Hospitium and Political Friendship in the Late Republic

John Nicols, University of Oregon

During the Republic, the relationship between Roman senators and peregrines, both individuals and communities, was regulated especially by *hospitium*. Generally speaking, *hospitium* involves a personal connection developing out of a guest-host experience. This notion of reception in the home of another and the establishment of mutual protection is a fundamental feature of Greek and Roman social history.[1] In the Roman concept, as in other ancient cultures, *hospitium* belonged to *mos*; that is, it was not regulated by human law, but was sacred (*hospitium…quod sanctissimum est*, Cic. Verr. II 2.110), being guaranteed by the gods to serve the interests of mankind. For my purpose here, the primary interest of this material lies in the interaction between two Roman institutions, *hospitium* and *patrocinium*; between the *hospes*/patron, on one hand, and the members of the local and provincial eliteson the other. The exercise of *hospitium* was a central element not only in the day-to-day administrative practice, but provided also structure that allowed imperial and local interests to be reconciled. This paper examines two components of *hospitium*: first, we shall look at a number of specific cases in the late republic and then examine some of the epigraphical manifestations of the phenomenon. The most useful single document for such an analysis is Cicero's "Verrine Orations". No other single literary source provides as much information as does this work. Moreover, though the audience as "virtual", Cicero had to remain true to its expectations about how *hospitium* worked. Though there is clearly some oratorical exaggeration, the description of both the positive and negative aspects of *hospitium* is constructed as a historically consistent context whole.[2]

1 *Hospites*, *amici*, patrons and clients

References to *hospitium* and *patrocinium* in the *Verrines*, summarized in Tables 1 and 2, are frequent and diverse.[3] It is readily apparent that the pattern of *hospitium* is quite different from that of *patrocinium*. In the seven of nine cases of *patrocinium* in the *Verrines* (Table 1) the patron is an individual Roman senator and the client is a community; that is, in seven of the nine cases, we have *patrocinium publicum*. The reverse applies to *hospitium*: Of the eighteen cases (Table 2), only three are *publice* and all the rest are *privatim* (i.e., both parties are individuals).

---

[1]For comments and suggestions, I am grateful to Michael Peachin and Mary Jaeger. On this subject, Th. Mommsen, 1864, I 319 ff. and J. Marquardt, 1886, 195 ff., R. Leonhard, 2493 ff. and T. P. Wiseman, 1971, 33ff. For the earlier period, L. J. Bolchazy,1977.

[2]As Cicero was speaking to a Roman audience, we must conclude that both the values associated with *hospitium* were indeed Roman, even though the original decree may have been in Greek.

[3]For the Roman perspective on the problem, see P. A. Brunt, 1980, 273ff. As traveling Roman magistrates regularly required the simple hospitality, it is likely that the list given here is incomplete.

Note, however, the instructive case of C. Claudius Pulcher. He not only was the patron of the Mamertini, but also that he was *hospes* of the Heii, a prominent family of that town (II 4.6). The two institutions appear then to serve quite distinct though complementary functions. Even so, there is enough variation in practice to suggest that no general rule may be deduced that would account for all instances.

Administrative activity in a province provided the most frequently used vehicle for initiating the relationship. Indeed, Verres (and Cicero, too) seems to have acquired an extensive number of *hospites* in the course of his travels through his province. The formalization of the connection typically followed an invitation to dine and/or to reside at the house of one party. This relationship is simple *hospitium* (e.g., II 5.108) and could be transferred to the descendants of both parties.[4] Whether simple *hospitium* developed into an enduring and politically useful connection was influenced by additional factors, namely how often hospitality was extended, the status of the provincial *hospes*, his connection to other important Romans, and by the willingness of both parties to provide the needed services. One may make distinctions on several levels:

- between the regulating force of *hospitium* and that of *patrocinium*,
- between *hospitium privatim* and *publice*, and
- on the nature of the relationship when *hospitium* is linked to notions of *amicitia*, *clientela* and *necessitas*.

2 Equality and Inequality

Hospitium, as Badian observes, "originally implies ipso facto, an equivalence or near equality between the hospitable arrangements awaiting each party."[5] Although this sense of theoretical equality was perhaps never lost, it is apparent that *hospitium* could also absorb relationships of inequality. Hence, *hospitium* provided not only for provisions and lodging, but also for protection. In the sense that Romans were received into the homes of provincials and provincials into the homes of Romans, the tradition of equality was maintained. Inequality, implicit in the formula *hospes atque cliens*, developed not simply because the Roman was more "powerful" but because of the inequality of protection: The protection the Roman *hospes* needed in the provinces was not comparable to the protection needed by the provincial even in his own community. Badian, indeed, has argued that there is no need to distinguish between *hospitium* and *clientela*, that the former is little more than a polite fiction for the latter.[6] It may then be reasonable to assume that when the word *hospes* is connected with *cliens* or *patronus*, the relationship between the parties is more "unequal". From the perspective of the Roman senator, this may well have been true, but what about those cases in which *hospes* is connected with the implicitly more equal term, *amicus*? Was it a matter of indifference to the provincial whether his *hospes* was also an *amicus* or a *patronus*? The evidence suggests that Cicero and the provincials were sensitive to these distinctions.

Consider the case of the most prominent of the Sicilians, Sthenius of Thermae. He is consistently described as the *hospes atque amicus* of some of the most important Romans of his day including, C. Marius, Pompeius,

[4]The *tesserae* and *tabulae hospitalis* regularly mention descendants (see below). On the conventions of dining see Michael Peachin's contribution to this volume.

[5]1958, 11; the same implications exist in *proxenia*, see F. Gschnitzer, RE Suppl 13, 645.

[6]Badian, id., 154-5.

Marcellus, Sisenna and other *viri fortissimi*. Indeed, he had many *amici* at Rome to whom he could complain about Verres (*rem ad amicos suos detulit*).[7] On the other hand, Diodorus of Melita, though of good family and character, does not appear to have been nearly as influential or as prominent as Sthenius. As a consequence, he had to appeal to his *patroni atque hospites* for aid.[8] In these cases, the equation of patron and *hospes* suggest a lower status of Diodorus while the linkage of *hospitium* and *amicitia* stresses the greater prominence of Sthenius among both Romans and provincials.

In sum, *hospitium* may have offered only the appearance of equality, but appearances were very important to those affected. Indeed, Cicero defined the social status of provincials in the *Verrines* linking these words with other qualifiers.

3 *Hospitium publice* and *privatim*

An additional problem of definition also requires discussion, namely, the relationship between *hospitium publice* and *hospitium privatim*. Cicero notes on one occasion that he is defending *multi hospites publice privatimque* (II 2.118). The former of these *hospites* should be understood to refer to communities, the latter, to individuals. It is, for example, the Syracusan senate which decreed that Cicero and his cousin should receive *hospitium publice* (II 4.145) and it is the Mamertini as a *civitas*, who are criticized for not doing the same (II 4.25). In contrast, *hospitium privatum* refers to a personal connection between two individuals such as between Cicero and Sthenius (II 2.117) or between Verres and Agathinus (II 2.89).

This distinction between *hospitium publice* and *privatim* was not exclusionary. While some communities had facilities for entertaining visiting dignitaries, it appears to be more usual for members of the local elite to take turns providing hospitality for official guests. Hence, Philodamus of Lampsacus protested that it was not his turn to provide services for Verres' associates (II 1.65). When a city voted to provide hospitality, it meant that one wealthy member of the state would undertake the responsibility as a liturgy or *munus*.[9]

---

[7] On Sthenius' prominence, see II 2.103 where all the Sicilians petition on his behalf. See also Münzer, RE IIIA "Sthenius" No. 2, Badian, 1958, 282. L. Cornelius Sisenna, the historian, RE IV "Cornelius" No. 375. On the *viri fortissimi*, *Verr*., II 2.110. On the complaints, II 2.95.

[8] II 4.37 and 41; surely, Q. Lutatius Diodorus of Lilybaeum and Diodorus ...*Lilybaei...multos annos habitat* are one and the same.

[9] Foundations and granting agencies work on the same assumption. E.g., the Fulbright Commission or the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung function as *hospites publici*, but they rely on a *hospes privatus*, like Geza Alföldy, to provide for the amenities.

4 The Initiation of the Relationship

Hospitium is extended by some formal invitation, by a decree of the local senate, if *publice*, or by the offer of lodging and victuals, if *privatim*. In both cases, the formula is clear: *invitare eum publice tecto ac domo* (II 4.25) or: *eum domum suam invitare* (II 2.89). Once the invitation had been accepted, the guest moved into the home of his new *hospes*.

Cicero does not mention other formalities, but the sources indicate that some kind of *tessera* and/or a guest-gift might be produced to commemorate the occasion. It may well be that Verres' abuse of the *iura hospitii* is to be connected with this gift.[10]

Cicero observes that Sthenius collected objects of marvelous artistic value not so much for his own pleasure, but especially to impress his friends and *hospites* (*non tam suae delectionis causa quam ad invitationes adventusque nostrorum hominum, amicorum atque hospitum,* II 2.83). This collection no aroused the interest (and cupidity) of many Romans and also enabled him to acquire an illustrious group of *hospites* at Rome (II 2.110). Verres might have been an exception in his readiness to take advantage of his position, but it is clear that the material duties of *hospitium* were by no means minimal. Sthenius apparently could afford to entertain and to obligate a number of important Romans. Others were not so fortunate. Cicero was well aware of this burden. In Messana, for example, he had his cousin put up in another household, apparently in order to reduce the costs to his personal *hospes* (II 4.25).

5 The Duties of the *Hospites*

The responsibilities of the provincial *hospes* were not simply material. Just as the reputation of a *homo clarus* could be enhanced by receiving *hospites multi* (Cic. *de off.* I 139), so too, Cicero characterizes his *hospes*, Sthenius, as someone who was particularly zealous about his (Cicero's) reputation (…*quem ego in quaestura mea singulariter dilexissem, de quo optime existimassem, quem in provincia existimationis meae studiosissimum cupidissimumque cognossem*, II 2.117).[11] Along with this mutual concern for their respective reputations, the *hospes* was also expected, when relevant, to advise and, where necessary, to act for his Roman counterpart. Hence Verres encouraged his *hospes*, Sthenius, to secure several valuable *signa pulcherrima atque antiquissima*. When the latter refused, the governor renounced the *hospitium* between them and then urged his *hospes novus*, Agathinus, not only to secure the statues, but also to prosecute Sthenius on a trumped-up charge (II 2.84-5, 88-9). The important point about these episodes is not their extortionate character, but the fact that Cicero and his contemporaries (Verrres

[10] On the guest gift, II 2.88 and Mommsen, 1864, 346. Also II 2.84 and Livy, V 28: *hospitum cum eo senatus consulto est factum donaque publice data*. On moving into the home, II 2.89. The expression *tessera hospitalis* is frequently used on early inscriptions of this kind, *ILLRP* 1064-9.

[11] On this point, note Cicero's remarks concerning Deiotarus: "public life has bound me to him in friendship (*amicitia*), mutual regard in *hospitium*, intercourse in intimacy (*familiaritas*); while his great services (*magna officia*) to me and to my army have riveted me to him by the closest of ties (*summam necessitudinem*), *de Deiot*. 14.39. Also such stock phrases as: "I have with X ties not only of *hospitium*, but also of closest *familiaritas*" (*ad Fam* 13,36,1; 52.1; 73.2).

included) expectated *hospites* to as their agents. Provincial *hospites* then served a number of functions beyond providing housing. It was this role that linked individuals among the local elite to the Roman elite and generated the appearance of clientele. It is not stated whether Sthenius actually lodged with Cicero or any of his other *hospites* during his lengthy exile in Rome, but the orator and his audience expected Roman senators to defend *hospitis salutem fortunasque* and cites a series of precedents illustrating the virtue of such actions (II 2.117-8; *Div. Caec.* 64).

6 The Violation of *Hospitium*

One of the most persistent charges made against Verres is that, aside from transgressing Roman law, he has also offended the gods and Roman tradition by his frequent and flagrant violation of the *iura hospitii*. Cicero pointedly reminded his listeners that Verres' failure to respect the *iura hospitii* was outrageous and uncivilized. Note, for example, the rhetorical question at II 2.111: *quare de hospitio violato et de tuo scelere nefario nihil queror*? Cicero mentions two other examples. Dexo of Tyndaris, the father of one of those captains unjustly charged with betraying the fleet to the pirates, appealed to Verres for justice: he was, Cicero says, *homo nobilissimus, hospes tuus. Cuius tu domi fueras, quem hospitem appellaras, eum cum illa auctoritate miseria videres perditum, non te eius lacrimae, non senectus, non hospitii ius atque nomen a scelere aliquam ad partem humanitatis revocare potuit? Sed quid ego hospitii iura in hac immani belua commemoro? Qui Sthenium Thermitanum, hospitem suum, cuius domum per hospitium exhausit et exinanivit, absentem in reos rettulerit, causa indicta capite damnarit, ab eo nunc hospitiorum iura atque officia quaeramus?* (II 5.108-9; also II 2.116: [Verres] *ardebat amore illius hospitae, propter quam hospitii iura violaret*). Respect for *hospites* and for *hospitium* served not only to raise the human above the level of wild beasts and also constituted the basis of civilized life.

7 The Renunciation of *Hospitium*

Another aspect of *hospitium* mentioned in these speeches is the *renuntiatio* of the connection. Several authors describe the termination of personal connections of various kinds, but the *renuntiatio hospitii* is known only from one passage in Livy (XXV 18.9) and from one in the *Verrines* (II 2.84-5). The same formula is employed and the same disapproval is expressed in both narrations: *hospitium*, once established by principled men, had to be maintained honorably.

The renunciation of *patrocinium publicum* is not attested. But, though there are few references to renunciation of patronage or clientele in the period covered by this study, such relationships clearly did end at least in the sense that they ceased to function. Lack of contact, neglect of obligations, outright abandonment (in time of need), or even compelling necessity, may have been the primary causes. It is significant that the sources do not generally dwell on the phenomenon. Notable and instructive exceptions include the relations between Deiotarus, Pharnaces, Pompeius and Caesar. Caesar's judgment is quite clear that compelling necessity was an adequate excuse.

8. Statues and Inscriptions:

Both statues and inscriptions were used to commemorate the relationship between patrons, clients and *hospites*. There is, of course some overlap; statues had bases on which were recorded at least the names of the party honored and of the party dedicating the monument and, frequently, also the reasons for the dedication. References to patronage, both civic and personal, especially appear on thousands of imperial inscriptions, many of them statue bases.[12] Another group of inscriptions, like the *tabulae patronatus* and *hospitalis*, were displayed on public buildings of various kinds as well as in private houses.[13]

In two places, Cicero records the use of bronze for epigraphical purposes, *tabulae aeneae*. In the first case, the reference is to Sthenius, *cuius de meritis in rem publicam Thermitanorum Siculosque universos fuit aenea tabula fixa Thermis in curia, in qua publice erat de huius beneficiis scriptum et incisum* (II 2.112). This is very close, in language and in form, to the kind of document widely used in the Principate (e.g., CIL IX 3429) and illustrates how useful such documents could be in court. In the second case, Cicero notes that the decree extending him *hospitium publicum* was recorded on bronze: *id* (the decree) *non modo tum scripserunt verum etiam in aere incisum nobis tradiderunt* (II 4.145), a formula that suggests that though decrees were common, the use of bronze was not.

During the Late Republic, there was considerable variety in the form of these *tessearae*. Some were shaped like animals (e.g., *ILLRP* 1068) but more commonly they were plaques either quadratic or pentagonal in shape. The decoration was often imaginative including wings, the symbolism of which is not at all clear. Of particular interest in this respect are two inscriptions from Spain (*AE* 1961. 96 from Castellum Toletum in the Tarrconensis, and *AE* 1936.66 from Baetulo in the same province, plates 1 and 2). The former of these two dates to A.D. 28 and records the establishment of *hospitium* between the Castellum and a prominent native. The inscription is pentagonal (a rectangle with a triangle added above) in shape, decorated with two wings (cf. plate 4) and a portrait bust presumably of one of the two parties set into the triangle. The second one, though dating from about A.D. 98, is rectangular, but includes also a very practical handle at the top. As there are four holes, one in each corner, the handle is clearly designed not for mounting the *tabula* on the wall, but rather for carrying it by hand.

Those that establish *hospitium publicum* ipso facto involve a community of some sort (a clan, *castellum*, or organized civic entity). Those that date to the Late Republic and Early Principate and involve Roman magistrates are generally high quality castings and are carefully engraved with well-formed letters. There is no indication in any of them that the use of bronze to record the relationship, or the establishment of *hospitium* was in any way unusual; though one should bear in mind Cicero's observation on quoted above.

The number of surviving bronze *tabulae* commemorating the establishment of *hospitium* continues to grow, the indications of Cicero, Pliny the Elder and other writers as well as the routine and self-evident presentation of the

[12] This subject is covered more formally in my forthcoming study of civic patronage in the Roman Empire.

[13] Nicols, 1980, 535 ff., and more generally, A. Wallace-Hadrill, 1988, 42ff. Technically, *tessera* refers to one item so divided that each party had a commemorative half. During the first centuries BC and AD, the term continues to be used, but the surviving plaques are "whole", suggesting the fabrication of duplicates. E.g., Nicols, id., no. 13 = ILS 6094.

inscriptions themselves suggest that such monuments were indeed widely deployed in the Roman world.[14] Nonetheless, we need not imagine that magistrates proceeded through their provinces accompanied by mule trains laden with *tabulae* decreed for them in each town visited. Indeed, we need not assume that the all the monuments were in the 0.5 x 0.3 m. range of some of the best-known bronze inscriptions (e.g., CIL VI 1492, plate 3 quoted below; Corell, op. cit, gives 17.5 x 20.0). One can generate a very acceptable and eminently readable text on a significantly smaller tablet at a size comparable to the wax writing tablets commonly used during the period.

To illustrate the point I refer to two items. R. Lanciani describes the house belonging to Atticus and his descendants, the Pomponii Basi, in which when first excavated in 1558, "family documents and deeds, inscribed on bronze, were still hanging on the walls of the *tablinum*." These probably were largely *hospitium* and *patronus* decrees, which "frequently prescribe bronze for the decree and the right for the recipient to display it at home." Note the inscription given to Pomponius Bassus (and probably found during the excavation reported by Lanciani, 191) which concludes with the text: *in clientelam … domus suae municipium nostrum recipere dignetur patronumque se cooptari tabula hospitali incisa hoc decreto in domo sua posita permittat*, CIL VI 1492 (also ILS 7216 from A.D. 190: *honorem tabulamque aeream cum inscriptione huius decreti in domo eius poni).* It is especially interesting to note that the phenomenon of cooptation is recorded on a bronze *tabula hospitali*, suggesting also the conflation of the two institutions. Equally interesting is the collection of four *tabulae aenea* dating to the reign of Tiberius, *tabulae* that confirm the cooption of a modest equestrian official, one Silius Aviola, as patron of four towns in Africa (CIL V 4919ff.). These plaques (three of four have apparently disappeared) may have been originally placed in the atrium of Aviola's house near Brixia.

If these texts were ubiquitous in the Roman world (as I am suggesting here) why do not more of them survive? The usual answers apply, but in this case I suspect that *tabulae* and *tesserae* were particular vulnerable to re-use. As my own experiments with the material indicate, it does not require a sophisticated heating system to soften the bronze to the point that it can be cast for a variety of different purposes. I suspect, but clearly cannot demonstrate, that communities had storerooms with "blank" bronze *tabulae* that could be pulled out and engraved as the occasion demanded. Recasting and reusing bronze must have been common, but of course leaves no trace in the record.

In sum, there can be no question that *patroni*, *hospites* and *necessarii* of a community were honored by statues and inscriptions in the manner suggested by Cicero. Though there is no evidence that a statue of every *patronus civitatis* stood in the forum of the client or that every *hospes publicus* received a *tabula* or *tessera aenea*, some token recording the event was certainly prepared and those mentioned here, in stone and on bronze, may well have been the most common. It is significant that these items were set up not only in the community and in the *atria* of the honored, but also in public places at Rome at least through the end of the Republic: *...Romae videmus in basi statuarum* (note the plural) *maximis litteris incisum* (II 2.154; Plin. NH 34, 30). Such items were the material evidence of the power of the senator and of the influence of the community. Finally, the presence of such

[14] On bronze inscriptions and their use, see Callie Williamson, 1987, 160-83. For a list of *tabulae* with their texts, see Dopico Caínzos, 1988, 67f., and J. Corell, 1994, 59ff. The latter also bears "wings".

monuments especially at Rome, conveyed the perception of provincial clientele even if the monuments did not specifically refer to that fact.[15]

Conclusions

The *Verrines* offer an abundance of *exempla maleficiorum* in respect to the exercise of patronage and *hospitium*. It is no surprise then that scholars have questioned the effectiveness of the institution.

This judgment is too harsh. There are also numerous *exempla beneficiorum* in the *Verrines*. Moreover, when the Roman public and elite were confronted with the evidence of flagrant extortion, they abandoned Verres. Cicero proved himself to be an effective defender of his *hospites* and clients. Moreover, there are reasons to believe that at least some of the traditional patrons and *hospites* of the island and its people preferred to act informally and for that reason it is extremely difficult to assess the effectiveness of their efforts. Nonetheless, it is important to bear in mind that if provincials were systematically disappointed, they would not have continued to seek patrons and *hospites* or appealed to them for protection.

Though Cicero is here primarily concerned with the manner in which Verres abused and exploited his legal (as governor) and his extra-legal (as *patronus* and *hospes*) position, he also describes, by way of contrast, the manner in which the *officia* of these institutions might be honorably met. *Patrocinium* and *hospitium* provide for mutual protection (*praesidium*) and assistance *(auxilium*) in an extra-legal context. For a member of the Roman governing class, *clientes* and *hospites* provided for the physical comforts of himself and his staff while circulating through the province and, as members of his *concilium*, were advisors, agents and sources of information on local conditions and problems. Moreover, they provided, on the appropriate occasion, protection in the form of testimonials and eulogies and, through their numbers and visibility, constituted an important measure of his reputation and power. For the provincials, the Roman patron or *hospes* served as an arbitrator of their internal disputes, as a guarantor of their safety and fortunes, as their mediator with the central government, as a promoter of individual and collective interests and, finally, as a visible symbol of their influence and reputation.

In sum, clients hoped that formal patronage and associated honors would induce members of the Roman elite to respect their interests. It is not so critical that a client succeeded or failed to manipulate a patron in any one case. Given the complex nature of the ties among the Roman nobility conflicts of interest must have been frequent and unavoidable. Hence, true protection could only be secured by having a number of patrons (and *necessarii*). The longer provincials were in contact with Romans the greater the number of opportunities they had, individually and collectively, to enter such relationships.

[15]For examples of monuments found at Rome that specifically connect governors and patronage, not the cases of Aelius Lamia, *AE* 1948, 93, and a certain Rufus, *CIL* VI 1508. Both individuals appear on monumental inscriptions and, at least in the latter case, had become patron of at least six provincial communities.

Bibliography:

Badian, E., *Foreign Clientelae*, Oxford, 1958.

Bolchazy, L. J., *Hospitality in Early Rome*, Chicago, 1977.

Brunt, P. A., Patronage and Politics in the Verrines, *Chiron* 10(1980) 273ff.

Dopico Caínzos, Maria Dolores, *La tabula Lougeiorum*, Santiago, 1988,

Corell, J. "Nueva *tabula patronatus* precedente de la Baetica", *Epigraphica* 56(1994) 59ff.

Gschnitzer, F., Art. "*proxenia*" *RE Suppl.* 13, 645.

Lanciani, R., *Pagan and Christian Rome* (London, 1892)

Leonhard, R., Art. "*hospitium*", *RE* VIII 2493 ff.

Marquardt, J. Das Privatleben der Römer, Leipzig, 1886.

Mommsen, Th. "Das römische Gastrecht und die römische Clientele", in *Römische Forschungen*, Berlin 1864.

Münzer, F. Art Sthenius" No. 2, *RE* IIIA "

Nicols, J., "Tabulae Patronatus", *ANRW* II, 13, Ed. H. Temporini, Berlin and New York, 1980, II, 13. 535.

Peachin, M., "Friendship and Abuse at the Dinner Table", in this volume.

Wallace-Hadrill, A., "The Social Structure of the Roman House", *PBSR* 56(1988) 43-97.

Williamson, C., "Monuments of bronze: Roman legal documents on bronze tablets", *Class. Ant* 6 (1987) 160-83

Wiseman, T. P. New Men in the Roman Senate, Oxford, 1971.

Plates:

1 = *AE* 1961. 0096 from Castellum Toletum in the Tarrconensis (photo from DAI Madrid, 0-746)
2 = *AE* 1936. 0066 from Baetulo in the same province
3 = CIL VI 1492 from Rome (?; photo from SAG Heidelberg
4 = AE 1972. 0263 from Munigua (photo from DAI Madrid, PLF 544)

Scans of the inscriptions available at:

http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~jnicols/projects/Photos/

Table 1
Patrons and Clients in the Verrines:

Patron	Client	Reference:	Text
patroni	Diodorus	II 4.41	*circum patronos cursare*
M. Claudius	Mamertini	II 4.6:	*Mamertini populi patronus*
P. Scipio	Segestani	II 4.80	*clientes tui*
M. Mar. Aeserninus	Sicilia	II 4.91	*patronum Siciliae*
C. Marcellus	Siculi	II 4.89:	*patronus*
Marcelli	Sicilia	II 3.45	*patronos Sicilae*
Marcelli	Sicilia	Div Q. Caec 13	*patroni Siciliae*
Marcelli	Heraclius	II 2.36??	*patronos...habuit*
Marcelli	Siculi	II 4.89:	*Siculorum...patroni*
Cn. Lentulus	Sicilia	II 2.103:	*patronum Siciliae*
patroni	Caecilius	II 1.28	*patroni Dionis*
C. Verres	Sicilia	II 2.154	*patronum insulae*
C. Verres	Siculi	II 2.114	*Siculorum patronum*

Table 2
Hospites* in the *Verrines

Roman	Provincial(s)	Reference
L. Tullius	*domus Pompeii Percennii*	II 4.25
L. Tullius	Syracuse	II 4.145
M. Tullius	Cn. Pompeius Basiliscus	II 4.25
M. Tullius	Syracuse	II 4.145
M. Tullius	Sthenius	II 2.117
M. Tullius	hospites multi	II 2.118
C. Claudius	domus Heii	II 4.6
C. Verres	Sthenius	II 5.109
C. Verres	Sthenius	II 3.18
C. Verres	Sthenius	II 2.110
C. Verres	Sthenius	II 2.83
C. Verres	Aristeus and Dexo	II 5.110
C. Verres	Agathinus	II 2.94
C. Verres	Dortheus	II 2.89
C. Verres	Lyso	II 4.37
C. Verres	C. Heius	II 4.18
Marcelli	Sicilians	II 4.89
C. Marius	Sthenius	II 2.111
C. Marcellus	Sthenius	II 2.111
L. Sisenna	Sthenius	II 2.111
viri fortissimi	Sthenius	II 2.111