. Horace therefore uses his poetry to link Augustus with *aequitas* and demonstrates Augustus' lenience in such a way that also vindicates his place at Augustus' side. This lenience was important, as Augustus was attempting to change the negative perception that was created by his initial adoption of extensive proscription.⁶¹ Horace thus helps to press upon his readers support for his powerful *amici* through poems concerning such ideal morals and perceived breaches of them.

While we see that the propaganda value diminishes from the *Sermones* to the *Odes*, it remains present within the "Roman Odes." In this collection of six odes, which share meter and message, Horace masterfully encapsulates the ideals and hopes of a budding Roman Empire led by Augustus. While some debate the sincerity of Horace's views on Augustus, these poems provide a distinct patriotic tone interwoven with religious and mythological personae in order to "recreate Augustus and legitimize a monarchic and divinely endorsed vision of power."⁶² In these poems specifically, Horace gives to Maecenas an inspiring tenet that reshapes the goals of the principate. Certainly, it is not reasonable to assume Horace shared the same ideologies as Augustus and Maecenas, as he began his career opposing Augustus and aligning with the army of Brutus. Therefore, it is problematic to imply Horace wholeheartedly accepted the doctrines of

⁶¹ DuQuesnay 1984, p.66-68.

⁶² Bowditch 2012, p.63. Lowrie (2007, p.77-81) discusses the positives and negatives of the relationship between Horace and Maecenas. Starr (1969, p.58) indicates that Horace "turned away from Augustus" over time.

Augustus. However, Horace's favorable portrayal of these themes indicates his willingness to aid his benefactors in exchange for continued poetic success.

A much less visible, but no less important asset Horace provides Maecenas is symbolic capital through dedications. Symbolic capital refers to the public status and debt accrued by a gift.⁶³ Connecting this to the *amicitia* between Horace and Maecenas, we see that the symbolic capital amassed is the inclusion of Maecenas into Horace's literary canon. Horace emphasizes Maecenas' capacity to give through phrases such as *satis superque me benignitas tua ditavit*.⁶⁴ He thus demonstrates to his audience his patron's power and generosity. In addition to this, the growing fame of Horace's poetry, in conjunction with Horace's established association with Maecenas, forever links Horace's success with Maecenas. Therefore, when Horace claims that *exegi monumentum aere perennius*, there is an implication that Maecenas too has "created a monument more enduring than bronze."⁶⁵ Bowditch emphasizes the role Horace's poetry plays in Maecenas' reputation when she writes in reference to *Epistle* 1.1, "Honor is owed to the patron, to be sure, but aesthetic artistry converts the poet's debt into that of his benefactor... Maecenas owes his poetic life to the speech of his protégé."⁶⁶ The inclusion of Maecenas in so many of Horace poems therefore serves as a gift of symbolic capital to Maecenas, helping to repay some of the debt accrued through the *amicitia*.

In addition, many other poems help to assure Maecenas that Horace is a worthy candidate for his benefaction. No poem demonstrates this better than the fifth of the *Sermones* in which Horace refuses to acknowledge the political ramifications of Maecenas' trip to Brundisium.

⁶³ Bowitch 2012, p.56.

⁶⁴ Hor. *Epodes* 1.31-2, "Your generosity has enriched me enough and more than enough."

⁶⁵ Hor. *Odes* 3.30.1.

⁶⁶ Bowditch 2001, p.171.

Horace metaphorically shows that he “saw nothing” when he writes, *hic oculis ego nigra meis collyria lippus illinere*.⁶⁷ This refusal to mention the serious purpose of the trip shows to Maecenas that Horace is able to keep the secrets of his circle. Horace’s discretion allows his patron to trust that he will not divulge any state secrets. Horace highlights the importance of secret-keeping when he advises Lollius never to give up a patrons secrets.⁶⁸

These examples of exchange from both parties, inequality and duration, demonstrate that Horace and Maecenas entered into a relationship known as patronage. The next step in addressing the extent of the *amicitia* involves tracing the vocabulary Horace uses to discuss Maecenas and analyzing the difficulty it poses. By tracking these instances through the *Sermones*, *Odes*, and *Epistles*, it is apparent that we must rely on the context of the poem to determine whether Horace is portraying Maecenas as a “friend” or patron.

In his *Sermones*, Horace describes his relationship with Maecenas in the terminology of *amicitia*, focusing on Maecenas’ capacity to give as a way to demonstrate *gratia*. This notion can be most clearly found in poem 1.6, in which Horace recounts the beginnings of his relationship with Maecenas. Here, Horace discusses the manner in which he was allowed *in amicorum numero* in what appears to be the moment Maecenas became his patron. Prior to this, Horace argues that:

*ut forsit honorem
iure mihi invidet quivis, ita te quoque amicum,
praesertim cautum dignos adsumere, prava
ambitione procul. felicem dicere non hoc*

⁶⁷ Hor. *Serm.* 1.5.30-31, “Here, bleary-eyed I smeared my eyes with black ointment.” For acknowledgement of this metaphor, see Oliensis 1998, p.28.

⁶⁸ Hor. *Ep.* 1.18.37-38.

me possim, casu quod te sortitus amicum

Though perhaps someone may accurately begrudge my position, he is not justified to grudge me your friendship, as you are careful to choose as a friend only those worthy, far off from wicked ambition. In this way I could not call myself lucky, that I be cast as your friend by chance.⁶⁹

Horace uses the term *amicus* twice in this passage, in ways that indicate a patronage relationship. The intention of the first use of *amicus*, is similar to how Maecenas allowed Horace *in numero amicorum*.⁷⁰ Here, the use of *adsumere*, which appears often in terms of transactions or exchanges, in conjunction with *amicum*, highlights the use of the terminology of *amicitia* to mask a discussion of patronage. The second use of *amicum* in the passage is Horace's assertion that he is an *amicus*, or "client," to Maecenas. The context of the poem helps to solidify this interpretation, as the poem begins with a reference to Maecenas' generosity: *nemo generosior est te*.⁷¹ While there certainly is an implication that Maecenas's philanthropy has greatly aided Rome, the repetition of *amicum* indicates that Horace is acknowledging Maecenas' willingness to take him on as a client.

The same trend continues throughout various other instances in the *Sermones* as Horace refers to Maecenas as *optimus* in the previous poem.⁷² Fraenkel argues this phrase is certainly an "affectionate expression."⁷³ The use of the word "affectionate" indicates Fraenkel believes there to be a fondness in the *amicitia*. However, *Maecenas optimus* is more akin to phrases such as

⁶⁹ Hor. *Serm.* 1.6. 49-53.

⁷⁰ Hor. *Serm.* 1.6. 62.

⁷¹ Hor. *Serm.* 1.1.2.

⁷² Hor. *Serm.* 1.5.27.

⁷³ Fraenkel 1957, p.111.

magnus amicus or *potens amicus*, than Cicero's ideal of the *alter ego*.⁷⁴ Therefore, within the context of the *Sermones*, it is more appropriate to think of *Maecenas optimus* as merely a way of honoring Maecenas' patronage.

The same can be seen in the *Odes* as Horace problematically favors the term *decus* to describe his patron in three of the eight poems addressed to him.⁷⁵ Horace refers to Maecenas as *dulce decus meum* (1.1.2), *meorum grande decus colemnque rerum* (2.17.3-4), and *equitum decus* (3.16.20). In each instance, *decus* can be translated as "glory" or "pride." This is a distinct divergence from the repeated use of *amicus* in the *Sermones*, making it more difficult to discern a clear usage of the programmatic language of literary patronage. I am inclined to agree with Garrison, who argues that the phrase "*dulce decus*... honors the prestige of Maecenas' patronage."⁷⁶ Therefore, Horace appears to be using *decus* as a heartfelt way to praise Maecenas for his patronage. This overwhelming gratitude appears in *Odes* 2.17 when, following his *meorum grande decus colemnque rerum*, he bursts out by saying, "but if some blow strikes you first and carries off the half of my life what is there to keep the other half here?"⁷⁷ Horace plays with the Ciceronian idea of the *alter ego* to show Maecenas his depth of appreciation. Though one may think that these specific lines imply a "friendship" relationship, Garrison dismisses this and argues that the lines are merely a grand statement in hopes to "cheer Maecenas up."⁷⁸ Though *decus* is not a typical word used throughout Roman literature to refer to one's patron, its prevalence and context in these *Odes* shows that Horace is using a marker of patronage.

⁷⁴ C. Williams 2012, p.47.

⁷⁵ The poems addressed to Maecenas are *Odes* 1.1, 1.20, 2.12, 2.17, 2.20, 3.8, 3.16, and 3.29.

⁷⁶ Garrison 1991, p.200.

⁷⁷ Translated by David West in his article *Cur Me Querelis* 1991, p.1: *a, te meae si partem animae rapit maturior vis, quid moror altera* (Hor. *Odes* 2.17.5-6).

⁷⁸ Garrison 1991, p.284.

Transitioning to the *Epistles* we see once again instances of *amicus*. However, the context as a marker of patronage is even more convoluted. In his first *Epistle*, Horace remarks towards the end of the poem: *de te pendentis, te respicientis amici*.⁷⁹ In this case, Horace reverses to whom he makes the *amicus* as this time he refers to himself. Here, Bowditch suggests the use of *amici* appears to encapsulate both a patron-client relationship and an elite “friendship” as Horace “teaches his patron to care for his protégé less as a public beneficiary or client... and more as a private friend.”⁸⁰ As we will see in the next chapter, Horace attempts portray himself as an equal to Maecenas as a part of a highly nuanced image-management program. In another poem, Horace uses the word *amicus* in a patronage-related sense when he calls Maecenas his *dulcis amice*.⁸¹ This notion is reinforced in following lines when Horace remarks “I also will show myself worthy as the glory of your deeds demands.”⁸² It appears that Horace still feels the need to prove his worth to Maecenas, possibly due to the stature of his patron in Rome. Horace’s deference to Maecenas and his accomplishments therefore shows his use of *amicus* follows more closely to the characteristics of patronage than those of friendship.

As we progress through these three works, we find that scholars are not unified in their assessments of what type of relationship Horace’s language portrays. On one side, there are scholars such as DuQuesnay and Reckford, who view their friendship as “historical fact” and appear to see this *amicitia* as a contemporary friendship.⁸³ On the other, there are scholars such as Garrison who only refers to Maecenas as “Horace’s patron”⁸⁴ or Verboven, who states that “it

⁷⁹ Hor. *Epistles* 1.1.105. As Bowditch translates, “the friend who depends on you, who looks to you for all” (2001, p.177).

⁸⁰ Bowditch 2001, p.177.

⁸¹ Hor. *Epistles* 1.7.12.

⁸² Line 24, *dignum praestabo me etiam pro laude merentis*.

⁸³ Reckford 1959, p.195 and DuQuesnay 1984, p.49.

⁸⁴ Garrison 1991, p.374.

is beyond doubt that the terms *amicus* and *amicitia* served as euphemisms to cover up relations of factual dependence.”⁸⁵ Though Verboven does not explicitly come out and say that Horace and Maecenas are not “friends” in the modern sense, he brings up an interesting consideration when he discusses “relations of factual dependence.” Even at their deaths, the evidence suggests that an imbalance remained between the two men. In Suetonius’ *Vita Horati*, Maecenas is purported to ask Augustus, *Horati Flacci ut mei esto memor*.⁸⁶ This excerpt embodies the Ciceronian ideals of Roman friendship. However, Suetonius goes on to recount how Augustus tells Maecenas, *Horatium nostrum a te cupio abducere*.⁸⁷ Here, Augustus is telling Maecenas that he plans to make use of Horace in the palace. The way that Augustus to *Horatium...cupio abducere* implies that Horace’s primary value is that of a poet. This portrayal of Horace shows that, though he may have been involved with Augustus and Maecenas socially, he was not a true friend to them. These examples demonstrate that, though there was some element of affection towards the end of the relationship, Horace could never overcome the imbalance between him and Maecenas.

I do not agree that Horace and Maecenas ever reached the status of “friends,” and therefore argue that the most accurate way to refer to the pair in English would be using “patron” or “client.” However, the Latin words *amici* or *amicitia* are best to label the pair, as these were the words Horace himself used. I would argue that the label “friends” or “friendship” would be applicable only if there are considerations for the nuances of the relationship. I stress against the label of “friendship” unless there is a clarification that the author acknowledged that the word *amicitia* is much more complex and stylized than the English definition of “friendship.” Unless

⁸⁵ Verboven 2002, p.51.

⁸⁶ Suetonius *Vita Horati*, “Be mindful of Horatius Flaccus as if myself.”

⁸⁷ Suetonius *Vita Horati*, “I wish to steal away our Horace from you.”

there is qualification of friendship in this way, the unequivocal portrayal of Horace and Maecenas as “friends” is incorrect. By allowing the Latin and the historical context of the text to serve as our definitions, we remove potential harmful biases from our analysis. As I shall discuss in the next chapter, assumptions about the authenticity of Horace’s persona can lead scholars to make imprudent claims about the relationship between Horace and Maecenas.

Saving Face: Maecenas' Role in Horace's Face-Management

Audiences were first exposed to Horace's poetry through oral performances. These performances could vary the tone and effect Horace intended in each poem. Even within the published poetry, there is much variation in the way Horace portrays himself. Whether becoming the scathing critic of some *Satires*, or the *vates* of the *Odes*, Horace alters the way in which he portrays himself both physically and as the first-person speaker of his poems. This "authorial persona" grows and develops throughout Horace's corpus.¹ This persona has value within social interactions and hierarchies – a personalized form of symbolic capital. As was defined in the previous chapter, "symbolic capital" refers to the value within a society one receives due to honor or recognition. Helpfully, Ellen Oliensis adopts the term "face" to refer to the public persona that serves as symbolic capital.² Anyone can put on a face, replace it, add one to another, or change faces depending on the social interaction. However, unlike the donning of a *persona* or mask, developing a face is to some extent defining oneself. As Oliensis states, the term "face" embodies the "fusion of mask and self," a way to present oneself to the world but to partially express one's own self-definition.³ For this reason, there is a temptation to interpret Horace's faces as biographical statements.

A problem inherent in understanding Horace's faces is that the historical poet is different from the character "Horace" portrayed in his poetry. For example, just because the character Horace may appear unrefined while around Maecenas in *Satire* 1.3, there is no evidence that the historical poet Horace actually behaved this way.⁴ Porter epitomizes the fabrication of the

¹ Oliensis 1998, p.1-2

² Ibid.

³ Oliensis 1998, p. 2

⁴ Horace Sat 1.3.63-66.

Horatian face when he writes, “Just like Horace’s arrangements of the poems in his collection are an act of poetic creation, so too are the characters we meet in them, among whom the most memorable, the most central, is Horace himself.”⁵ In this way, the faces Horace embodies in each of his poems can provide valuable information about the image Horace has crafted for himself. However, we must remember that these faces are artfully-crafted, poetic devices and not historical fact.

Horace’s faces cannot provide definitive evidence into Horace’s actual feelings about his relationship with Maecenas. In poems which directly mention Maecenas, Horace is manipulating his faces as well as those of others to serve in his overall program of image-management.⁶ Therefore, Horace’s faces are not a manifestation of his attitude towards Maecenas; they are tools primarily to shape the public’s perception of himself. In addition to this, Horace’s poetry is a part of Maecenas’ public image as his appearance in Horace’s poetry is also “subject to the same creative transformations that anything else in poetry is.”⁷ Therefore, in this chapter, I will argue that the poems that mention Maecenas do not constitute a manifestation of Horace’s true feelings of Maecenas. Horace utilizes these poems in a complex and nuanced program of face-management that relies on various faces to succeed. In this way, the poems directly mentioning Maecenas cannot be used as hard evidence to show Horace’s prevailing opinions of Maecenas.

⁵ Porter 2002, p. 23.

⁶ I define “directly mentioned” as instances in which Horace specifically mentions Maecenas by name. While there are certainly other poems that reference Maecenas, I choose only to focus on these as they eliminate any ambiguity as to whether or not Horace is invoking Maecenas.

⁷ Zetzel 1982, p.98.

The Satires

Horace burst into the spotlight after winning over Maecenas. He no longer was a common poet; the satirical poems placed him in the midst of one of the most revered literary and social circles of Rome. Yet, this is merely how Horace is portraying the events. The conversational style of the *Satires* gives them the appearance of biographical insight, when in reality, they are purposefully and artfully crafted. In the *Satires*, he gives the impression that critics thought climb to fame came out of greed and unchecked ambition.⁸ There was also the potential argument of hypocrisy as Horace “climbs the social ladder by poking fun at social climbers.”⁹ Some modern scholars are quick to pick-up on the presence of critics and place Horace in an unflattering light.¹⁰ Lyne goes so far to say that Horace “solicited and won the patronage of Maecenas.”¹¹ Horace establishes the appearance of critics as an occasion to defend his image.

Select poems serve to pre-empt accusations he viewed as “wrong,” and explain why Maecenas was desirous as an *amicus*.¹² Each book presents a different approach to defending Horace’s social status. In the first collection, Horace attempts to demonstrate that it was Maecenas’ insight into Horace’s moral character, not his appreciation of Horace’s poetry, which led to his rise to fame. This focus distances himself from his patron as a way to avoid the appearance of dependency. In the second, Horace distances himself from the face he develops in the first book of *Sermones* as he showcases his proximity and loyalty to Maecenas in a non-

⁸ Oliensis 1998, p.40-41.

⁹ Oliensis 1998, p.18.

¹⁰ Lyne (1995) and Fraenkel (1995).

¹¹ Lyne 1995, p.13.

¹² Lyne 1995, p.14.

political capacity. At the same time, each publication serves Horace's face-management by elevating the status and ideals of the circle of Maecenas.

The clearest example of Horace's use of faces in the first book of *Sermones* is poem 1.6. Horace is directing much of his message not at Maecenas, whom he directly addresses, but rather those critics who are "over-reading." Horace implies that it was his upstanding moral code rather than parasitism or ambition that led him to Maecenas' circle. Horace demonstrates his passivity in the process when he writes, *magnum hoc ego duco, quod placui tibi, qui turpi secernis honestum non patre praeclaro, sed vita et pectore puro*.¹³ Here, Horace reinforces that fact that he did not actively seek out this *amicitia*. Instead, Horace portrays himself as someone whom Maecenas just so happened to deem worthy as he was *vita et pectore puro*. The humility and inaction shown here are the hallmarks of a recurring face in the *Sermones*. On a basic level, Horace therefore shows his critics that he cannot be labeled an ambitious social climber if he is not purposefully seeking Maecenas. On a more substantial level however, Horace hides behind the grand image of Maecenas by depicting him as a person who only accepts as friends those who embody good Roman values. Since Maecenas deemed Horace virtuous, any attacks on Horace's unworthiness therefore accuse Maecenas of "moral laxity."¹⁴ While Horace may be a viable target of criticism, Maecenas is undoubtedly far too formidable a foe.

Even though Horace does not fully reveal this face until the sixth poem, he certainly begins its creation far earlier. Horace famously begins his *Sermones* asking Maecenas why no man is content with his lot.¹⁵ Taken in conjunction with the self-effacement of 1.6, the question

¹³ Hor. *Serm.* 1.6.62-64, "I consider it a great honor, that I have pleased you, who discern honest from foul, not from the fame of a father, but from a blameless life and heart."

¹⁴ Oliensis 1998, p.32.

¹⁵ Hor. *Serm.* 1.1.1-3.

begins to frame Horace as the passive poet who could never be accused of rising in the social ranks by writing poetry. Oliensis attributes this sense of complacency to Horace's father when she writes, "What the son inherits from the father is thus not only modest material sufficiency but also the moral equipment he needs to rest happily in that sufficiency. Far from enabling Horace to scale social heights, satire figures here as a leash binding him to his lowly beginnings."¹⁶ Though it may just be a face he puts on, this disavowal of ambition gives Horace the moral authority he needs to satirize his subjects effectively.

Horace even goes so far to simulate a conversation between a pest trying to gain access to Maecenas' circle and himself, giving Horace a chance to correct misperceptions of the group. Horace portrays himself as peacefully attempting to get the interlocutor to leave for the first portion of the poem.¹⁷ However, somewhat unexpectedly, the interlocutor jumps in and asks *Maecenas quomodo tecum*, triggering Horace to insinuate that the pest would not be allowed into the circle.¹⁸ Here, the pest takes on the argument of Horace's critics as he remarks *nemo dexterius fortuna est usus*.¹⁹ Here, the implication is that Horace is an ambitious parasite. By framing this as a question, Horace is able to provide a clear response. In a somewhat passionate outbreak, perhaps to emphasize his loyalty to Maecenas, Horace argues:

*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.*

¹⁶ Oliensis 1998, p.25.

¹⁷ Hor. *Serm.* 1.9.1-43.

¹⁸ Hor. *Serm.* 1.9.1-43, "How stands Maecenas with you?" and Oliensis 1995, p.37-8.

¹⁹ Hor. *Serm.* 1.9.45, "No one has made more skillful use of his opportunity [than you]."

We do not live there in such terms that you think. There is no house more pure than this; it never offends me, I tell you, if another man is richer or more cultured than I am; each one of us has his own place.²⁰

Once again, Horace's focus on moral cleanliness, as evident by *purior*, reinforces the idea that access to Maecenas requires worthy character.²¹ It is for this reason that Horace is "in" and the pest is "out."

This conversation also highlights how Horace can manipulate references to Maecenas to fit his own agenda. In this poem, Horace does not himself bring Maecenas into the conversation, but instead the interlocutor. This is a calculated maneuver as Horace wants to defend himself without appearing too indebted to Maecenas. As Lyne suggests, one of the major "embarrassments" Horace must over-come with his face-management is the stigma of dependence.²² Therefore, Horace uses the mock conversation to get "a chance to act the part of faithful friend" and can fulfill his duty to Maecenas of idealizing his circle of friends.²³ Much like with the faces seen so far in the satires, Horace employs a passive self-effacement in support of his patron. The character of Horace in 1.9 does not go out with the intention of defending Maecenas name, but is willing to do so if necessity arises. This passivity gives Horace a distance from Maecenas while still giving an impression of cordiality. As is evident in the next collection of *Sermones*, Horace eventually works to close the physical distance between himself and Maecenas.

²⁰ Hor. *Serm.* 1.9.48-52.

²¹ Lyne 1995, p.15.

²² Lyne p.13.

²³ Oliensis 1998, p.39.

At the time when he published the second book of *Sermones*, Horace had a fair amount of fame and recognition due to his poetry and his association with Maecenas. Certainly, the reception of his first book of satires led to literary success. On the other hand, the social success of his *amicitia* with Maecenas, and by extension Augustus, was something he fiercely rejected in his first book. At the beginning of satire 2.1, it is clear that this is no longer the case as Horace mentions Caesar three different times.²⁴ Rather than shy away from acknowledging his ties to his patron, Horace attempts to highlight the connection. Horace portrays himself as a loyal companion who is able to socialize at the high level Maecenas demands. While this is in direct contrast to the face Horace developed in the first *Sermones*, Horace still uses the face to respond to potential criticisms.

As with the first book of *Sermones*, the sixth poem provides the clearest path to Horace's face management. The placement of this poem in the collection is certainly no coincidence. Horace is trying to get his readers to think back to 1.6 and how far he has come since his initial meeting with Maecenas.²⁵ Horace portrays his day not as a quiet wandering but a boisterous bustle, going from obligation to obligation. He is moving so fast that one passerby remarks, *tu pulses omne quod obstat ad Maecenatem memori si mente recurras?*²⁶ Horace does not take this as an insult, but instead relishes the attention as he writes *hoc iuvat et melli est, non mentiar.*²⁷ Even though he may be running about, he shows in this deferential complement that he enjoys his current status with Maecenas. The choice of *recurras* as implying that Horace is not just "running" but "returning" to Maecenas adds to the image of Horace as a loyal companion.

²⁴ Hor. *Serm.* 2.1.11, 19, and 84.

²⁵ Oliensis 1998, p.40.

²⁶ Hor. *Serm.* 2.6.30-1. "Would you push aside everything which stands in your way if you're racing to Maecenas, with your mind mindful of him?"

²⁷ Hor. *Serm.* 2.6.32. "That pleases me and it is like honey, I won't lie."

Critics could read this eagerness as a sign of hierarchy – that Maecenas is forcing Horace to run about and do work for him. Horace dispels any thought of these accusations here in a conversation with another interlocutor. As he gets close to Maecenas’ estate, a passerby asks him to try and get Maecenas to sign some documents. Horace ends up commenting that it has been around eight years since Maecenas made him a “friend,” or at least to the extent that he would bring Horace along for carriage rides and ask him about the time, weather, and sports.²⁸ This exchange demonstrates a combination of discretion and a distinct lack of political intentions. While the interlocutor is convinced Horace is privy to political secrets, Horace corrects him, explaining how his conversations with Maecenas are trivial. Horace makes the distinction that while he is as close to Maecenas as possible socially, he is as far removed as possible politically. This stems from Horace’s past “political embarrassment” when he fought for Brutus. Rather than side with Maecenas and leave himself vulnerable to the charge of being a “turn-coat”, Horace shows that he “has left politics entirely: no career, no interest, no knowledge.”²⁹ Horace does make the same case in Sat. 1.5 when he artfully neglects to include any talk of politics, however the openness he shows in 2.6 demonstrates a direct contrast of strategies. Nevertheless, the image of Maecenas that Horace is fashioning is not that of a political figure, but that of refinement and culture.

In the rest of the *Sermones*, Horace both reinforces his social connectedness to Maecenas and also distances himself from appearing indebted to his patron. In Satire 2.8, Horace attends a dinner party with Maecenas as the guest of honor. The poem is less about the gossip of the state, but more of a window into Horace’s satiric process as well as a discussion of social values.

²⁸ Hor. *Serm.* 2.6.40-45.

²⁹ Lyne 1995, p.20.

Although Horace does not utilize Maecenas' voice in the poem, he names him twice and has Maecenas' companions as central figures of the story which reminds the audience of his presence at the dinner. The humor of Fundanius' comedy and Nasidienus' calamity demonstrate the sort of lightness that Horace has while around Maecenas.³⁰ This face is an attempt to portray Maecenas as a likeable figure, but also to attempt to level the disparity between patron and client. By demonstrating himself as a friendly figure, Horace hopes his audience sees him as more of a friend than the stylized *amicus* would imply. In addition to this, at the start of 2.6, Horace opens by thanking fortune for his Sabine estate. Instead of thanking his patron, Horace writes, *auctius atque di melius fecere*.³¹ By removing Maecenas from the equation, Horace distances himself from critics who could argue that he is too indebted financially to his patron. Towards the end of that satire, Horace hints at the face he will develop in his later works – that of an independent socialite.

The Odes

Before launching into his poetry, it is necessary to reevaluate Horace's standing in Rome when he published the *Odes*. In the same year as publishing his second book of *Sermones*, Horace released what he called the *Iambi*, lyric poetry imbued with ridicule and a sense of political crisis.³² These poems began Horace's career in lyric poetry, a genre that had been dominated by the Greeks. In these *Iambi*, or as we refer to them, the *Epodes*, Horace addresses the first and ninth poems to Maecenas. Horace dons a face of political despair regarding the

³⁰ Oliensis 1998, p.48.

³¹ Hor. *Serm.*2.6.3-4. "The gods have done for me more and better."

³² Garrison 1991, p.10.

battle of Actium and provides his patron with one of hope.³³ By doing so, Horace channels “political optimism” through Maecenas and firmly points to Augustus as the “solution all men look to.”³⁴ This political backdrop was still relevant at the time Horace published his *Odes*. This is a major reason why Horace spends most of his *Odes* celebrating Augustus and his triumphs.

While Horace may take on this face of a supporter of Augustus in some poems, it is not the main face Horace develops when discussing Maecenas. This seemingly bolder, more confident Horace uses poems to Maecenas to showcase his literary agenda of refashioning Greek lyric. In order to make lyric distinctly Roman, Horace weaves it together with the “same spatial and moral mastery that underwrites Roman imperialism.”³⁵ Horace thus portrays his acquired *auctoritas* over lyric poetry in parallel to Augustus’ consolidation of power. In this light, as Oliensis suggests, Horace embraces the idea of the “imperial poet.”³⁶ To manage this face, Horace portrays himself as a powerful equal to Maecenas. This face primarily manifests itself in *Odes* which mention Maecenas to insist on self-sufficiency. Horace takes the idea of resiliency from *Sermones* 2.8 and pushes it to the extreme in his *Odes*. No longer does Horace merely dine alone as in 2.8, but now he depicts himself as having the power to invite Maecenas over to dine. The three “invitation poems,” *Odes* 1.20, 3.8, and 3.29, showcase Horace’s physical and philosophical independence from his patron.³⁷

In *Odes* 1.20, Horace beseeches Maecenas to drink his own, cheap wine as a means to highlight Horace’s modesty. When Horace claims *vile potabis modicis Sabinum / cantharis*, he essentially skips over the invitation, launching right into how Maecenas *potabis* or “will drink”

³³ See Hor. *Epodes* 1.1-4 and 9.2-3 as examples of the portrayals of despair and joy respectfully.

³⁴ G. Williams 1982, p.14.

³⁵ Oliensis 1998, p.102.

³⁶ Oliensis 1998, p.103.

³⁷ I follow Lyne (1998, p.106) in referring to these particular *Odes* as “invitation poems.”

the wine Horace provides.³⁸ By skipping a formal invitation, Horace fashions himself as such a close companion to Maecenas that he doesn't need to even ask his patron to come over, but rather, as the future tense of *potabis* suggests, demands that he come. As compared to the *Caecubum... uvam*³⁹ or a Falernian wine Maecenas may be accustomed to, Horace provides wine that is *vile* which, as Garrison points out, is "cheap, not vile or distasteful."⁴⁰ Through this portrayal of his wine as inherently cheaper, Horace is making a statement of deference to Maecenas' wealth and independence. On the one hand, Horace is offering Maecenas some homely wine, packaged in Greek jars, which can be construed as a metaphor for his lyric poetry.⁴¹ On the other hand, Horace shows his audience that he can get away with offering Maecenas cheap wine and not offend his patron. In a society with fairly rigid social practices and hierarchies, this action demonstrates an apparent equality between Maecenas and Horace.⁴² The use of *potabis* and this emphasis on evenness demonstrate "the underlying message: after all due deference, Maecenas and Horace are sufficiently on a level to be drinking buddies."⁴³ I disagree with Lyne's implication that Horace's message indicates "friendship," but rather assert that this portrayal of the pair as "drinking buddies" is a strategy utilized in Horace's face-management.

Take for example the other "invitation poems." In 3.8, Horace gives himself the face of a powerful friend of Maecenas when he invites his patron to celebrate the day he narrowly escaped death. Tactfully delaying the name of his addressee, Horace implores Maecenas to join in the intimate celebration: *Sume, Maecenas, cyathos amici / sospitis centum*.⁴⁴ The delayed, informal

³⁸ Hor. *Odes* 1.20.1-2, "You will drink cheap wine from modest containers at my Sabine villa"

³⁹ Hor. *Odes* 1.20.9-10, "Caecubian wine."

⁴⁰ Garrison 1991, p. 233.

⁴¹ Hor. *Odes* 1.20.2-3.

⁴² Lyne 1995, p.108

⁴³ Lyne 1995, p.109.

⁴⁴ Hor. *Odes* 3.8.13, "Drink up, Maecenas, a hundred cups for your unharmed *friend*."

address indicates that Horace views himself as intimate with Maecenas.⁴⁵ Unlike in the *Sermones* in which Horace was hesitant to imply that Maecenas showed any affection towards Maecenas, Horace now places himself in the position of an *amicus* of Maecenas. Horace not only depicts himself as a “friend” of Maecenas literally, but also portrays himself as having a good enough relationship with Maecenas to advise him when it is appropriate to remove political thoughts from his mind.⁴⁶ As much as Horace is deferential in his complements of Maecenas’ cultural acuity and great political abilities, he also is celebrating his own greatness. Horace depicts Maecenas “as the great man, but Horace presents himself on intimate terms with the great. There is discreet flattery here for [Horace] himself, as well as for his great addressee.”⁴⁷ This “discreet flattery for himself” emphasizes that Horace is not just focused on stylizing his relationship with Maecenas, but also his own personal image-management.

This same face appears once more in 3.29, the “grand Maecenas Ode”⁴⁸ in which Horace manipulates the theme of independence sown in the previous invitation poems to cement his image as self-sufficient. In by far the most famous of the three invitations, Horace requests Maecenas *eripe te morae* and, as in 3.8, leave behind *beatae / fumum et opes strepitumque Romae*.⁴⁹ Horace emphasizes his own satisfaction and the motif of *carpe diem* by highlighting how:

*Mundaeque parvo sub lare pauperum
cenae sine aulaelis et ostro
sollicitam explicuere frontem*

⁴⁵ Lyne 1995, p.111.

⁴⁶ Hor. *Odes*. 3.8.25-26.

⁴⁷ Lyne 1995, p.111.

⁴⁸ Bowditch 2001, p.161.

⁴⁹ Hor. *Odes* 3.29.5, “Seize yourself from your delay” and 3.29.11-12, “the smoke, the riches, and commotion of prosperous Rome.”

Under the humble roof of poor men, without
tapestries and purple, refined meals unfurl a worried
brow.⁵⁰

Not only does Horace tout the power of the “refined” life in contrast to the *strepitum Romae*, but he also appears at ease mentally. Unlike one with a *sollicitam...frontem*, a phrase Horace indirectly aims at Maecenas, the peace and independence the Sabine farm gives Horace a sense of worthwhile satisfaction. At this level, Horace once more uses the face of the host as a means of claiming distance from Maecenas.

Unexpectedly however, Horace diverges from ending with the invitation, and “embarks on a detached philosophical meditation.”⁵¹ While much of Horace’s face-management up to this point has consisted of elevating his stature in relationship to Maecenas physically, Horace here signifies another layer of differentiation. Though Horace is not explicitly contrasting his philosophical beliefs with Maecenas when he launches into his discussion of Fortune and the *prudens*,⁵² he adds a new face to his repertoire to strengthen his public image. While many of Horace’s poems to Maecenas see him enter into a didactic mode “directed not as his patron but as an unspecified ‘you’, Horace, albeit through the deference of a subordinate, targets Maecenas directly.⁵³ Therefore, Horace appears in this poem as a self-assertive thinker, one who can respectfully make fun of Maecenas. As already seen, other poems suggest that Horace would often joke and jab at Maecenas in a playful manner, but would never actually show Horace doing it. In this *Ode*, Horace is educating Maecenas on how to seize the day and enjoy the simpler

⁵⁰ Hor. *Odes* 3.29.14-16.

⁵¹ Bowditch 2001, p.161.

⁵² Hor. *Odes* 3.29.29.

⁵³ Oliensis 1998, 167.

pleasures in life, crafting a juxtaposition between the country and Rome, patron and client that will become essential in the *Epistles*. As Horace wraps himself in his cloak of virtue,⁵⁴ a reference to the philosopher's cloak,⁵⁵ he demonstrates to the public audience that not only does Horace have the standing and authority with Maecenas to invite him to drink, but he also is close enough to chide him so clearly. In this way, Horace definitively places himself on the same level as his patron in the eyes of his audience. The invitation poems therefore suggest that while they may appear to be examples of friendship between Horace and Maecenas, Horace manipulates his own image to appear on par with his patron. In doing so, Horace both rebukes his critics and portrays himself as the master of his Roman lyric domain - the true imperial poet.

The Epistles

The *Epistles* catch Horace snared between several opposing spheres of influence. They see Horace secluded in his countryside estate, and explaining his absence from the city and its elite. These poems, structurally crafted as letters, resemble the style of the *Satires* as “both kinds are conversational... they deal with human foibles and frailties, discuss philosophic principles, open windows upon the poet's domestic circle, and give us incidents and scenes from daily life.”⁵⁶ Like the *Sermones*, the conversational style of the *Epistles* have an engaging tone that hints at biographical truth.

While the *Satires* were concerned with defending a blossoming public image, Horace had accrued much symbolic capital at the point at which he published the *Epistles*. The Horace of *Odes* 3.29, cloaked in his Stoic virtue, serves as the foreshadowing for the face Horace dons in

⁵⁴ Hor. *Odes* 3.29.54-55, *Mea virtute me involvo* or, “I cloaked myself with my virtue.”

⁵⁵ Garrison 1991, p.337.

⁵⁶ Fairclough 1926, p. xxi.

the *Epistles*. The continuation of Horace's face into the *Epistles* "points to a diachronic development, stretching from the first three books of the *Odes* into the *Epistles*, of Horace's relationship with Maecenas."⁵⁷ While there certainly is a progressive quality to Horace's use of image-management, Horace is faced with new struggles in the *Epistles* that alter how he shapes his faces. As McCarter summarizes, this face exemplifies "profound ambivalence toward public and private, engagement and withdrawal, and independence and obligation."⁵⁸ This struggle is over the amount of *libertas* (or freedom) - with regards to philosophy, friendship, poetry, and location - that works best for "a successful poet and associate of Maecenas - or any ambitious man in 20 B.C.E."⁵⁹ Of these areas Horace explores, his discussions on the liberties associated with *amicitia* are of critical interest to understanding Horace's handling of Maecenas.

In the *Odes*, Horace portrayed himself as independent from Maecenas as means to stifle criticism about being a *cliens*. Presumably, this concern still existed for Horace as evidenced by the overarching theme of *libertas*. However, as the collection as a whole suggests, Horace moves from "an uncompromising view of freedom to one that is characterized by moderation and adaptability."⁶⁰ Horace shifts away from the extremes and attempts to find the balanced mean. For Horace, the *Epistles* as a whole represent the quest for moderation in all aspects of life. In the poems directed at Maecenas, Horace does not examine necessarily his own *amicitia*, but uses his patron as a character to explore the larger idea of stylized friendship. Horace centers several of the *Epistles* on Maecenas to add a biographical authority to Horace's broader debate about *amicitia*. In addition, Horace uses the poems addressed to Maecenas as a way of advocating poetic *libertas*. This allows Horace to continue to demonstrate to critics that he is not reliant on

⁵⁷ Bowditch 2001, 162.

⁵⁸ McCarter 2015, p.3.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ McCarter 2015, p.23.

Maecenas' good fortune. I therefore argue that Horace depicts himself as seeking freedom from Maecenas in the *Epistles* not out of resentment of the *amicitia* but rather as one side to a larger discussion on balance in patronage relationships.

Before even delving into the actual poetry, the structure of the *Epistles* helps to elucidate the implications of Horace's faces. At the most basic level, the poems of the *Epistles* are structured as letters - "a piece of written communication addressed to a person."⁶¹ Letters inherently have two subject positions, the speaker and the addressed. The letter is therefore the ideal vessel to examine the dyadic relationships between the patron and *protégé*, city life and the countryside.⁶² This focus on the dyadic removes all others besides the speaker and addressee from the apparent audience. I do not suggest here that these poems were intended as letters for Maecenas' eyes only, but rather that Horace artfully manipulates his face and message to suggest as much.⁶³ Horace attempts to create the appearance of a highly personal piece of correspondence between himself and his *amicus* in the hopes of bolstering the personal allure of the poems. In doing so, by merely structuring his poem as a personal correspondence to Maecenas, Horace creates an autobiographical subjectivity that represents the basis of his face in the *Epistles*.

The actual content of Horace's *Epistles* to Maecenas relies upon the style of the *recusatio* to depict himself as a self-reliant poet capable of success without suggestion or influence of his patron. As a poet with many accomplishments, Horace can rely upon his obtained social capital

⁶¹ *Oxford English Dictionary*, 3rd ed. 4a.

⁶² Bowditch 2001, p.167.

⁶³ There is dissention among scholars on whether or not the letters are "real." Bowditch (2001, p.163-4) summarizes the main arguments from both sides of the issue, citing the development of the arguments in footnotes 3 through 5. I specifically agree with her assertion that the letters had "an effect on readers other than those specifically addressed." I would add that if the letters were supposed to be written for specific addressees only, they would most likely not employ the same literary style of the *Sermones* which was clearly intended for public eyes.

to partake in such explorations that have such large potential consequences. Oliensis cleverly portrays *Epistles* 1.1 and 1.7 as “testing the elasticity of the strings attaching Horace to Maecenas.”⁶⁴ Horace begins his first *Epistle* in a way that captures the essence of this struggle, as he compares himself to a freed gladiator when he asks Maecenas, *spectatum satis et donatum iam rude quaeris, Maecenas, iterum antiquo me includere ludo?*⁶⁵ This dedicatory *recusatio* forces Maecenas to consider whether Horace has fulfilled all of his duties as a *cliens*. Certainly, this may appear to be a question to Maecenas regarding how much debt Horace still has to pay off. Given the indeterminate nature of exchange within an *amicitia*, “a friend can never be sure that he has paid off his debt.”⁶⁶ However, several lines later Horace subtly demonstrates that his purpose will not be to challenge *his* patron specifically but rather to examine the nature of *amicitia* in a philosophical sense. In what can be interpreted as his purpose in the *Epistles*, Horace writes, *nunc itaque et versus et cetera ludicra pono; quid verum atque decens curo et rogo et omnis in hoc sum.*⁶⁷ No longer will Horace write in lyrics or about *ludicra* or “playful toys,” but rather will seek what is *verum atque decens*. These lines treat *amicitia* with the same broad philosophical approach as with other topics in the preceding poems.

The action of putting aside lyric poetry suggests a focus particularly on the *libertas* of the poet. The transition away from *versus et cetera ludicra* of lyric poetry to the epistolary genre seems to imply that Maecenas asked Horace to write more lyric. Horace argues here that the mode of lyric poetry is not suited for the wandering nature of philosophical meditation.⁶⁸ By

⁶⁴ Oliensis 1998, p.155.

⁶⁵ Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.1-2, “Maecenas, do you ask me to lock myself up once more in my former gladiator school, after I have already fought enough and have been presented with the wooden sword?”

⁶⁶ Oliensis 1998, p.155.

⁶⁷ Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.10-11, “And so I place aside both my verses and all other playful toys; my care and my consideration is that which is right and proper and in that pursuit I am wholly engaged.”

⁶⁸ Lyne 1995, p.145.

stating that he is focusing on *quid verum atque decens*, Horace frames his poems as the results of his philosophical inquiries. Horace thus changes his face from the *vates* of the *Odes* to a *praeceptor* or “teacher of philosophy.”⁶⁹ At the end of the poem, the *praeceptor* aspect of Horace’s face appears clearly when Maecenas laughs if Horace appears with a bad haircut or garment.⁷⁰ However, when Horace comes to Maecenas with erratic thoughts, he gets no response. Here, Horace assumes “the independent voice of the philosopher... [and] teaches his patron to care for his protégé less as a public beneficiary or client... and more as a private friend.”⁷¹ Through this didactic scene, Horace elevates his authority as a *praeceptor* by placing Maecenas in the role of the student. At the same time, he maintains his obligatory deference to Maecenas by referring to Maecenas as *rerum tutela mearum*.⁷² As evident from the previous chapter, language such as this cannot be construed to imply friendship but is a calculated way of highlighting the gift exchange of patronage. In that sense, Horace offers what is more of an obligatory compliment than a statement of adoration.

In *Epistle* 1.7, Horace once more utilizes a *recusatio* and the face of the disgruntled *praeceptor* to further demonstrate his preference for total *libertas*. Horace openly admits to denying Maecenas’ request that he come to Rome as he bluntly writes, *quinque dies tibi pollicitus me rure futurum Sextilem totum mendax desideror*.⁷³ Horace goes further and asks for Maecenas’ indulgence to remain in the countryside when Horace feels sick, as it is city life that can make the poet ill.⁷⁴ Here, Horace reemphasizes the dichotomy of the country and the city, patron and

⁶⁹ Bowditch 2001, p.167.

⁷⁰ Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.94-105.

⁷¹ Bowditch 2001, p.177.

⁷² Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.103-4, “Though you are the keeper of all of my things.”

⁷³ Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.1-2, “I promised to you that I would be away five days in the countryside, I, a liar, missed the whole month of August.”

⁷⁴ Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.3-5.

poet, playing along with the dyadic nature of the epistle. At a basic level, the refusal to come to Rome at Maecenas' request expresses an extreme case of *libertas*. However if you apply Horace's message to a broader discussion on *amicitia*, it becomes clear that Horace is focusing on the way in which a patron summons a client. Lyne suggests that "1.7 insists on the discretion with which a great man should impose his wishes on an *amicus* who is far from abjectly *humilis*... Horace the *amicus* feels empowered to insist on certain rights."⁷⁵ I agree with Lyne's assessment, however, I suggest that while Horace may be advocating for "certain rights," he is not specifically asking that Maecenas grant him these rights. In addition to his claims about granting lenience to a poet, Horace maintains his *praeceptor* face for the rest of the poem where he includes a list of short stories. In each of these stories, Horace portrays characters, such as the boorish Calabarian host, who are used as *exempla* for how and how not to have a successful *amicitia*. It is essential to remember that while it may be tempting to interpret Horace's themes as historical opinions, "these attitudes have been carefully crafted by Horace to reflect and advance his epistolary themes... rather than to reflect reality."⁷⁶ Therefore, Horace primarily uses Maecenas to add believability and authority, teasing readers with a glimpse into the inner circle.

Horace's epistolary persona is certainly the culmination of a lifetime's worth of service. Horace implies this when he tells Maecenas that the only way he would never leave his patron is through the return of lost youth.⁷⁷ In the *Epistles* the discussion on friendship attempts to find balance between total poetic independence and a strict vertical relationship which McCarter goes so far to call slavery.⁷⁸ In the poems mentioning Maecenas, Horace skillfully focuses on the

⁷⁵ Lyne 1995, p.150.

⁷⁶ McCarter 2015, p.21.

⁷⁷ Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.25-28.

⁷⁸ McCarter 2015, p.21.

libertas side of the scale, maintaining the voice established in the *Odes*. Also, Horace does so out of deference. Had he painted Maecenas in a way that supported a rigid patron-client division, this would reflect extremely poorly on both Maecenas' and Horace's public images. Horace's association with Maecenas gives him credibility and adds to his growing fame. For Maecenas, part of his legacy is his adoption of protégés. Therefore, Maecenas' success is inextricably connected to Horace's continued fame and role as Maecenas' protégé. Horace saves his discussion of limitations on *libertas* for other epistles, such as 1.17 and 1.18, which I will discuss in more depth in the following chapter.

Throughout Horace's corpus, the role of the authorial tone clearly remains focused on protecting Horace's public image even though the faces themselves change. The multitude of complex faces Horace utilizes hinders our ability to make generalizations about his face-management. However, what is abundantly clear is that these faces primarily serve as a literary tool. Therefore, it is incorrect to interpret Horace's faces as anything but carefully crafted poetry.

Why then do scholars so often attempt to read Horace's poetic face as a manifestation of his own inner self? I hypothesize that it is due to the autobiographical elements Horace utilizes in his poetry. Horace adds what Bowditch refers to as "a seductive believability" to his work by seeming to give his audience a taste of his personal life.⁷⁹ These elements, in addition to the colloquial tone of the *Satires* and *Epistles*, lead scholars and readers to conclude they are witnessing Horace's true confessions. However, this is merely a literary tactic; it is therefore impossible to distinguish between the opinions of the historical poet and the fictionalized "Horace." For these reasons, I assert that, though tempting, the poems in which Maecenas is

⁷⁹ Bowditch 2001, p.10.

directly mentioned cannot be used as firm evidence of Horace's prevailing attitude toward his patron.

Other *Amicitiae* in Horace's Poetry

Due to the nature of poetry, the absence of a figure can signify as much as the inclusion of the same figure. Poems excluding Maecenas therefore deserve the same scrupulous analysis as poems including his name. While it may be essential to use these poems to investigate the nuances of the *amicitia*, it is not practical to do so using every poem that does not mention Maecenas. However, Horace makes *amicitia* a literary theme throughout several poems. He includes *exempla* of poets outside of himself and addresses their failing attempts to win over a *magnus amicus*. Not surprisingly, these examples come at the end of his collection in the *Epistles*. In poems 1.17 and 1.18 McCarter suggests that Horace “proves the most outstanding exemplar for independence in social relationships” is himself.¹ While McCarter finds that, “Horace’s advice... must be taken earnestly,” there are those scholars who contend that the voice is for comedic effect.² For example, McCarter credits Fraenkel, Oliensis, and Perret as believing the poems to be “true satire, from the first line to the last.”³ I assert that no matter the reading, the poems demonstrate a focus on the limitations of an *amicitia*. Specifically, Horace focuses on the restricted freedoms of the poet.

The lessons which Horace teaches to lesser men highlight the advantages—economic, social, and philosophical—one can receive from patronage. However, the poems also make clear the constraints that are placed upon the poet to reap such benefits. McCarter argues that Horace’s focus on the liberties of the poet is one aspect of a larger theme of *libertas* and *servitus*.⁴ While

¹ McCarter 2015, p.190.

² McCarter 2015 p.190. Reckford (1959, p.206) argues that the resentment Horace shows may be genuine, but does not reflect upon his relationship with Maecenas. On the other hand, in footnote 8 on the same page, McCarter cites interpretations by Moles, Traina, Mayer, and Johnson as supporting the claim that these poems must be interpreted as satire.

³ McCarter 2015, p.191-192.

⁴ McCarter 2015, p.3.

McCarter limits her argument to the Horace of the *Epistles*, the question becomes whether or not the same theme can be found throughout the rest of his works. One poem in particular, *Epistle* 2.2, offers an alternative way to view such restrictions. In the poem, Horace compares himself to a minimally talented slave who was requested to provide certain poetry and failed. Horace embodies the perspective of both the slave and the slave-master, melding together the patron-client relationship with that of the master and slave. While McCarter argues throughout her book that Horace is weighing freedom with an abstract *servitus*, this poem concretely links Horace's position and slavery. This creates the possibility of interpreting the slave-master relationship in all of Horace's corpus as a metaphor for *amicitia*.

Both poems referencing slavery and the *Epistles* about patronage emphasize the limited *libertas* of the poet. What the poems do not contain are instances of the affectionate behavior associated with friendship. There are no examples of Cicero's *alter ego* or other such ideals. This does not indicate that a patron-client relationship could not also assume the shape of friendship. Instead, it shows that Horace is choosing not to focus on the affection within a patron-client relationship but instead the constraints a patron places on a poet. As I have argued in the previous chapters, it would be a mistake to read this representation of *amicitia* as a manifestation of Horace's opinions on his own relationship with Maecenas. However, this portrayal is significant as it reinforces the fact that, throughout his corpus, Horace does not necessarily depict the patron-client relationship in a way that we would call friendship.

The Amicitiae of Epistles 1.17 and 1.18

Horace uses his *Epistles* to weigh the amounts *libertas* and *servitus* in an ideal patronal relationship. Poems 1.1 and 1.7 depict Horace expressing total *libertas* as he portrays himself both refusing to accept Maecenas' demands and remaining isolated in the countryside. These first two "Maecenas" epistles combine with 1.17 and 1.18 to frame the general question of what is the best level of freedom for a poet to strive for in *amicitia*. Horace shows restraint in 1.17 and 1.18 as he argues that a middle ground is preferable to the isolation that comes with unyielding independence. In 1.17, Horace shows there are benefits to being a *cliens* and how one can maximize these benefits. In 1.18, Horace strives to investigate what compromises the "middle path" in arguing that outspoken *libertas* and criticism of a patron makes you no worthier an *amicus* than a *servus*. In each of these poems, Horace's focus is on how to win over a great man, not the affection that could develop between patron and client.

In 1.17, Horace teaches his addressees both that the client that asks for less and the most adaptable client get the most from their patron in order to show how to maintain one's equanimity in an *amicitia*. At the beginning of the poem, Horace beseeches his addressee Scaeva to "learn the lessons of your humble friend, who must also learn himself, as if a blind man that wants to point out the way."⁵ Here, Horace asserts himself as a teacher, but qualifies his experience by comparing himself as one who "must learn himself." The persona anticipates the teaching of a lesson via an *exemplum*, which is exactly what occurs. Horace uses the incident between the philosopher Aristippus and the Cynic Diogenes to show how the best course is moderate social interaction and attendance upon the elite. This debate is framed by the

⁵ Hor. *Ep.*1.17.3-4, *Disce, docendus adhuc quae censet amicus, ut si caecus iter monstrare velit.*

connection these two men have to wealthy patrons and centers on Aristippus and Diogenes debating freedoms. The core issue is that of dependency, as Aristippus claims, *scurror ego ipse mihi, populo tu: rectius hoc et splendidius multo est... tu poscis vilia rerum, dante minor, quamvis fers te nullius egentem.*⁶ Here, Aristippus uses the word *scurror* or “I act like a foolish parasite” to show that both he and Diogenes depend upon others. Horace uses this to set up his critique of Diogenes, in claiming that his version of parasitism lowers his autonomy and virtue as he begs the crowd for everything he needs. On the other hand, Horace remarks to Scaevus *accedes siccus ad unctum* or “you ought to approach a rich table when thirsty.”⁷ The moderation Horace argues for is a reasonable amount of social interaction combined with restraint in asking for favors.⁸ Rather than shun all excess and lavish dinners, Horace argues for, and has shown throughout his poetry, that attendance at dinners is required.

Towards the end of the poem, Horace advises Scaeva to distinguish himself from a parasitic beggar by keeping quiet about his needs. Horace argues that the quiet *cliens* gets more when he writes, *coram rege suo de paupertate tacentes plus poscente ferent. Distat, sumasne pudenter an rapias...sed tacitus pasci si posset corvus, haberet plus dapis et rixae multo minus invidiaeque.*⁹ This passage critically acknowledges both that “being a *cliens* has a financial motive” and that Horace knows “how to maximize benefactions.”¹⁰ First, Horace is not ultimately claiming that absolute silence is ideal, but rather the illusion of silence. As Oliensis suggests, “it is crucial for a client (not to be but) to appear uninterested in gifts if he is (not to be

⁶ Hor. *Ep.* 1.17.19-22, “I am a parasite for myself, you for the crowd. What I do is better and finer by far...you beg for the cheapest of things, thus lesser than the giver, even though you claim that you need nobody.”

⁷ Hor. *Ep.* 1.17.12.

⁸ McCarter 2015, p.194.

⁹ Hor. *Ep.* 43-44, 50-51, “The ones quiet about their poverty in the presence of their patron will get more than the beggar. There is a difference whether you wisely acquire or snatch greedily... but if the crow could eat quietly, he would have more meat and much less conflict and envy.”

¹⁰ McCarter 2015, p.201.

but) to appear worthy of them.”¹¹ It is clear that Horace embodies this, especially in his *Sermones*, as he made a point “of never asking Maecenas for any material thing” and “succeeded nonetheless, as everyone knew, in profiting from Maecenas’ patronage.”¹² The important implication here is that Horace is advocating a method through which Scaeva can not only retain his honor but also get *plus* from being *coram rege*.¹³ There is ambiguity whether the term *plus* refers specifically to financial gain or something more informal such as trust and admiration from the patron.¹⁴ No matter what *plus* implies, this passage demonstrates a focus on the material benefits of the patron-client relationship.

The persona of the *praeceptor* implies that Horace himself has learned these behaviors. His self-comparison to a *caecus* at the start of the poem suggests that though Horace knows much, he is still perfecting a way of maintaining equanimity in his relationship with Maecenas. In addition to this, Horace is humbly attempting to convince his audience that he in fact an *exemplum* for ideal *cliens* behavior. This naturally causes one to ponder whether the way Horace behaves as a client in his previous poems is itself an *exemplum*. In this way, Horace teases at the notion that poem 1.18 is corrective of his behavior at the beginning of the *Epistles*.

As we transition to 1.18, it becomes abundantly clear that Horace is critical of his refusal to cooperate with Maecenas in *Epistles* 1.1 and 1.7. Here, Horace places himself as the “ethical *monitor*” of Lollius and “offers a voice of experiences... in order to advise Lollius... on the

¹¹ Oliensis 1998, p.170.

¹² Oliensis 1998, p.170.

¹³ The use of the word *rege* for “patron”, though it may appear as a way of reproaching Maecenas, is actually a stylized term. As Fairclough (1926, p.364) points out, “in comedy the term *rex* is used by a parasite of his patron.” In addition, this interpretation is corroborated as this specific line is cited in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (2nd ed.) as an example of the word *rex* meaning “a great man in relation to his clients.” Therefore, though it may be incredibly tantalizing to read *rege* as critical of Maecenas, we cannot.

¹⁴ McCarter 2015, p.203.

pitfalls of friendship with the great.”¹⁵ Much as Scaeva was in 1.17, Lollius becomes a figure through whom Horace can project both his ethical debate on the ideal amounts of social freedom and dependence in patronage. Lollius is a historically relevant figure as the only ex-consul in the book and as a *novus homo* like Horace.¹⁶ His presence in this epistle is striking as while he was a politically relevant figure, he was not “in” with the inner circle of Augustus.¹⁷ Here, it can be read that Horace is not only advising Lollius, but arguing to Augustus to bring him in.¹⁸ To Oliensis, Horace offers Lollius to Maecenas as a “more suitable candidate” for social companionship than Horace.¹⁹ She argues that “Horace instructs Lollius to do just what Horace himself declines to do in *Epistles* 1.1 and 1.7.”²⁰ In this way, Oliensis argues, in 1.18, Horace continues the *recusatio* of 1.1 and offers up a younger poet as a proxy for his attendance in Rome. On the other hand, McCarter views the poem “as a revision of that earlier refusal in that it sets up new parameters through which his own compliance can conditionally occur.”²¹ The evidence, namely Horace’s lessons to Lollius and parallelism to *Epistles* 1.1 and 1.7, suggest that McCarter’s interpretation is preferable.

Horace advises Lollius on restraint in speech as well as the need to adapt to a patron’s demands in a way that implies criticism of his own *recusationes*. First, Horace outlines to Lollius that “true *amicitia* is a mean between extremes” by addressing his fear of appearing too dependent or free to his patron.²² He then extends this argument to unrestricted speech as

¹⁵ McCarter 2015, p.204.

¹⁶ Syme 1986, p.397.

¹⁷ Syme 1986, p.393.

¹⁸ Lyne 1995, p.205.

¹⁹ Oliensis 1998, p.171.

²⁰ Oliensis 1998, p. 170.

²¹ McCarter 2015, p.2014.

²² McCarter 2015, p.206.

asperitas agrestis et inconcinna gravisque is nearly as bad as acting like a parasite.²³ Here, Horace is arguing as he does in his *Satires* in which he criticizes Lucilius for speaking with unmitigated, hostile *libertas*.²⁴ However, there are many connections to *Epistle* 1.1 that suggest Horace appears critical of the way he asserted his poetic freedom “by adopting excessive hostility.”²⁵ For instance, in 1.1, Horace embodies the persona of a retired gladiator who refuses to compromise with Maecenas’ invitations and calls himself *virtutis verae custos rigidusque satelles* or the “strict guardian and attendant of true virtue.”²⁶ In 1.18, Horace depicts Lollius’ boorish friend as wanting “his *libertas mera*, ‘unmixed freedom,’ to come across as *vera virtus*, ‘true virtue.’”²⁷ Horace continues to discuss hostility by showing how Lollius’ friend is wrong as he, *rixatur de lana saepe caprina et propugnat nugis armatus*.²⁸ In this example, Horace condemns the way in which the friend argues with his patron about *nugis*, suggesting that he is being unnecessarily combative. Once more, this is evidence of McCarter’s corrective argument as Horace embodies the combative behavior in 1.1 that he advises against in 1.18. Through these examples, it is clear that Horace is somewhat critical of the excessive *libertas* he depicts in 1.1 and 1.7.

While Horace may be critical of himself, there is no evidence to suggest that he is critical of Maecenas. In one section, Horace’s tone indicates that he is frustrated with the process of *amicitia*. Horace ominously warns Lollius that *dulcis inexpertis cultura potentis amici: expertus metuet* or “for inexperienced men, the cultivation of a powerful *amicus* is sweet: yet the

²³ Hor. *Ep.* 1.18.6, “Boorish harshness that is inelegant and hostile.”

²⁴ Lyne 1995, p.26.

²⁵ McCarter 2015, p.208.

²⁶ Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.17.

²⁷ McCarter 2015, p.208. The Latin referenced comes from line 8 of *Epistles* 1.18 which she introduced earlier.

²⁸ Hor. *Ep.* 1.18.15-16, “He quarrels often about goat wool and fit for war he fights over trifles.”

experienced man will be afraid.”²⁹ At first glance Oliensis suggests “the shift from plural to singular singles out Horace as the man who has tried this kind of ‘friendship’ and found it wanting.”³⁰ She goes on to argue that “it is thus open to us and to Maecenas to read this letter as retroactively revealing the internal resistance Horace himself had to overcome when complying with his patron’s demands.”³¹ In each of these assessments, Oliensis claims that Horace’s comments to Lollius are an expression of caution coming from a place of exhaustion with Maecenas. McCarter on the other hand reads these lines differently as she argues that they “call for [*amicitia*] to be entered with opened eyes, the same sort of opened eyes that Horace, thanks to his many years of *amicitia* with Maecenas, currently possesses.”³² Though Oliensis and McCarter interpret Horace’s attitude differently, they both demonstrate how Horace is relying on his experience to teach Lollius the ideal mannerisms of a *cliens*. Horace remains deferential to his patron, and though he does not specifically name him, he remains grateful for the position he is in.³³ Though this can be a face Horace dons, the focus on Horace’s experience with great men is focused on how to win them over. There is no discussion of how a patron provided an affectionate relationship. Therefore, both 1.17 and 1.18 demonstrate that Horace does not depict the patron-client relationship as the affectionate relationship we call “friendship.”

Horace the Slave

The internal struggle of the *Epistles* is Horace’s acceptance of restrictions to his freedom. Though many of Horace’s poems focus on various aspects of freedom, several do in fact draw

²⁹ Hor. *Ep.* 1.18.86-87.

³⁰ Oliensis 1998, p.171. This same resentment is seen by Reckford (1959, p.206).

³¹ Oliensis 1998, p.171-172.

³² McCarter 2015, p.220.

³³ Oliensis 1998, p. 172-3.

upon slavery as a theme. As Fitzgerald claims, “as an extreme condition, slavery provided the free with a metaphor and yardstick for a variety of relationships.”³⁴ Throughout his *Epistles* and the rest of his corpus, Horace has many poems in which he dons the mask of the slave or utilizes a slave as a key figure. I contend that Horace uses these instances of slavery as a metaphor for his *amicitia* with Maecenas as it links the idea of *libertas* with the manumission of a slave. The linkage of these two relationships reiterates Horace’s place below Maecenas and reinforces the vertical nature of their relationship.

Epistle 2.2 establishes a thematic link between slavery and *amicitia* that echoes back through Horace’s corpus. In 2.2, Horace poses a hypothetical situation to Florus in which a man wanted to sell a *puer* or “slave-boy.”³⁵ The slave-dealer goes on to describe the slave: *hic et candidus et talos a vertice pulcher ad imos... litterulis Graecis imbutus, idoneus arti cuilibet; argilla quidvis imitaberis uda; quin etiam canet indoctum sed dulce bibenti.*³⁶ The knowledge that the slave is *litterulis Graecis imbutus* should immediately set off alarms as Horace was the one who took Greek lyric and made it Roman. The mention here of Greek, though it is very common for slaves to know Greek, shows how Horace signals that the slave will be compared to himself. In this passage, Horace embraces the voice of the slave complaining to the demanding master as he writes:

*“Dixi me pigrum proficiscenti tibi, dixi
talibus officiis prope mancum, ne mea saevus
iurgares ad te quod epistula nulla redirect.
quid tum profeci, mecum facientia iura*

³⁴ Fitzgerald 2000, p. 69.

³⁵ Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.1.

³⁶ Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.3-4 and 7-9, “He is handsome, lovely from head to toe... he is trained in Greek letters, adaptable to whatever task you fancy; he is wet clay that can be molded however you wish; he even can sing for you while you are drinking, artlessly but sweetly.”

*si tamen attemptas? Queris super hoc etiam, quod
exspectata tibi non mittam carmina mendax.*

I told you when you were leaving that I was lazy, I told you that I am quite defective at such things, lest you angrily scold me because no letter of mine reached you in reply. What good then did I do, if when my deeds are right you still attack me? And then, even more than this, you complain that since I did not send the poems you were expecting that I am a liar.³⁷

This passage highlights the diminutive nature of the slave-poet in the face of his master.

Fitzgerald uniquely points out however that “[Horace] has split himself into the poet and the client who commends his services, and he has cast the whole transaction between patron and client into a framework that gently reminds Florus of the limits of the patron’s rights over his client.”³⁸ The critical portion of Fitzgerald’s observation is that there is a conflation of the master-slave relationship and the patron-client relationship that places Horace directly at its center. In this way, the poem creates a direct comparison between Horace’s role as a *cliens* and that of a slave. By using this poem as a starting point, we can read Horace’s use of slavery as a metaphor for *amicitia*.

Through this line of inquiry, one of Horace’s most notable interactions with a slave can be applied to his most famous ode to Maecenas in a way that reduces Horace to the role of the slave. In *Odes* 1.38, Horace accosts a *puer* for making preparations that he did not like. Horace “issues no order” after this, which is unique as Fitzgerald states that “for the slave-owner, all pleasures are accompanied by imperatives.”³⁹ The way in which the *puer* attends Horace, as well as the poem’s placement at the end of *Odes* 1, both create a link to *Odes* 3.29. At the start of this

³⁷ Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.20-25.

³⁸ Fitzgerald 2000, p.77.

³⁹ Fitzgerald 2000, p.28.

poem, Horace writes, *tibi non ante verso lene merum cado cum flore, Maecenas, rosarum et pressa tuis balanus capillis iamdudum apud me est.*⁴⁰ Here, Horace has made preparations for Maecenas, offering him not only a jar of wine, but also rose petals and balsam. When taken in comparison with 1.38, “the poet now plays the role of the ministering *puer* to his great friend.”⁴¹ Horace becomes the *puer* he previously scolded, inverting his position while also placing him squarely beneath Maecenas. At the same time, Horace implies that since he wishes to share a drink *sub atra vite* with the *puer* of 1.38, he would anticipate Maecenas’ doing the same in 3.29.⁴² Due to the intimacy of 1.38, I do not suggest that Horace is using these poems to criticize Maecenas for treating him poorly. Instead, I contend that Horace is reminding us of the verticality inherent in his relationship with Maecenas. The fact that 1.38 and 3.29 both are that the ends of their books, and that the creation of the servile character occurs in the first stanza indicates that the connection between the poems is not coincidental. While the books may have been initially performed separately, the first three books of the Odes were published together. This means that the structure and placement of poems within the books would be under the same creative scrutiny as the poems themselves. Therefore, the connections between the poems shows that Horace does not truly place himself on the same level as Maecenas.

There are several occurrences in the *Epistles* in which interpreting a slave-master dynamic as patronage further elucidates this claim. At the beginning of *Epistles* 1.1, Horace portrays himself as a retired gladiator, a character who “throughout the Roman tradition [was] a man utterly debased by fortune, a slave, a man altogether without worth and dignity.”⁴³ Once

⁴⁰ Hor. *Odes* 3.29.1-5, “Maecenas, a jar of unturned mellow wine is now already waiting for you at my house, along with rose petals and fresh-squeezed balsam for your hair.”

⁴¹ Fitzgerald 2000, p.31.

⁴² Hor. *Odes* 1.38.7-8, “Under the woven vine.”

⁴³ Barton 1993, p.12

given his wooden sword, the gladiator would be freed from his debt to his master. In that same way, Horace may be exclaiming to Maecenas he has paid off his debt by publishing this book of *Epistles*. Bowditch argues for such as she writes, “the economic meaning of *addictus* reinforces Horace’s use of the gladiatorial metaphor to express a past sense of obligation.”⁴⁴ In this way, Horace signifies that just as the gladiator is released from his *ludus*, he is now released from his role as *cliens*. This interpretation coincides with the purported decline seen between the relationship of Horace and Maecenas. Syme links Maecenas to the attempted conspiracy of L. Munera and Fannius Caepio in 22 B.C. He argues that here, “Maecenas begins to recede,”⁴⁵ potentially demonstrating why Maecenas fades from the spotlight. While this decline is highly debated among scholars, the literal reading of Horace as a retiring gladiator could suggest that this book of *Epistles* truly was the final payment for Horace.⁴⁶ Although there can be no certainty that there was both an end to Maecenas’ patronage and that this poem certifies as much, the connection between Horace the poet and Horace the slave is enlightening.

In *Epistles* 1.20, Horace compares his completed book of poetry to a recently freed slave in order to shield himself from his desires of success and glory. Horace calls the book *liber* which is also a play on the adjective *liber* meaning “of or pertaining to a freedman.”⁴⁷ Horace furthers the comparison by enacting a form of manumission as he releases the book to the world by saying, *fuge quo descendere gestis. Non erit emisso reditus tibi.*⁴⁸ In these lines *emisso* invokes a form of publication that is a manumission. McCarter notes as well that the “letter in some ways resembles a *manumissio per epistulam*, an informal method of manumission in which

⁴⁴ Bowditch 2001, p.173. Bowditch references *addictus* which comes from *Ep.*1.1.14.

⁴⁵ Syme 1986, p.389.

⁴⁶ Bowditch 2010, p.72 discusses this contention amongst scholars.

⁴⁷ *Hor. Ep.*1.20.1 and *Oxford Latin Dictionary* 2nd ed. McCarter 2015, p.266.

⁴⁸ *Hor. Ep.*1.20.5-6, “Flee to where it is you long to go. There will be for you no return once you have been sent away.”

a master addressed a letter to a slave granting him freedom.”⁴⁹ As a freedman, or *libertinus*, the book goes against Horace’s stance on publications as it attempts to gain poetic fame for its author. Horace implies as such when he writes *cum tibi sol tepidus pluris admoverit aures, me libertino natum patre et in tenui re maiores pinnae nido extendisse loqueris*.⁵⁰ The statement about *maiores pinnae* establishes a direct comparison to the *decisae...pennae* or “clipped-wings” that he began with in *Epistles* 2.2.⁵¹ In this sense, Horace is transformed from the “liberating master” of the book in the first half of the poem to sharing in the book’s status as “free.”⁵² Much like the retired gladiator of 1.1, Horace to some extent now views himself as a *libertinus*. The persona of the freed slave of 1.1 as well as the liberating master and *libertinus* of 1.20 help to establish a framework of manumission that extends across the *Epistles*. This reinforces the conjecture that Horace is released from his bonds to Maecenas by publishing the *Epistles*.

In these few instances, Horace has utilized slavery as a way of helping to discern the placement of the poet in relation to his patron. These poems therefore serve to highlight the constraints that patronage places upon freedom. In this way, these poems are a natural extension of the debate on *libertas* and *servitus* seen in the *Epistles*. Fitzgerald suggests that the use of slavery reinforces independence when he writes, “the freedom of the citizen was sharpened by and contrasted with the servility of the slave.”⁵³ To McCarter, *Epistles* 1.20 serves to cap off the book as “one last compromise between Horace’s freedom and slavery, and the epistolary poetry that was the product and reflection of his independence must itself take on a degree of servitude.”⁵⁴ As McCarter and Fitzgerald suggest, the comparisons to slavery do not explicitly

⁴⁹ McCarter 2015, p.266.

⁵⁰ Hor. *Ep.* 1.20.19-21, “When the warmer sun brings you a larger audience, you will tell them that I, born from a freedman father in a modest home, spread my wings too far for my nest.”

⁵¹ Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.50.

⁵² McCarter 2015, p.272.

⁵³ Fitzgerald 2000, p.1.

⁵⁴ McCarter 2015, p.273.

create negative connotations for Horace's opinions of Maecenas. Just as *Epistles* 1.17 and 1.18, they both demonstrate that Horace's focus is on the position of the poet beneath the patron. In this way, Horace treats the patron-client relationship as a vertical relationship and not a "horizontal dyad of personal friendship."⁵⁵

⁵⁵ Bowditch 2001, p.167.

Conclusion

Each chapter shows that from the words to the tone to the themes, there are inherent ambiguities in assessing the *amicitia* of Horace and Maecenas. Certainly, there is no clear answer to whether or not Horace was a friend of Maecenas. The progressive changes of the works suggests that there is a gradual development in how Horace portrays the *amicitia*. Bowditch argues that as the *amicitia* develops, the gap of inequality between Horace and Maecenas diminishes and therefore the pair grows into “egalitarian friendship.”¹ She further clarifies this point in saying:

“The evidence of Suetonius, coupled with interpretations based on the poems themselves, suggests that the patronal relationship originally secured by an act of benefaction had become an external structure within which the feelings or emotive content of real friendship had developed.”²

I agree with Bowditch’s assessment that the patronal relationship served as the framework for a productive relationship to develop. However, as we have seen, Horace’s poetry does not definitively prove that the “emotive content of real friendship” arises. Horace’s treatment of his *amicitia* shows only that the framework of patronage, namely the vertical relationship between patron and client, is present from *Sermones* 1 to the *Epistles*.

While there may seemingly be instances of affection, these can merely be manifestations of Horace’s face-management. Horace has purposefully crafted his poetry in a way that suggests we are not to attempt to view his work as autobiographical. As he writes in his *Ars Poetica*: *aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere vitae...ficta voluptatis*

¹ Bowditch 2001, p.19

² Bowditch 2001, p.162. While Bowditch hinges much of her argument upon Suetonius’ *Vita Horatii*, I do not view his work as firm evidence for affection. Suetonius’ work celebrates the impact of Augustan writers on a similar level to politicians and is inherently a reaction to their works. Therefore, I do not view his writing with the same historical gravitas as Bowditch does.

causa sint proxima veris.³ Horace famously argues that poets either “aim to please or benefit.” In addition, he goes so far to say that even if a poet is crafting *ficta voluptatis causa*, he ought to make those as close to reality as possible. Therefore, how are we to discern between those poems that are fictions and those that are meant as truths if both are so rooted in reality? Horace suggests that maybe we are not meant to, but that we ought to enjoy and learn from the poems the best we can. To Horace, “a poem is like a picture.”⁴ Even if a poem may be framed as a personal confession, there will inherently be an element of fabrication.

How does this relate to Horace’s treatment of Maecenas? In general, it is clear that we often oversimplify the complexities of ancient relationships. We often take an ancient writers’ words too literally. While this may be the intended interpretation, we simply cannot know what the author wanted to tell his contemporary audience. Ultimately, the inherent differences between ancient and modern society hinder the application of the messages and meanings of ancient Roman literature to modern analysis. That being said, the language, faces, and themes Horace use all reinforce the fact that we cannot confidently call their relationship a friendship. Instead, I advocate that we refer to the pair as patron and poet and that we label their relationship as literary *amicitia*.

³ Hor. *Ars Poetica* 333-338, “Poets aim either to benefit or to please, or at the same time to utter words both pleasing and helpful to life...fictions meant for pleasure ought to be close to truths.”

⁴ Hor. *Ars Poetica* 361, *Ut pictura poesis*.

Bibliography

- Barton, Carlin A. *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans: The Gladiator and the Monster*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993. Print.
- Bowditch, Phebe Lowell. *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage*. Berkeley: University of California, 2001. Print.
- _____. 'Horace and Imperial Patronage', in *A Companion to Horace* (ed G. Davis), Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, UK, 2010. Print
- DuQuesnay I. M. LeM. 'Horace and Maecenas; the propaganda value of *Sermones* I', in T. Woodman and D. West, eds., *The Roman cultural revolution* (Cambridge), 1984. Print.
- Fairclough, H. Rushton. *Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica, with an English Translation*. London: W. Heinemann, 1926. Print.
- Fitzgerald, William. *Slavery and the Roman Literary Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Print.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. *Horace*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1957. Print.
- Garrison, Daniel. *Horace: Epodes and Odes*. University of Oklahoma Press: Norman, 1991. Print.
- Hands, Arthur R. *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome*. London, 1968. Print.
- Johnson, W. R. *Horace and the Dialectic of Freedom: Readings in Epistles 1*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993. Print.
- Lowrie, Michèle. "Horace and Augustus", *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*. Ed. Stephen Harrison. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. p.77-90. *Cambridge Companions Online*. Web. 19 February 2016.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995. Print.

Mayer, Roland. 1995. "Horace's *Moyen de Parvenir*." In *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*, edited by Stephen Harrison, 279–95. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McCarter, Stephanie. *Horace between Freedom and Slavery: The First Book of Epistles*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 2015. Print.

Moles, John. "Cynicism in Horace Epistles I." *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 5: 34–39, 1985.

Oliensis, Ellen. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Print.

Perret, Jacques. *Horace*. Translated by Bertha Humez. New York: New York University Press, 1964.

Reckford, Kenneth J. "Horace and Maecenas." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 90 (1959): 195-208. *JSTOR [JSTOR]*. Web. 08 June 2015.

Sahlins, M. 'On the Sociology of Primitive Exchange.' In M. Banton, ed. *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*, 139-236. New York, 1965.

Saller, Richard P. *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982. Print.

Starr, Chester G.. "Horace and Augustus". *The American Journal of Philology* 90.1 (1969): 58–64. Web. 13 November 2015.

Syme, Ronald. *The Augustan Aristocracy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986. Print.

Traina, Alfonso “Horace and Aristippus: The Epistles and the Art of Convivere.” In K.

Freudenberg, ed. *Horace: Satires and Epistles* (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies), 287–307. 1991.

Verboven, Koenraad. *The Economy of Friends: Economic Aspects of Amicitia and Patronage in the Late Republic*. Bruxelles: Editions Latomus, 2002. Print.

West, David. “Cur Me Querelis.” *The American Journal of Philology* 112 (1991): 45-52. *JSTOR* [JSTOR]. Web. 08 June 2015.

White, Peter. ‘Positions for Poets in Early Imperial Rome’, in *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (ed B. Gold), University of Texas Press, Austin, 1982. Print.

_____. *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993. Print.

Williams, Craig A. *Reading Roman Friendship*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Print.

Williams, Gordon. ‘Phases in Political Patronage of Literature in Rome’, in *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (ed B. Gold), University of Texas Press, Austin, 1982. Print.

_____. *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon P., 1968. Print.

Zetzel, James. ‘The Poetics of Patronage in the Late First Century B.C.’, in *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (ed B. Gold), University of Texas Press, Austin, 1982. Print.